Loyola University Chicago
Loyola eCommons

Dissertations

Theses and Dissertations

1980

The Role of the Central Office Instructional Leader in Selected Public Elementary School Districts

William J. Loftus
Loyola University Chicago

Follow this and additional works at: https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss

Part of the Education Commons

Recommended Citation

Loftus, William J., "The Role of the Central Office Instructional Leader in Selected Public Elementary School Districts" (1980). *Dissertations*. 1890.
https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss/1890

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License.
Copyright © 1980 William J Loftus

THE ROLE OF THE CENTRAL OFFICE INSTRUCTIONAL LEADER IN SELECTED PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICTS

by

William J. Loftus

Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the School of Education of Loyola University of Chicago in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Education

January

1980

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to thank Dr. Max A. Bailey, director of his dissertation committee, for his guidance, support, and encouragement throughout the preparation of this study. The interest and concern that Dr. Bailey demonstrated played an important role in bringing this study to its final conclusion. In addition, the author is grateful to Dr. Jasper J. Valenti and Dr. Philip Carlin for their assistance as members of the dissertation committee and for their advice and cooperation in resolving problems encountered by the author while doing the research for this study.

A special note of thanks and appreciation is due Jackie Karvanek for her assistance in typing and to Larry Wyllie for the gentle prodding that he provided in helping the author to complete this study.

Most importantly, the author wishes to thank his wife, Debbie, for the love and concern that was extended so unselfishly and that was so essential to the author's success in realizing his goals. The same debt of gratitude is owed to all of the members of the author's family for the network of support that was present at all times and was called upon frequently.

Thanks are due to the good Lord who gave the author the strength and perseverance doggedly to pursue the fulfillment of his dream to gain this degree in order to better serve others in the field of education.

VITA

William J. Loftus was born in Chicago, Illinois, December 12, 1946. He received his elementary and secondary education in parochial schools in Chicago and graduated from Quigley Preparatory Seminary in June 1964. He received the Bachelor of Science degree from the University of Illinois, Chicago Circle, in June 1968 and the Master of Arts degree in Education from St. Xavier College in August 1971.

He began his teaching career in September 1969 as a mathematics teacher at Evergreen Park High School and entered the field of education administration in 1971 as an assistant principal at Laramie Junior High School in Oak Forest, Illinois. From 1972 until 1977 he was an elementary school principal in School District 125, Alsip, Illinois, and was appointed as the first principal of the Hamlin Heights Upper Grade Center in that school district in 1977. In 1978 he was awarded the position of Assistant Superintendent/Curriculum Director for Berwyn School District 100, Berwyn, Illinois.

The author is married to the former Deborah Glynn and has a daughter Colleen, and a son, Terrence.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS ii

VITA iv

LIST OF TABLES vii

CONTENTS OF APPENDICES viii

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION 1

Purpose 6
Procedure 9
Limitations 14

II. REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE AND RESEARCH 18

Leadership 19
Educational Leadership 27
Instructional Leadership 32
Superintendent as Instructional Leader . . 36
Principal as Instructional Leader 42
Central Office Administrator for Instruction 49
Roles and Responsibilities 51
Instructional Leader as Change Agent . 65
Organizational Status 75
Evaluation 82

III. PRESENTATION OF DATA 90

Questionnaire Results 91
Personal Information 92
Organizational Status 97
Duties and Responsibilities 100
Evaluation Procedures 105
Interviews 107
Summary 125

Chapter | Page

IV. ANALYSIS OF DATA 127

Profile of the Instructional Leader 129
Authority of the Instructional Leader . . . 133
Duties and Responsibilities of the Instructional Leader 140
Evaluation of the Instructional Leader . . 150
Instructional Leadership 153

V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . 162

Summary 162
Conclusions 165
Recommendations 175

BIBLIOGRAPHY 178

APPENDIX A 188

APPENDIX B 190

LIST OF TABLES

Table | Page

1. Distribution of Ages of Central Office Administrators 93
2. Undergraduate Majors of Central Office Administrators 94
3. Central Office Administrator's Previous Positions 95
4. Central Office Administrator's Professional Memberships 96
5. Are the Principals Directly Responsible to You on Instructional Matters? 99
6. Do You Evaluate or Assist in the Evaluation of Principals? 100
7. Relative Importance of Instructional Responsibilities 101
8. Superintendent's Priority Listing of Instructional Responsibilities as Perceived by the Central Office Instructional Leader . . . 102
9. Administrator's Allocation of Time to Areas of Responsibility 103
10. Relationship between Types of Authority and Job Titles of Administrators 135
11. Priority Listing of Instructional Responsibilities According to Central Office Administrators, Their Superintendents, and the Administrators in the 1955 Study by Freese . . . 142
12. Priority Listing of Instructional Responsibilities of Central Office Administrators as Compared to Their Application of Time 145

CONTENTS OF APPENDICES

		Page
APPENDIX A	Letter to Curriculum Directors	188
APPENDIX B	Interview Instrument: Guide for Interviews with Curriculum Directors	190

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The need for positive and productive leadership is fundamental to all human organizations. As society becomes increasingly complex and as the rate of change continues to accelerate, the demand for individuals who have the energy and talent to demonstrate leadership is on the rise. This societal phenomenon is clearly manifest within the field of education to all who are in a position to observe and evaluate educational systems from within as well as from outside the field. For the demand for leadership in education is apparent and has been long lasting. Yet, there are those who claim that the task has never been more exacting of those who choose to lead. Cunningham described the situation with these words:

> Leading exacts a high price from those who accept the challenge. Leaders have to possess energy, lots of it. Energy for planning and reflection, for daily associations with people, for encounters with adversaries, for achieving agreements, and accepting defeats. The pressure on leaders is unrelenting, sustained. Leaders have to stick around, clean up after the dance. There is little if any down time or breathing space before the next problems, the next demand, the next negotiation.[1]

---

[1]Luvern L. Cunningham, "Educational Leadership: The Curious Blend," Educational Leadership 33 (February 1976): 323.

It is this quality and quantity of leadership that is needed at every level of education in America today and it is at the local level, within the individual school district, that the need appears to be most critical. Moreover, it is the individual school superintendent that is expected to provide the necessary leadership in his role as the chief administrative officer of the local educational enterprise. More specifically, it is the expressed responsibility of this office holder to provide instructional leadership to the staff and to the community. This responsibility is most often clearly defined in the written policies that provide guidance and direction to the school district.

Most authors in the field of educational administration would identify the superintendent's role as the instructional leader as his first and foremost responsibility. The increased demands that have been heaped upon the school superintendent of the twentieth century often force him into the uncomfortable and compromising position of being out of touch with the real instructional needs of the staff and the students. His role has changed to become more of a manager or a corporate executive who has a business to run and who must dedicate the majority of his time and efforts to maintaining the system. He has little time to lobby for educational innovations. He is considered by most to be competent if he can simply keep abreast of the daily flow of activity within the organization.

> Instead of educational leaders, public school superintendents have become meeting-attenders, form filler-outers, public relations experts, and specialists at coordinating advisory committees. In too many cases this dominance of paperwork and committees means that superintendents don't have as much impact as they should on the education program in their school systems.[2]

Through the use of an informal survey, Holcomb found that "most school superintendents have neither the time nor the inclination to act as the education leader for their schools."[3]

Time has borne witness to the evolution of the central office position of curriculum director or assistant superintendent for instruction. This administrative/supervisory role has taken on increased importance in providing for the instructional needs of the district that the superintendent is hampered from attending to at the district level. Most would agree that the principal can still exert influence within a particular attendance center as the instructional leader. The void may continue to be apparent at the district level if neither the superintendent nor the assistant demonstrates leadership qualities within the areas of curriculum and instruction. As a result, this support position becomes increasingly more important and the delineation of the role and responsibilities of the instructional leader becomes even more critical as we look to the future.

---

[2]John H. Holcomb, "Superintendents Should Push Programs--Not Paperwork," The American School Board Journal 166 (June 1979): 34.

[3]Ibid.

> There could not be a more exciting time in the history of education to be in a leadership role in curriculum and instruction. Our leadership capacities will be tested to the utmost in the next few years. Whether we succeed in meeting the challenge of a crisis society will depend upon our ability to develop the breadth of vision for curriculum development that is needed to be responsive to humanistic and democratic ideals, more values, changing knowledge, new skills, and the findings of future studies.[4]

In analyzing the situation it would seem clear that (1) today's school superintendent is experiencing an increasing amount of frustration in providing instructional leadership to his school district, and (2) the school principal is restricted to a building-level perspective in providing instructional leadership.

Therefore, it follows that the central office administrator or supervisor who reports directly to the superintendent and who has sole responsibility for the improvement of the school district's instructional program must provide a large share of the instructional leadership that is so desperately needed at the level. Similarly, it follows that questions that beg answers include the following:

1. Can a person in this position effectively provide the necessary leadership?

2. Is this person now providing that leadership?

3. How is this leadership being provided to the

---

[4]Glenys G. Unruh, "New Essentials for Curriculum Leadership," Educational Leadership 33 (May 1976): 582.

staff and to the students?

4. What are the obstacles that interfere with the efficiency of this practice?

A survey of the literature indicated that efforts have been made to analyze various aspects of the roles and responsibilities of curriculum directors and related positions of instructional supervisors. However, the focus had not been directed toward the leadership function nor toward answering the rather basic questions outlined above. There was a need, therefore, for a thorough investigation of how individuals in those central office instructional leadership positions were fulfilling their responsibilities.

> Supervisors are beginning to react to traditionally imposed roles! The growing need for stronger leadership for the improvement of instruction has made urgent the casting aside of outmoded concepts and the provision of some clarity as to the function and practices of instructional supervision. Unfortunately, this task has previously only been undertaken when less pressing agenda items allowed for discussion, issue analysis, and problem definition regarding supervisory behavior. It is not difficult to assess the reasons that newcomers to the field of instructional supervision are struggling constantly for clarity of purpose.[5]

If we are to be successful in ascertaining key factors that contribute to the efficiency and effectiveness of the central office instructional leader, we need to know how the position interacts with the other components of the system. That is, relationships must be closely examined

---

[5]The ASCD Working Group on Supervisory Practices, "Issues in Supervisor Roles: What Do Practitioners Say?" Educational Leadership 34 (December 1976): 217.

between the instructional leader and the board of education, the superintendent, the principals and teachers, the students, parents, and community. The effect of these relationships upon the position's leadership potential must be determined through appropriate analysis.

Finally, the identification of common roadblocks to the successful realization of the instructional leader's goals along with a review of some of the techniques and practices that some leaders find to be helpful in overcoming these obstacles may provide direction to the future efforts of other instructional leaders.

The pursuit of these data and their analysis is clearly justifiable. The synthesis of these findings has important "real-life" applications for superintendents and boards of education and may indeed have implications for the future development of administrative theory building.

Purpose

The purpose of the study was to analyze the role and responsibilities of the central office administrator or supervisor who reported directly to the superintendent and had primary responsibility for providing instructional leadership at the elementary school level. Questions that provided direction for the study included the following:

1. How can we describe demographically the central office administrator or supervisor who is currently providing instructional leadership at the elementary school level?

a) How old is he and how long has he been in education?

b) Is there a pattern behind the kinds of experience that this person has had prior to assuming his current position?

c) What is his educational background?

d) Does he work all year (twelve months) or only during the school term (nine-ten months)?

2. What is the significance of this person's position within the organizational framework of the school district?

a) What percentage of the instructional leaders are "line" administrators? What are the advantages and disadvantages of this type of authority in providing leadership?

b) What percentage of the instructional leaders are "staff" administrators or supervisors? What are the advantages and disadvantages of this type of authority in providing leadership?

c) Is there a relationship between the title of the position and the type of authority assigned to the position?

d) What strategies does the instructional leader use to overcome the disadvantages of the "line" or "staff" position?

3. How do his administrative responsibilities compare with his supervisory responsibilities?

a) What are the written responsibilities (job

description) of this instructional leader?

b) What are his priorities within the area of instruction and how do they compare with the priorities of his superintendent?

c) How does he apportion his time to his responsibilities within the area of instruction?

d) How much of his time is required for noninstructional duties?

4. How does he demonstrate instructional leadership for the district?

a) Can this responsibility be delegated in an effective way by the superintendent?

b) How are changes in the instructional program implemented?

c) What obstacles interfere with his success as a leader?

5. What are the processes currently in use for evaluating instructional leaders?

a) What criteria are used for this evaluation?

(1) Rating systems

(2) Performance appraisals

b) What are the advantages and disadvantages as well as the implications of each process?

c) How do these findings compare with recommendations from the literature?

Procedure

The procedure that was used in the development of this study on the role and responsibilities of the central office administrator or supervisor who has primary responsibility for providing instructional leadership at the elementary school level was developed in the following manner. A review of the related literature was conducted to determine the current state of the field of educational administration with respect to instructional leadership. Special emphasis was given to the recommendations made by authorities regarding the job responsibilities of central office administrators responsible for providing instructional leadership; the amount of authority assigned to the position; the relative distribution of time and effort by this person to areas such as in-service training, instructional materials, curriculum development, and supervision of instruction; and the procedures for evaluating this person's performance.

The sample that was determined for this study included central office administrators or supervisors who report directly to the superintendent and have primary responsibility for providing instructional leadership at the district level. All of the elementary school districts in suburban Cook County, Lake County, Will County, and DuPage County were included in the sample. The selection was limited to those districts which had one, and only one, administrator or supervisor responsible for the instructional

program of the district. A preliminary review of the directories from these counties and written inquiries to some of the school districts indicated that there were approximately fifty individuals who met the established criteria. The titles of these individuals were varied and included: Assistant Superintendent/Curriculum Director, Assistant Superintendent for Instruction, Director of Curriculum, Director of Instructional Services, Curriculum Coordinator, Director of Instruction, etc.

A questionnaire was then developed to obtain information about the position under review. The questions were directed toward these five areas:

1. Demographic information about the individuals who currently hold the position of central office instructional leader.

2. The amount of authority assigned to the position relative to the other administrators and supervisors in the district.

3. The relationship between this person's role as an administrator and a supervisor.

4. The manner in which this person provides leadership for the improvement of the district's instructional program.

5. The procedure used to evaluate this person's performance.

The questionnaire was validated by administering it

to a small sample of administrators at the elementary school level and several professors in the Department of Administration and Supervision, Loyola University. This procedure helped to provide for the necessary internal validity of the instrument. All necessary modifications were completed before the questionnaire was distributed to the individuals in the sample. Each administrator/supervisor was asked to provide a copy of his written job description and a copy of the school district's organization chart.

Upon receipt of the completed questionnaires, some preliminary findings were drawn from the data relative to the five areas of concern that had already been identified. These preliminary findings were used to develop a set of questions for use as an interview guide in the on-site interviewing of six administrators who completed the questionnaire. Three "line" administrators were randomly selected from the larger sample of administrators/supervisors who stated their line/staff relationship on the questionnaire. The advantages of interviewing, according to Issac, include: (1) it permits greater depth, (2) it permits probing for more complete data, (3) it makes rapport with the respondent possible, and (4) it provides a means of checking the effectiveness of communication.[6]

---

[6]Stephen Issac, Handbook in Research and Evaluation (San Diego: Robert R. Knapp, 1971), p. 96.

A profile was then developed reflecting the educational and experiential background of the individuals currently holding the position of instructional leader at the district level; the preliminary findings of the completed questionnaires were categorized within the areas of concern that had been previously identified. The organizational charts and written job descriptions were compared with the responses provided in the questionnaire to questions about the organizational status of the position and the duties and responsibilities of the position.

The analysis of the data was predicated on the return of at least thirty completed questionnaires. It was expected that a larger number of these questionnaires would be returned. Nevertheless, the minimum number of thirty responses is commonly required to perform any statistical manipulation of data. The findings of this study were analyzed in the following manner:

1. The educational background, previous work experience, and professional credentials of the administrators in this study were analyzed to determine common factors that were significant to the roles and responsibilities of the position under review.

2. The organizational chart and job description of each administrator was analyzed along with the data from the questionnaire to determine the types and amount of authority assigned to each administrator's position. This information

was reviewed to determine if there was any significant correlation among job title, duties, and line/staff authority.

3. Data retrieved from the completed questionnaires were analyzed to determine the relative amounts of time allocated and the importance attributed to administrative versus supervisory responsibilities (as indicated by the administrators in the sample). In addition, a comparative analysis was made between the priorities of the administrator/supervisor and the perceived priorities of his superintendent.

4. The administrator's role as an instructional leader was analyzed according to the response gained from the completed questionnaires regarding his relationship to his superintendent and board of education and the certified teaching staff.

5. The completed questionnaires were reviewed to determine policies and procedures currently used to evaluate the performance of instructional leaders.

6. Information gained through the on-site interviews was used to verify the tentative conclusions drawn from an analysis of the data retrieved from the completed questionnaires.

7. The findings gained through the analysis of the data from the questionnaire and from the interviews were compared to the findings of the research of the literature.

Limitations

It is to be understood that the procedures as outlined above were intended to provide the basis for determining the role and responsibilities of central office administrators in fulfilling their responsibility to provide instructional leadership. It was anticipated that the findings of the study could then be used to determine the type of instructional leadership that is expected and is currently being provided by administrators holding these positions.

Limitations upon the study were fundamentally related to the research design employed in the study and the procedures that were a part of that design. That is, the research conducted in this study was ex post facto in nature and incorporated the use of a mail questionnaire along with several personal interviews. This type of research--applied research--has been criticized for lacking the control that is characteristic of laboratory experiments. There were no independent variables that were manipulated by the experimenter in an effort to record changes in dependent variables that would, in turn, disprove the null hypotheses of the study. As a result, this type of "field study" was expected to be low in internal validity but "strong in realism, significance, strength of variable, theory orientation, and heuristic quality."[7]

---

[7]Fred N. Kerlinger, Foundations of Behavioral Research (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1973), p. 406.

The combined use of the mail questionnaire along with the personal interview of a small number of individuals from the sample was intended to take advantage of the apparent strengths of each procedure while attempting to neutralize their characteristic weaknesses. Specifically, "survey information ordinarily does not penetrate very deeply below the surface. The scope of the information sought is usually emphasized at the expense of depth."[8] For this reason, the interviews were completed in an effort to gain access to the "depth" of information that was difficult, perhaps impossible, to obtain through the use of the questionnaire. Nonetheless, the mail questionnaire was extremely helpful in providing direction to the author in the development of the interview guide.

The interview technique was, in itself, considered to be a limitation since there may have been outside constraints upon those who were interviewed that may have limited their willingness to be completely frank and honest with the interviewer. There was always the possibility that "subtle but often unconscious visual or vocal cues"[9] were given to those who were interviewed by the interviewer. In addition, "eagerness of the respondent to please the interviewer, a vague antagonism that sometimes arises between the

---

[8]Ibid., p. 422.

[9]Deobold B. Van Dalen, Understanding Educational Research (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973), p. 330.

interviewer and the respondent, and the tendency of the interviewer to seek out answers that support his preconceived notions all complicate his method."[10] The awareness of these extraneous variables by the author and the use of a well-defined interview guide aided in the reduction of this condition.

Any research that uses sampling is naturally subject to questions regarding its size, method of selection, and representativeness. In this study the number of individuals who were included in the mail questionnaire was only fifty. However, this number included each and every administrator in the counties of Cook, Lake, Will, and DuPage in northeastern Illinois that fit the description defined by the author for this study. The names of those to be selected for inclusion in the study were obtained from county directories of schools or through letters sent to local school districts soliciting this information. The representativeness of the sample was limited to a small part of the larger population of school districts throughout the United States. However, it was felt that the four counties selected for the study reflected a broad enough base from which to develop some parameters for theory building. The use of only elementary school districts was considered to be a limitation in some respects. Yet, it was determined that such a focus

---

[10] Issac, Handbook in Research and Evaluation, p. 96.

of the research had to be limited in order to yield more definitive results.

Finally, the study was limited by the fact that information was sought out from only those who were actually in the position under review. The study did not include the observations of either subordinates or superordinates who may have provided a different orientation to the data gathered from these administrators. Nevertheless, it was determined early in the development of this study that the greatest source of information about the position was to be found within those who actually occupied the position. It was thought that such an approach chould at least provide one dimension of this leadership position. This approach will allow for future research into alternative perspectives on the role and responsibilities of the instructional leader at the elementary school level.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE AND RESEARCH

The primary focus of this study was on analyzing the role and responsibilities of the central office administrator or supervisor whose primary role is to provide instructional leadership at the elementary school level. An increase in the complexity of the educational enterprise has required the addition of specialists skilled in responding to the instructional needs of children at the elementary school level. These specialists perform a variety of functions within the organization that are intended to improve the quality of the instructional program. However, it seemed important for this study to examine these functions as they relate to the concept of instructional leadership.

The review of the literature was directed toward the acquisition of information relative to the fundamental questions that were raised in the first chapter of this study. A preliminary review of the literature includes material that relates to the basic concepts of leadership, educational leadership, and, more specifically, instructional leadership. Subsequently, the review moves toward exploring what the literature adds to our understanding of how leadership is demonstrated at the local level by the elementary

school superintendent and by the elementary school principal. Finally, the examination turns toward the position of central office administrator and those aspects of that position that are under investigation in this study.

Leadership

The leadership function has been studied, researched, and discussed from a number of viewpoints. Psychologists, sociologists, and educators have analyzed the concept of leadership to the extent that one could conclude that there remains little more that can or should be said about the topic. Nevertheless, there still seems to be room for differences of opinion on the subject.

> In the first place, there is no general agreement among researchers and writers on the meaning of the word "leader." For example, some writers, especially historians, do not distinguish clearly between a leader and the holder of a position with status in the organizational hierarchy. These persons, as well as lay persons, generally assume that the holder of an important position in the hierarchy is, by virtue of his position, a leader. Most behavioral scientists do not hold that view.[1]

The earliest studies of leadership were directed toward the identification of personal traits in individuals that would perhaps provide a personality profile that could be generally applicable to all leaders. Such an approach can be traced all the way back to the earliest of historians

---

[1] Edgar L. Morphet, Roe L. Johns, and Theodore L. Reller, Educational Organization and Administration (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1966), pp. 127-28.

who documented the accomplishments of their leaders and described them in terms of those personality traits most closely associated with strength, bravery, and high moral standards. The investigation of personality traits of leaders became popular in the 1940s with the development of more sophisticated tools that enabled researchers to identify such characteristics in more precise terms. Stogdill's research in this area was often cited, and his conclusion was that "a person does not become a leader by virtue of some combination of traits, but the pattern of the personal characteristics of the leader must bear some relationship to the characteristics, activities, and goals of the followers."[2] Additional studies by Weber and Weber,[3] Pierce and Merrill,[4] and Gibbs[5] provided similar findings. Bavelas summarized by saying:

> Leadership is still generally thought of in terms of personal abilities, but now the assumption is made that the abilities in question are the same as those

---

[2]Ralph M. Stogdill, "Personal Factors Associated with Leadership: A Survey of the Literature," Journal of Psychology 15 (January 1948): 64.

[3]C. A. Weber and Mary E. Weber, Fundamentals of Educational Leadership (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1955).

[4]Truman M. Pierce and E. C. Merrill, Jr., "The Individual and Administrative Behavior," in Administrative Behavior in Education, ed. Roald F. Campbell and Russell T. Gregg (New York: Harper & Bros., 1957).

[5]Cecel A. Gibb, "Leadership," in Handbook of Social Psychology, ed. Gardner Lindzey (Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1954).

> possessed by all normal persons: individuals who become leaders are merely presumed to have them to a greater degree.[6]

The focus of research on the individual as a leader of a group precipitated a closer examination of the groups that were being led. This change in direction from the psychological dimension to the sociological resulted in a set of renewed efforts to analyze leadership as an organizational function rather than as a collection of personality traits. Hemphill is recognized for his contribution to the field through his analysis and identification of fifteen group dimensions that help to provide important qualitative descriptions of different groups.[7] In this way, the potential success of an individual to provide leadership for a group was measured in the light of that particular group's characteristics. The conclusions that were drawn by researchers who assumed this sociological perspective indicate that the leader's ability to provide leadership is dependent to a great extent upon the situation within which he acts.

> Under this concept it is not sensible to ask of an organization "who is the leader?" Rather we ask "how are the leadership functions distributed in this organization?" The distribution may be wide or narrow. It may be so narrow--so many of the leadership functions may be vested in a single person--that he is the leader

---

[6] Alex Bavelas, "Leadership Theory and Administrative Behavior," Administrative Science Quarterly, March 1960, p. 491.

[7] John K. Hemphill, Situational Factors in Leadership (Columbus: Ohio State University, 1949).

> in the popular sense. But in modern organizations this is becoming more and more rare.[8]

In addition to the psychological and sociological approach to the study of leadership there existed a third dimension that researchers discovered as a potential source of information. The behavioral approach to the study of leadership was directed toward the analysis of the acts that the leader performed as he demonstrated leadership rather than his personal traits or the characteristics of the group he led. Halpin was responsible for making a significant contribution to the behavioral approach and described it as follows:

> First of all, it focuses upon observed behavior rather than upon a posited capacity inferred from this behavior. No presuppositions are made about a one-to-one relationship between leader behavior and an underlying capacity or potentiality presumably determinative of this behavior. By the same token, no a priori assumptions are made that the leader behavior which a leader exhibits in one group situation will be manifested in other group situations . . . . Nor does the term . . . suggest that this behavior is determined either innately or situationally. Either determinant is possible, as is any combination of the two, but the concept of leader behavior does not itself predispose us to accept one in opposition to the other.[9]

The scientific observation and evaluation of leadership behavior can be traced back to the early 1900s. The work of Lewin, Lippitt, and White in 1939 held great

---

[8]Bavelas, "Leadership Theory and Administrative Behavior," p. 496.

[9]Andrew W. Halpin, The Leadership Behavior of School Superintendents (Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1959), p. 12.

significance for those who attempted to analyze leadership from the behavioral point of view.[10] Their research yielded examples of three distinct leadership styles: democratic, autocratic, and laissez-faire. The observed benefits that resulted from the "democratic" leadership style had far-reaching effects upon leaders throughout America.

Consistent with this emphasis upon the behavioral aspects of leadership were the research studies that were conducted at Ohio State University. It was at that university that Hemphill and Coons developed the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ).[11] This instrument provided a description of a wide variety of leadership acts and, based on the selections made, a profile could be developed that describes the individual's leadership style.

The two dimensions of leader behavior that were developed for use in scoring the results of the questionnaire were entitled Initiating Structure and Consideration. They were described as follows:

> Initiating Structure: High positive loadings on the Initiating Structure factor occur on items which imply that the executive organizes and defines the relationship between himself and the members of his staff. He

---

[10]Kurt Lewin, Ronald Lippitt, and Ralph K. White, "Patterns of Aggressive Behavior in Experimentally Created Social Climates," Journal of Social Psychology 10 (1939): 271-99.

[11]John K. Hemphill and Alvin E. Coons, "Development of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire," in Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement, ed. Ralph M. Stogdill and Alvin E. Coons (Columbus: Ohio State University, 1957).

> tends to define the role which he expects each member of the staff to assume and endeavors to establish well-defined patterns of organization, channels of communication, and ways of getting jobs done.
>
> Consideration: High positive loadings on the Consideration factor are associated with behavior indicative of friendship, mutual trust, respect and a certain warmth in the relationship between the administrator and his staff. High negative loadings appear on items which suggest that the executive is authoritarian and impersonal in his relations with members of the group. Consideration thus refers to the extent to which the executive, while carrying out his leadership functions, is considerate to his staff.[12]

Often, these are referred to as the "get the work out" and the "human relations" dimensions. Needless to say, the effectiveness of the leader is directly related to how his particular leadership style best meets the needs of the group being led.

In comparing the leadership styles of school administrators with those of aircraft commanders, Halpin administered the LBDQ to 64 educational administrators and 132 aircraft commanders. The aircraft commanders demonstrated less Consideration than was desirable and the educational administrators evidenced a need for increased attention to Initiating Structure.[13]

At almost the same time as the LBDQ was being developed at Ohio State University, there were other

---

[12] Carroll L. Shartle, Executive Performance and Leadership (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1956), p. 121.

[13] Andrew W. Halpin, Theory and Research in Administration (New York: Macmillan Co., 1966), pp. 81-130.

researchers at the University of Michigan who were constructing a similar tool to measure leadership styles. Blake and Mouton developed The Managerial Grid consisting of a 9 x 9 matrix reflecting various leadership styles.[14] Depending on the individual's demonstrated concern for people (Y-axis) and his concern for production (X-axis), a score is obtained that reflects the comparative amounts of concern in each area. It is on the basis of this research that leaders are commonly referred to as "task-oriented" and/or "people-oriented."

In summary, it can be said that there exists a plethora of information about leadership. Attempts to define it, measure it, and cultivate it in individuals have met with only limited success. Nonetheless, there exists a need to be selective from the available research and to isolate a working definition of leadership from which to develop subsequent points that have merit for this study. For that reason the definition provided by Boles and Davenport appeared to be as complete and as meaningful as might be necessary for this discussion.

> Leadership is a process in which an individual takes initiative to assist a group to move toward production goals that are acceptable, to maintain the group, and to

---

[14] Robert R. Blake and Jane Srygley Mouton, The Managerial Grid: Key Orientations for Achieving Production through People (Houston, Tex.: Gulf Publishing Co., 1964), p. 10.

> dispose of those needs of individuals within the group that impelled them to join it.[15]

The strength of the definition provided above lies in its comprehensive approach to the typical responsibilities that any leader would hold in giving direction to a group. However, the chief criticism that might be leveled at it would be of its lack of reference to those dynamic qualities that are most often attributed to effective leadership. For there were many who would have taken issue with the absence of clearly stated references to the need for the leader to act as a change agent. Perhaps this point can be made clearer by referring to the definition provided by Hemphill: "We may define leadership as the initiation of a new structure or procedure for accomplishing an organization's goals and objectives or for changing an organization's goals and objectives."[16] Here we can see the direct correlation that was drawn between leadership and change and the "initiation of the new structure." The apparent difficulty that followed was that under most circumstances the recognized leader of any organization is not necessarily noted for his contribution as a change agent. The situation

---

[15]Harold W. Boles and James A. Davenport, Introduction to Educational Leadership (New York: Harper & Row, 1975), p. 117.

[16]John K. Hemphill, "Administration as Problem Solving," in Administrative Theory in Education, ed. Andrew W. Halpin (Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1958), p. 98.

was summed up by Thompson in the following passage:

> Modern social scientists are coming to the conclusion that headship and leadership are incompatible or that their consolidation in the same hands is very unlikely. Leadership is a quality conferred upon a person by those who are led, and in this sense the leader is always elected. An appointed person, on the other hand, must work to advance the interests of his sponsors. He cannot be a leader for his subordinates and still serve his sponsors, unless there is complete harmony between the two, an unlikely event.[17]

The resolution of this dilemma was hardly apparent. In the discussion that follows it becomes clearer how this problem has had particular significance within the field of education. In the meantime, it must be kept in mind that

> there is a distinction between leadership acts and acts of leaders. Leadership acts have been defined to include a specific class of behavior. Acts of leaders would include all acts, both leadership acts and all other acts, in which a leader engages.[18]

Educational Leadership

In narrowing our focus from a general review of the leadership function to the more specific investigation of leadership within the field of education it may have been expected that the literature would yield more precise information about the role and function of the educational leader. Nevertheless, there remained a lack of agreement among the experts about the differences between educational

---

[17] Victor A. Thompson, Modern Organization (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961), pp. 119-20.

[18] Andrew W. Halpin, ed., Administrative Theory in Education (Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1958), p. 112.

leadership and educational administration. Textbook after textbook used the terms interchangeably and the assumption was oftentimes made that they were one and the same.

Lipham held strongly to the belief that "while leadership and administration may have many factors in common, they basically are mutually exclusive."[19] He described the differences in the following passage:

> The leader is concerned with initiating changes in established structures, procedures, or goals; he is disruptive of the existing state of affairs. The administrator, on the other hand, may be identified as the individual who utilizes existing structures or procedures to achieve an organizational goal or objective. As in the case of the leader, the administrator may bring to bear the authority of his role or the influence of his personality in his relationships with other members of the organization. But the administrator is concerned primarily with maintaining, rather than changing, established structures, procedures, or goals. Thus, the administrator may be viewed as a stabilizing force.[20]

Lipham emphasized that frequency and potency are important aspects of leadership. It was his position that the quality of leadership was directly related to how often it was demonstrated and to the extent to which it effected significant changes in the organization or in those who made up the organization.

Other researchers besides Lipham have agreed that

---

[19]James M. Lipham, "Leadership and Administration," in Behavioral Science and Educational Administration, Sixty-third Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, pt. 2, ed. Daniel E. Griffiths (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964), p. 141.

[20]Ibid., p. 122.

administration and leadership are not identical. However, many have held with the explanation that administration is a broader function that describes the efforts of individuals to plan, direct, coordinate, organize, appraise, communicate, etc. Most authorities in education would have agreed with the universal applicability of the following statement:

> As we see it, the central purpose of administration in any organization is that of co-ordinating the efforts of people toward the achievement of its goals. In education these goals have to do with teaching and learning. Thus, administration in an educational organization has as its central purpose the enhancement of teaching and learning. All activities of the administrator--whether working with the public, the board of education, or the professional staff--should ultimately contribute to this end.[21]

In "coordinating the efforts of people toward the achievement of its goals," it can be assumed that such goals were clearly defined and gave direction to the efforts of the group. Thus it can be seen that administration, for the most part, was a maintenance function while leadership behavior almost always included those acts that resulted in changes intended for the betterment of the organization.

> In leading, the responsible individual has specific behavioral objectives which, if performed at least adequately, are expected to lead to the goals of satisfying individuals' needs and innovating. Innovating requires attention to bringing general change, but also to identifying organization goals, revising goals, and making critical decisions.
>
> Administering consists of the actions of problem

---

[21]Roald F. Campbell, John E. Corbally, Jr., and John A. Ramseyer, Introduction to Educational Administration, 3rd ed. (Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1966), p. 83.

> solving, decision making, and programing, all aimed at providing learning opportunities. Maintenance of the organization is achieved through the actions of co-ordinating, resolving conflicts, and appraising.[22]

In view of the preceding remarks, it can be more clearly understood why Lipham said that "the oft-used term 'administrative leadership' is something of a paradox."[23] The proper resolution of this conflict appears to be found by treating the two functions separately and speaking positively of the need for both. For example, in the words of Campbell, Corbally, and Ramseyer: "Throughout the growth of the American school system there has developed an increasing awareness of need for professional leadership and administration."[24] Finally, Owens echoed the concerns of Lipham by making this comparison:

> The concepts of administration and leadership make phrases such as "administrative leadership" somewhat misleading, for they imply that the school administrator, being a wearer of two hats, is expected to emulate both Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde.[25]

In summary, it may be important to remind the reader that the task of reducing the very complex concept of leadership to something that is well defined, clearly stated, and generally applicable may be practically impossible.

---

[22] Boles and Davenport, Educational Leadership, p. 175.

[23] Lipham, "Leadership and Administration," p. 123.

[24] Campbell, Corbally, Jr., and Ramseyer, Educational Administration, 2nd ed., p. 58.

[25] Robert G. Owens, Organizational Behavior in Schools (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1970), p. 128.

Selznick referred to these frustrations in the following exerpt:

> Leadership is not a familiar, everyday idea, as readily available to common sense as to social science. It is a slippery phenomenon that eludes them both. What leaders do is hardly self-evident. And it is likely that much failure of leadership results from an inadequate understanding of its true nature and tasks.[26]

In seeking to grasp this "slippery phenomenon," it is helpful to recall that leadership can best be described behaviorally in the light of "acts" of leadership. Therefore, it may give our discussion direction to identify "educational leadership tasks." Examples include the following:

1. To help the people of the school community define their educational goals and objectives.
2. To facilitate the teaching-learning process--develop greater effectiveness in teaching.
3. To build a productive organizational unit.
4. To create a climate for growth and for the emergence of leadership.
5. To provide adequate resources for effective teaching.[27]

Despite the fact that this list is hardly unique nor is it so complete as to exclude from consideration additional items of significance, it does provide a starting point for the development of our picture of how instructional leadership is provided at the elementary school level.

---

[26]Philip Selznick, Leadership in Administration (New York: Harper & Row, 1957), p. 22.

[27]Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD), Leadership for Improving Instruction, 1960 Yearbook (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1960), p. 29.

Campbell, Corbally, and Ramseyer suggested similar leadership responsibilities for the educational administrator. They included (1) the definition of goals and objectives for the educational system, (2) the development of greater effectiveness in instruction, (3) the organization of the system into a productive unit of many components interacting in an effective manner, (4) the development of a climate within the schools that fosters professional services by the staff to the community, and (5) the procurement and distribution of adequate resources and services to staff and students.[28] These tasks and others like them fall within the area of responsibility of today's educational administrator. It is the manner in which these responsibilities are fulfilled that signifies the work of today's educational leader. In the next section we move into the area of instruction as one facet in which every school administrator must provide "professional leadership and administration."

Instructional Leadership

Experts in educational administration often identified a number of broad categories within which the elementary school administrator must exercise leadership. These usually included: curriculum and instruction, finance, personnel, student services, physical facilities, and

---

[28] Campbell, Corbally, Jr., and Ramseyer, Educational Administration, p. 83.

school-community relations. All of these areas were interrelated and required coordination and close supervision in order to guarantee the overall effectiveness of the educational enterprise. However, it was the opinion of most writers that the instructional responsibilities of the school administrator should be assigned the very highest priority. For this was the primary reason for which the local educational organization existed. However, the typical administrator's daily schedule of activities did not usually reflect sufficient emphasis within the area of instruction. "The profession of educational administration has given lip service for years to the proposition that the main function of educational administration is to facilitate instruction."[29]

The increased demand placed upon the chief school administrator in all areas of responsibility had interfered with his best intentions to provide a sizable amount of his professional time and talent to providing for the instructional needs of the school district. These instructional needs grew increasingly more complex and, as a result, naturally required a greater share of his energies.

> The administrator's role as instructional leader involves many facets of total operation of the school. He has the primary responsibility, with staff and community involvement, for planning his school's

---

[29]Roald F. Campbell and Russell T. Gregg, eds., Administrative Behavior in Education (New York: Harper & Bros., 1957), p. 437.

> curriculum and support services. Planning also involves articulation between elementary, junior high, and senior high schools. Implementation is achieved by staff in-service as well as by administering and coordinating support services such as pupil personnel, guidance and counseling, health, co-curricular activities, the instructional media center, special education classes, and federal and state programs. He must continuously evaluate curriculum, support services, effectiveness of his teaching staff, and his communication with the school community.[30]

In order to provide strong leadership in the area of instruction "there is a need for uniquely defined roles, backed by specific competence to perform, a structure for collaborative efforts, and finally, an evaluative thrust that yields priorities."[31] Unfortunately, these needs have not been attended to as they should have been. The consequences are disappointing and the final result reflects upon the effectiveness of the efforts of the elementary school administrators and likewise upon the total operation of their school systems.

In seeking out direction for school administrators who wish to provide "instructional leadership," it can be said that efforts "will consist in helping chart and describe directions, in helping attain more promising programs and policies for education, and in competing for resources

---

[30]Emery Stoops, Max Rafferty, and Russel E. Johnson, Handbook of Educational Administration (Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1975), p. 9.

[31]Ben M. Harris, "Supervisor Competence and Strategies for Improving Instruction," Educational Leadership 33 (February 1976): 334.

to implement needed programs and policies."[32]

Such challenges for today's instructional leaders are hardly well defined nor will they be easy to achieve.

> Underlying the task of charting meaningful directions for educational institutions within a markedly ambiguous society is an even more basic challenge. That is the challenge of achieving and expressing authentic confidence concerning goal definition and attainment in a setting where a lack of confidence often abounds. When frustration and ambiguity are pervasive, there is great need for leaders who can communicate hope. When a society is whipsawed by forces which distort its outlook, leaders are needed who believe in themselves and in the capacity of society's institutions to progress toward defined goals. And when society is caught up in crisis, leaders are needed who can project a vision which goes beyond the vicissitudes of the moment.[33]

The setting of goals for the educational system is, perhaps, one of the most important single functions of the instructional leader. For "leadership is irresponsible when it fails to set goals and therefore lets the institution drift."[34] In addition,

> instructional leadership suggests that administrative and supervisory personnel have a professional obligation to develop a conceptual framework for the study of curriculum and its change. It necessitates, at the very least, comprehending and evaluating the learning experience provided in the system, the methods used in the teaching-learning process, and the nature and availability of instructional resources and materials.[35]

---

[32]Jack Culbertson, Robin H. Farquhar, Alan K. Gaynor, et al., Preparing Educational Leaders for the Seventies Columbus, O.: University Council for Educational Administration, 1969), p. 72.

[33]Ibid., p. 169.

[34]Selznick, Leadership in Administration, p. 143.

[35]Stephen J. Knezevich, Administration of Public Education, 2nd ed. (New York: Harper & Row, 1969), p. 379.

Finally, instructional leadership called for the administrator to be active in:

1. Stimulating staff members and others to study cooperatively new approaches to instructional improvement.
2. Helping staff members to become more skillful in research or problem solving in curriculum.
3. Providing staff members and others engaged in study and research with the resources they need.
4. Obtaining from such study groups the kinds of information required for prudent decision making on changes in the curriculum, for allocation of various resources within the system, or for introduction of new approaches.[36]

In conclusion, it was evident that the instructional leadership role of the school administrator was a dynamic one that at times may have seemed overwhelming. This role is most often ascribed to the superintendent of schools and to the school principal. The manner in which they demonstrate leadership within the instructional program is to be described in the following sections.

Superintendent as Instructional Leader

In seeking a clarification of the roles and responsibilities of the central office administrator who has primary responsibility for providing instructional leadership at the elementary school level, it was essential to consider the role of the superintendent of schools as an instructional leader. This was deemed apparent from the literature and from the traditional view of school administration that held

---

[36]Ibid., pp. 381-82.

strongly to the principle that the superintendent was _the_ instructional leader for the local school district. By obtaining these additional insights into the superintendent's role as the instructional leader and by identifying those obstacles to his effectiveness as a leader, it was expected that the central office administrator's role would be more easily defined. It was within this frame of reference that the following paragraphs were included.

The chief executive officer of most elementary school systems holds the title of superintendent of schools and is most often referred to as the instructional leader within that particular educational setting. This weighty responsibility was not the central purpose for which the position of superintendent came into existence in Buffalo and Louisville in 1937.[37] Originally it was the intention of most school boards to employ a superintendent as a business manager who would take responsibility for the fiscal and budgetary aspects of the school district's operation. As the position has grown and developed, the superintendent has been recognized as the instructional leader of the system and as such has been saddled with a host of responsibilities that are intended to contribute to the maintenance and improvement of the instructional program.

---

[37]Emery Stoops and M. L. Rafferty, Jr., _Practices and Trends in School Administration_ (New York: Ginn & Co., 1961), p. 461.

The overall responsibilities of the superintendent according to Stoops and Rafferty included the following:

1. Select high caliber teachers, counselors, and administrators.
2. Provide for in-service training.
3. Budget for instructional materials.
4. Provide supervision for all employees.
5. Encourage and secure participation in continuous curriculum development.
6. Make provisions for a curriculum laboratory, guidance and counseling services, educational research, special education, a health program, adult education, and an audio-visual program.
7. Provide for attendance and child welfare services.
8. Improve public relations for instructional programs.
9. Promote articulation between elementary and high school grades.
10. Provide for library services.
11. Encourage vertical and horizontal communications.[38]

The literature indicates that in order for the superintendent to properly maintain the instructional program there is a need for research, in-service training, a good human relations program, a solid system for evaluation of programs as well as of personnel, and close coordination of the instructional program within the budget of the school system. A good communication system is, of course, fundamental to the success of any human organization. According to the ASCD Yearbook of 1960 entitled Leadership for Improving Instruction, the superintendent of schools is primarily responsible for the instructional program and can exercise instructional leadership by attracting, selecting, and retaining good teachers.[39]

---

[38] Ibid., p. 463.

[39] ASCD, Leadership, p. 120.

The school board that employs the superintendent also plays a significant role in the development of a superintendent's instructional priorities. The following list of duties shows the general conception held by school boards as to the activities of the superintendent that are important, in rank order:

1. Visiting schools as often as practical;
2. Holding teachers' meetings to discuss methods;
3. Carefully noting methods of instruction of each teacher;
4. Advising teachers on methods of instruction;
5. Noting qualities of teachers;
6. Suggesting improvements in teaching;
7. Controlling methods of instruction;
8. Using teachers' meetings for demonstration lessons;
9. Noting methods of instruction of supervisors.[40]

In 1971 the American Association of School Administrators (AASA) published a book entitled Profiles of the Administrative Team. In that book the obvious concern over the superintendent's instructional responsibilities was reflected in the following statement:

> Leadership in the development of the curriculum is the prime responsibility of the superintendent. Operation of a school system without strong leadership in curriculum is potentially a detriment to the quality of education each child receives. A competent business administrator should only be considered for the superintendency if he has extensive preparation in the areas of curriculum or is able to devise an organizational patterns which will provide this leadership.[41]

---

[40]James R. Marks, Emery Stoops, and Joyce King-Stoops, Handbook of Educational Supervision (Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1971), p. 126.

[41]American Association of School Administrators (AASA), Profiles of the Administrative Team (Washington, D.C.: AASA, 1971), p. 70.

In summary, the need for strong leadership in the areas of curriculum and instruction has been mandated of the superintendent by his staff, his school board, and by his own choice. Most importantly, the quality of that leadership must be appraised on a regular basis if it is to be properly maintained and in concert with the needs of the superintendent's constituents.

It is important to note that attempts to evaluate the superintendent's effectiveness as a leader have met with some difficulty.

> The superintendent, as the officially designated leader in charge of the school organization, is confronted by two major sets of responsibilities. He is responsible to the board of education, but he also must be responsive to the members of his own professional staff. Both reference groups, the board and the staff, impose upon him expectations of how he should behave as a leader. When these expectations are essentially similar, he probably encounters no difficulty in orienting his behavior to them. But to the extent that they are incompatible, he is placed in a position of potential role-conflict. How should he behave as the leader? Should he respond principally to the expectations of his own board or to those of his staff? Or should he "be his own man" and persist in his own style of leadership irrespective of what either board or staff may wish?[42]

The importance of considering the evaluations of both the staff and the board of education in evaluating the superintendent's effectiveness was apparent to Halpin in 1958. It was at that time that he used the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) to assess the leader

---

[42]Fred D. Carver and Thomas J. Sergiovanni, Organizations and Human Behavior (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1969), p. 304.

behavior of fifty superintendents. Using the two factors of Initiating Structure and Consideration that are characteristic of that instrument, he found that eleven of the men scored high in both factors as indicated by both their staffs and their boards of education. Only two men scored low on both factors. More importantly, it was discovered that the members of each group (staff and board) agreed to a great extent within their group about the leadership strengths of the superintendent. However, there was not as much consistency between the two groups.[43] Thus we see the apparent dilemma that the superintendent faces in trying to provide leadership to both groups at the same time.

In addition to facing the difficulties of trying to lead two very different groups at the same time, the modern-day superintendent can point to several other factors that inhibit his effectiveness. A survey of school superintendents in 1970 yielded the following list of factors that superintendents felt were obstacles to their success as leaders. Inadequate financing was the most frequently cited factor; "too many insignificant demands upon the superintendent" and "inexperienced, unqualified, or unprepared staff members" were ranked second and third, respectively. "Limits on personal or professional capabilities" was fourth

---

[43]Andrew W. Halpin, "The Superintendent's Effectiveness as a Leader," Administrator's Notebook 7 (October 1958): 1-4.

on the list, and "lack of time or too much added responsibility" was fifth in the ranking.[44]

Unfortunately, all of these factors have contributed in their own way to the demise of the superintendent as the instructional leader for his school system. We will now direct our attention to the role of the principal and his effectiveness as the instructional leader of his school.

Principal as Instructional Leader

Educational administration, in theory and in practice, has always attributed the role of instructional leader to the principal. His manifestation of leadership in curriculum and instruction has been researched and documented in textbook after textbook. Furthermore, the principal's role at the elementary school level was expected to mirror the instructional leadership efforts of the superintendent at the elementary school district level. Through a comprehensive review of the literature with respect to the principal as the instructional leader at the building level in conjunction with the previous section on the superintendent's role, it was anticipated that the role of the central office administrator for instruction would become more apparent. Therefore, the following pages reflect this review and provide a backdrop against which this study will outline the

---

[44] Stephen J. Knezevich, ed., The American School Superintendent: An AASA Research Study (Washington, D.C.: American Association of School Administrators, 1971), p. 60.

roles and responsibilities of the central office administrator who has primary responsibility for providing instructional leadership at the elementary school level.

There exists a great amount of similarity in the roles of the superintendent of a school district and a principal of a school within that system. The principal is the chief administrator of his particular school and holds responsibility for many of the same administrative tasks at that level as the superintendent holds at the district level. His primary responsibility is to provide an environment within the school that facilitates the teacher-learner process and contributes to the realization of the goals and objectives of the educational system. He is ultimately held accountable for the instructional program within his school and is assumed to be the key person to provide instructional leadership to the staff and students at that school.

> Within the limitations of personnel and physical resources of a given situation, the role of the principal of the individual school is potentially one of the most influential for improving the teaching-learning processes. In spite of all his varied responsibilities, including building management and public relations, the principal's primary role remains that of instructional leadership.[45]

At the same time the literature made reference to the elementary school principal as "middle management" along with the implication that his role was a rather simple one of communicator between his staff and the central office.

---

[45]ASCD, Leadership, p. 110.

Little was expected of him in the way of change and his primary function was to keep things as quiet as possible. Campbell's view of the elementary school principal was that

> he is an administrator who most of the time maintains an organization for established purposes but who occasionally recognizes the need for modification and is able to generate this change in the organization and make it effective.[46]

Some of the difficulty that the principal has encountered in his attempts to provide instructional leadership may be attributed to the same predicament that interfered with the effectiveness of his superintendent. For his role as a part of "middle management" includes having several groups who look to him for direction. Moser's study of the leadership patterns of school principals revealed that the principal's teachers and his superintendent subject him to markedly different sets of leadership expectations and his behavior varies according to the group with whom he is working.

> The principal is in a delicate position as a member of two organizational families. His role is of key importance as a connecting link between the superintendent and the teachers. In the same way that the superintendent of schools is the middle-man between the board of education and the professional staff, the principal serves as the middle-man between the superintendent and the teaching staff.[47]

---

[46]Roald Campbell, "Administrative Concepts Applied to Elementary Principalship," in School Administration: Selected Readings, ed. Sherman H. Frey and Keith R. Getschman (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1968), p. 191.

[47]Robert P. Moser, "The Leadership Patterns of School Superintendents and School Principals," Administrator's Notebook 6 (September 1957): 4.

This situation needs to be monitored closely by all in order to minimize the amount of conflict experienced by the principal in his attempts to provide leadership.

> Having but one head, the principal is subjected to one of his most serious types of conflict by the necessity of simultaneously having to wear many "hats." He often must fill two or more incompatible roles at the same time.[48]

Another source of conflict for the principal lies in his eagerness to accomplish the school's institutional goals while, at the same time, responding to the needs of the people within the institution. This difficulty was analyzed in the work of Getzels and Guba who developed a two-dimensional model for describing social behavior. Their efforts resulted in the identification of three leadership styles.

> 1. The nomothetic style is characterized by behavior which stresses goal accomplishment, rules and regulations, and centralized authority at the expense of the individual. Effectiveness is rated in terms of behavior toward accomplishing the school's objectives.
> 2. The idiographic style is characterized by behavior which stresses the individuality of people, minimum rule and regulations, decentralized authority, and highly individualistic relationships with subordinates. The primary objective is to keep subordinates happy and contented.
> 3. The transactional style is characterized by behavior which stresses goal accomplishment, but which also makes provision for individual need fulfillment. The transactional leader balances nomothetic and

---

[48]James M. Lipham, "Dynamics of the Principalship," in School Administration: Selected Readings, ed. Sherman H. Frey and Keith R. Getschman (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1968), p. 273.

> idiographic behavior and he judiciously utilizes each style as the occasion demands.[49]

The practical applications of this theoretical model were apparent from the literature where reference was made regularly to the need for the principal to demonstrate leadership through the use of organizational approaches that stress the need for efficiency and goal-centered behavior. In similar fashion, sources can be cited that call for the "humanistic" approach to leadership and administration by recognizing and considering the human needs of persons within the organization. These sources included the works of Maslow,[50] Herzberg,[51] and McGregor.[52]

In addition to resolving the potential conflicts associated with serving more than one group along with the ever-important need to reconcile the "nomothetic" and "ideographic" dimensions of his behavior, the principal is confronted with still another potential impediment to the successful manifestation of leadership. That is, most elementary school principals are confounded by the apparent

---

[49] J. W. Getzels and E. G. Guba, "Social Behavior and the Administrative Process," School Review 65 (Winter 1957): 426.

[50] Abraham H. Maslow, Toward a Psychology of Being (Princeton, N.J.: Van Nostrand, 1968).

[51] Frederick Herzberg, Work and the Nature of Man (Cleveland, O.: World Press, 1966).

[52] Douglas McGregor, The Human Side of Enterprises (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1960).

lack of time to provide leadership. Their efforts were almost wholly concentrated in the maintenance of the organization rather than in attempts to improve the organization. Survey after survey indicated that principals are overwhelmed with "administrivia" and that they frequently lacked the time to guide and direct the staff in the improvement of instruction. As a result there is an increasing amount of concern about the future role of the principal as an instructional leader.[53]

The opportunities, or better stated, the obligations for leadership by the elementary school principal are readily apparent. As a member of the management team he has the ability to participate in the decision-making process at the district level through discussions held during administrative meetings that relate to the instructional program. Secondly, the close working relationship that most often characterizes the interactions of an elementary school principal and his staff puts him in the unique position of greatly influencing the instructional efforts of the teachers within the system. Finally, the principal is called upon "to interpret the work of the schools to the people, to mold public attitudes regarding the school, and to keep the public constantly informed and intelligent about

---

[53]Donald A. Erickson, "Changes in the Principalship," The National Elementary Principal 44 (April 1965): 16-20.

the changes which are occurring in the practices of the school."[54]

In the face of these imperatives to provide leadership the elementary principal must take decisive action if he is to maintain his position as an instructional leader. He must practice leadership by setting goals for the group, by developing plans for their achievement, and by lobbying for support of these plans with those most directly involved. He must allocate less time within his weekly schedule to administration and more time to leadership by delegating responsibility for routine matters that may ordinarily consume large chunks of precious time that may be better spent on more important problems. Lastly, he must obtain an objective assessment of his leadership behavior through the use of techniques that have been developed to assist leaders to measure their effectiveness.

The changes that have occurred in the roles and responsibilities of the principal and his superintendent since the mid-1950s were reflected in the following passage about the popular image of educational administrators:

> The principal, beset with seemingly insoluble problems ranging from discipline to curriculum and besieged by demands from students, parents, teachers, and community; the superintendent struggling to remain afloat amidst political viscissitudes and capricious school boards, cajoling out of the public purses enough money to keep

---

[54] Henry J. Otto, Elementary School Organization and Administration (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1954), p. 662.

the school system operating and, it is to be hoped, effective. There are, of course, significant exceptions to these images. But the popular currency of these profiles, heavily reinforced by the testimony of principals and superintendents in the educational literature, points to fundamental problems created or exacerbated by the crises of the past two decades.[55]

Central Office Administrator for Instruction

The positions of curriculum director and assistant superintendent for instruction and director of instruction do not have as deep a historical background as does the position of superintendent or principal. Regardless of the title ascribed to the position, it most certainly was born out of the position of instructional supervisor that dates back to the turn of the century. One of the earliest attempts to categorize the work of these supervisors was completed in 1926 by Barr. This study classified the duties of the instructional supervisors in the city of Detroit into thirteen separate categories which included the selection of textbooks, teacher supervision, and related administrative responsibilities.[56]

During the past fifty years the position has

---

[55]Bernard C. Watson, "Issues Confronting Educational Administrators, 1954-1974," in Educational Administration: The Developing Decades, ed. Luvern L. Cunningham, Walter G. Hack, and Ralph O. Nystrand (Berkeley, Cal.: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1977), p. 78.

[56]Arvil S. Barr, "An Analysis of the Duties and Functions of Instructional Supervisors: A Study of the Detroit Supervisory Program," Bureau of Educational Research Bulletin No. 7 (Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1926), pp. 46-49.

undergone changes in roles and responsibilities and there have been a great number of studies completed that attempted to analyze the roles and responsibilities of this position along with other issues related to this position. According to Davis, there were ninety-nine different studies completed on this topic between 1955 and 1969.[57] Yet the position continued to lack definition within many school districts during the 1960s.

> The curriculum leader, whether he is a general or subject supervisor, special services or instructional media supervisor, or director or assistant, associate or deputy superintendent in charge of instruction, is a relative newcomer to the leadership team in school systems.[58]

The need for leadership in education has already been demonstrated along with the specific need for instructional leadership by today's administrators. The superintendent of schools and the elementary school principal share fully in the obstacles that interfere with their effective manifestation of instructional leadership. Part of the solution, according to a survey of the superintendents, lies in the addition of curriculum and instructional specialists.

---

[57] Carmen B. Davis, "Roles and Responsibilities in General Supervision of Instruction" (doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, 1970).

[58] Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Role of Supervisor and Curriculum Director in a Climate of Change, 1965 Yearbook, ed. Robert R. Leeper (Washington, D.C.: ASCD, 1965), p. 67.

> Better than half (52.5 percent) called for more curriculum and instructional specialists as a way to improve school performance or output levels. These traditional "generalists" were considered to be the most urgently needed personnel in today's schools.[59]

However, an increase in the quantity of such specialists has not necessarily resulted in a corresponding increase in the quality of the instructional program at the elementary level.

> Instructional supervision in the public schools continues to evolve reactively from the growing complexity of social and political environments. As such, it has little logical pattern for development. Supervision assignments/responsibilities seem to be made piecemeal, allocated to whichever department or person within the existing staff structure that appears best able to absorb the responsibilities. In today's school systems, therefore, instructional supervision is less than ideal, allowing little continuity, and providing minimum assistance for the improvement of instruction.[60]

In seeking out direction for instructional improvement through the efforts of the central office administrator, the review of the literature will focus on (1) roles and responsibilities, (2) the significance of the position as a change agent, (3) organizational aspects of the position, and (4) the manner of evaluation.

Roles and Responsibilities

One of the most comprehensive studies of the position

---

[59] Knezevich, ed., American School Superintendent, p. 60.

[60] A. W. Sturges et al., "The Roles and Responsibilities of Instructional Supervisors" (report from the ASCD Working Group on the Roles and Responsibilities of Instructional Supervisors, October 1978), p. 1.

of assistant superintendent for instruction was completed in 1955 by Freese.[61] He reported that the position was originally established to aid the superintendent and that little attention was given to the position until 1945. His questionnaire survey of 348 large school systems from throughout the United States led him to report the following data. In the judgment of those in the position, their six most important areas of responsibility, in rank order, were:

1. Curriculum development
2. Supervision of instruction
3. In-service training
4. Educational personnel
5. Instructional materials
6. Public relations

Freese's recommendations, among others, included the following:

1. That the duties and responsibilities of this position be clearly defined in writing.

2. That the person filling this position be directly responsible to the superintendent of schools and that this position, in the main, be a line position.

3. That principals be directly responsible to the person filling this position on instructional matters and

[61]Theron Freese, "A Study of the Position of Assistant Superintendent in Charge of Instruction: Its History, Status, and Functions" (doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1955).

that all instructional supervisors, consultants, and directors be directly responsible to this person in all matters.

Curriculum directors in nineteen New Jersey school systems contributed to the development of a list of duties that were considered to be most important by that group. They included:

1. Planning for improvement of the curriculum and of the curriculum development program
2. Helping evaluate continuously both the appropriateness of the curriculum and the quality of the curriculum development program
3. Directing the formation of point of view, policies and philosophy of education
4. Directing the development of curriculum materials
5. Using ready-made research data, and promoting local research
6. Coordinating the activities of other special instructional personnel, e.g., supervisors, librarians
7. Working with guidance personnel to integrate curriculum and guidance functions
8. Providing for lay participation in curriculum improvement
9. Arranging time, facilities and materials for curriculum improvement
10. Serving school personnel as technical consultant and adviser regarding curriculum problems
11. Organizing and directing special in-service education projects
12. Interpreting the curriculum to the public and, in certain situations, to the Board of Education
13. Encouraging articulation among levels of the school system[62]

A survey report by Irving R. Melbo of Los Angeles, California (July 1960), was outlined in the Handbook of Educational Supervision as a basis for suggesting job

---

[62]Ronald C. Doll, Harold T. Shafer, Sarah Christie, and Jerome C. Salsbury, "What Are the Duties of the Curriculum Director?" Educational Leadership 15 (April 1958): 429-30.

functions of an assistant superintendent of schools. To most effectively improve instruction, the assistant superintendent should be assigned rather broad authority and responsibility in the area of instructional services. Melbo recommended the following functions:

1. Assist the superintendent in the program for community relations and in the development of educational policies and programs for the entire school system.
2. Assist the superintendent in the recruitment, selection, employment, induction, and assignment of certified personnel (both regular and substitute) and in the maintenance of necessary school system personnel records for these employees.
3. Direct curriculum development, evaluation, textbooks and supplementary book adoptions, instructional procedures, and instructional material selection.
4. Direct the in-service education program.
5. Direct and coordinate the school system's program of health services and the program of education for physically handicapped children and for the home bound.
6. Supervise and coordinate the work of all personnel assigned to attached positions.[63]

Despite the reference to "the assistant superintendent," many of the job responsibilities outlined above were considered to be general enough to be assigned to a director of instruction. Regardless of the task, it is of paramount importance that the holder of this position recognize that

> effective operation in such roles frequently requires a large degree of diplomacy and a sense of balance between direct and indirect leadership approaches to problems. Differences in philosophy, in perceptions of roles, and in methods of operation are expected. However, the ready reconciliation of misunderstandings arising from

---

[63] James R. Marks, Emery Stoops, and Joyce King-Stoops, <u>Handbook of Educational Supervision</u> (Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1971), p. 107.

> closely related or overlapping areas of responsibility is requisite to the maintenance of effective leadership.
> The director of instruction must maintain close and continuing communication with the superintendent on all matters of major concern in the instructional area. His interpretations of policy must be consistent with those of the superintendent. He operates within the limitations of board and administrative policies and within his own appraisal of community acceptances and of readiness of staff and community for change. He observes carefully the line of communication which leads first to the superintendent on its way to the board and community.[64]

The findings of research reports and the writings of recognized authors in the field during the 1960s described the role of the director of instruction in terms that hardly reflected the traditional attributes associated with dynamic leadership. In 1962 Puckett analyzed "The Status and Function of the General School Supervisor in Selected Arkansas Schools"[65] and found that the primary function of the supervisor was to coordinate the instructional program by keeping teachers informed with regard to new school policies, improved methods of teaching, and new ideas related to teaching; by helping orient new teachers; and by helping to select textbooks and other instructional materials. Campbell, Corbally, and Ramseyer echoes this statement when they stated that "the assistant superintendent of instruction must give his attention to planning and co-ordinating

---

[64]ASCD, Leadership, pp. 117-18.

[65]Daniel W. Puckett, "The Status and Function of the General School Supervisor in Selected Arkansas Schools" (doctoral dissertation, University of Arkansas, 1962).

instruction throughout the school system."[66]

> During the 1960's the schools were exhorted, loudly and strongly, to innovate, to change, to be creative . . . .
> When curriculum workers--who, whatever their varied titles, were charged with responsibility for curriculum development and improving instruction--opposed and denounced isolated, purely cognitive learning, the academicians called them anti-intellectuals and pushed on, ignoring warnings of the consequences of over-emphasizing the cognitive to the exclusion of other learner needs. Being politically astute, they also ignored the institutional levels of curriculum decision making, bypassed the specialists in that realm of the school's operation, and went directly to private publishers and other large sources of finance (where there was no public control of funds) to publish and market their instructional materials. These materials are now in hardcover textbooks; teachers are using them in the way they have traditionally used the textbooks--as the largest single determiner of what is taught.
> The role of the curriculum worker became unclear. The curriculum project staffs went directly to the teachers, inviting them to summer workshops to learn the new materials to be taught; however, they failed to involve teachers in any continuous thought and study, so the teachers taught the new materials in the same old ways.[67]

In 1964 the ASCD Committee on the Professionalization of Supervisors and Curriculum Workers filed a report in New York City that identified the primary functions of the overall instructional role in rather broad terms. These goal statements reflected a more aggressive, action-centered point of view that contrasted with earlier descriptions of the central office instructional leader. They included:

---

[66]Campbell, Corbally, Jr., and Ramseyer, Educational Administration, 2nd ed., p. 214.

[67]William J. Ellena, ed., Curriculum Handbook for School Executives (Arlington, Va.: American Association of School Administrators, 1973), pp. 365-66.

To develop balance in the curriculum
To develop balance in the educational program for the child
To develop commonality of goals
To provide for adjustment of contradictions within the program
To provide for control of the overdevelopment of individual areas
To provide for design and organization of the instructional program in terms of knowledge of human growth and development, value patterns, social trends, educational research
To provide for continuous evaluation in terms of fundamental principles and objectives
To stimulate change--to act as a change specialist
To provide for synoptic view of all the areas.[68]

At the same time, Moll sought out the "most important" duties of the curriculum directors in unified school districts in California as perceived by those same curriculum directors. That listing demonstrated some of the same forward-looking orientation that was evident from the work of the curriculum directors in New York City. Their list was as follows:

1. To plan for improvement of the curriculum and development of the pilot program.
2. To continuously evaluate both the appropriateness and quality of the curriculum.
3. To implement changes in the curriculum when conditions warrant a change.
4. To serve the school personnel as a consultant and advisor regarding curriculum problems.
5. To select alternatives with consequences on curriculum problems and present them to the superintendent for his decision.
6. To make decisions of priority in the curriculum department.

---

[68]"New York City Conference Report" as formulated at the meeting of the ASCD Committee on the Professionalization of Supervisors and Curriculum Workers, New York City, January 1964.

7. To promote, direct, report, and use local research for curriculum development.
8. To promote articulation between levels of the school system.
9. To arrange time, facilities, and materials for curriculum improvement.
10. To organize and direct special in-service education projects.
11. To use national and state research data on curriculum improvement.[69]

In addition, the study conducted in California emphasized the need for flexibility in developing job expectations for curriculum directors depending on the needs of the individual school district. However, the report stressed that these job expectations should be clearly defined in writing. Two years later, in 1967, a study was made in Buffalo, New York, that focused on the responsibilities of central office curriculum instruction personnel.[70]

It was the finding of these researchers that the tasks and functions of the central office curriculum worker were not properly communicated to other professional staff members. Therefore, it was clear to them that the success of the instructional leader was dependent to a great extent on the clarity with which the leader's responsibilities and duties are defined and the effectiveness with which these job expectations are communicated to the other staff members.

---

[69] Loren Allen Moll, "An Analysis of the Role of Curriculum Director" (doctoral dissertation, Colorado State College, 1965).

[70] Darwin G. Carlson, "A Case Study of Central Office Personnel with Designated Responsibility for Curriculum-Instruction in Four Selected School Systems" (doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo, 1967).

In 1970 Carman reviewed ninety-nine different pieces of research that were written between 1955 and 1969 and had contributed to the analysis of the role and responsibilities of general supervisors and directors of instruction. Her findings included a listing of ten responsibilities that were cited most often in the review of the literature. Those responsibilities, arranged in descending order, were:

1. Coordinating in-service education programs and workshops
2. Fostering improvement in human relations
3. Providing consultative help and instructional services
4. Engaging in community, student, and organizational contacts
5. Providing resource materials
6. Coordinating instructional programs
7. Visiting classrooms
8. Demonstrating methods and materials
9. Assisting in evaluation of system-wide programs
10. Holding follow-up conferences after classroom visits.[71]

According to Carman, the primary role of the director of instruction was "to produce a coordinated effort for the improvement of instruction, with the three areas of curriculum development, in-service education and assistance to individual teachers being paramount concerns."[72]

In 1976 Fry completed a study entitled, "An Analysis of the Role of Curriculum Director in Selected Illinois

---

[71]Beatrice D. Carman, "Roles and Responsibilities in General Supervision of Instruction: A Synthesis of Research Findings" (doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, 1970), p. 41.

[72]Ibid.

Schools."[73] In completing his research he determined a listing of fourteen tasks that were considered by elementary teachers, secondary teachers, and curriculum directors to be "very important." This list provides a good checklist, according to Fry, for items which should be found in the curriculum director's job description.

1. Evaluate innovations in curriculum educational technology, and school organizational patterns
2. Develop criteria by which to evaluate proposed changes in curriculum
3. Establish the long-range goals of curriculum and instruction in the district
4. Coordinate the work of curriculum committees in the district
5. Coordinate articulation between grade levels and between school units
6. Serve as a consultant on curriculum matters for the professional staff
7. Plan in-service programs for teachers
8. Coordinate changes in school district instructional goals
9. Confer with principals, teachers, and department heads about the effectiveness of the instructional program
10. Explain to the school board the need for curriculum changes
11. Explain to the school board any changes in curriculum which have been made
12. Interpret the school program for school board members
13. Communicate with building principals concerning instructional problems in their building
14. Discuss curriculum needs with the superintendent[74]

In reviewing the complete list of eighty-five tasks, Fry concluded that "by far the most important function of

---

[73] Terry L. Fry, "An Analysis of the Role of Curriculum Director in Selected Illinois Schools" (doctoral dissertation, Illinois State University, 1976).

[74] Ibid., p. 73.

the curriculum director role is that of curriculum development."[75] The evaluation of instruction was also considered to be most important along with providing instructional materials and equipment and being involved in budget and finance matters as they relate to curriculum and instruction. Fry pointed out that his research "clearly defines the role of the curriculum director as a stimulus for change in the curriculum, a troubleshooting evaluator of the instructional program, and a communication link among teachers, other administrators, and the school board."[76]

In December 1976 the ASCD Working Group on Supervisory Practices reported the results of a survey they had conducted with ASCD members from throughout the United States. Their attention was directed to the "practitioners'" perceptions of issues relative to proper supervision in our schools. Their findings indicated that "it is obvious from this study, at least, that the 'live' issues have to do with teacher evaluation, leadership for change, and the supervisor's basis of authority for taking initiative."[77]

In a 1978 report by the ASCD Working Group on the Roles and Responsibilities of Instructional Supervisors, Lovell referred to an earlier study by Christiansen and

---

[75]Ibid., p. 77. [76]Ibid.

[77]The ASCD Working Group on Supervisory Practices, "Issues in Supervisor Roles: What Do Practitioners Say?" Educational Leadership 34 (December 1978): 220.

Turner.[78] In that study they suggested that some of the confusion surrounding the role and responsibilities of the instructional supervisor might be resolved if two different positions were identified: curriculum directors who were closely related to program development and evaluation and instructional supervisors who were primarily responsible for providing help and "people services." However, Lovell found that this may not be the best solution.

> First, some educators find the idea of separating curriculum development from instruction is impossible. Second, some feel it is important to have people closely related to the instructional program actively involved in curriculum development and, conversely, workers involved in curriculum development actively involved in the instructional program. Third, activities related to curriculum development are program related, and activities associated with instructional improvement, including teacher support, service and help, are both people related and curriculum related. It can be concluded that all professionals who have primary responsibilities in the instructional supervisory system need to have some specialized competence in both curriculum development and instructional improvement.[79]

Sturges suggested that there exist a number of factors that "may help explain part of the confusion."[80]

---

[78] Marvin Christiansen and Harold Turner, "The Roles and Preparation of Instructional Supervisors," in "Certificating the Curriculum Leader and the Instructional Supervisor," ed. Allan W. Sturges (report from the ASCD Working Group on the Role, Preparation and Certification of Curriculum Leader and Supervisor, 1977).

[79] John T. Lovell, "Instructional Supervision: Emerging Perspective," in "The Roles and Responsibilities of Instructional Supervisors," ed. A. W. Sturges et al. (report from the ASCD Working Group on the Roles and Responsibilities of Instructional Supervisors, October 1978).

[80] Ibid., p. 71.

First, instructional supervision involves both direct support for teachers (such as observation and analysis of teaching), and administrative activities (such as quality control and the evaluation of teacher performance). Such widely divergent services may not always be compatible in the same role, and may create confusion in the minds of teachers and administrators.

Second, teachers often expect supervisors to deliver services closely related to their needs as teachers, and general administrators often expect supervisors to provide services more closely related to the general needs of the organization. Thus supervisors are often perceived by teachers as not doing enough for teachers, and by administrators as not doing enough for the organization.

Third, there is a conflict between the general services that supervisors provide (such as curriculum planning, development of system objectives and designing professional development programs), and the clinical-type services delivered to a particular group of students.[81]

Sturges went on to suggest:

One possible approach to the resolution of some of these conflicts would be to conceptualize broad categories for supervisors, and would include such responsibilities as quality control, development and evaluation of educational objectives for school programs, the selection, allocation and evaluation of professional personnel, and other similar activities. Instructional supervisors with responsibilities for the coordination and direction of a program would normally fit in this category. Curriculum directors, assistant superintendents for instruction, school principals and department heads would be examples of administrative instructional supervisors.

A second category of supervisory roles could be grouped under the title of consultative instructional supervisor, and would include the direct psychological and technical support to help teachers improve their performance in the classroom. It would also include consultation with teachers and others for the planning of professional development programs; teacher evaluation would be diagnostic, to enable the correction of teaching activities that are not effective. Although these consultative instructional supervisors could be housed at the central office complex, they would normally be assigned to specific building levels in order to facilitate their direct contact with teachers.

---

[81] Ibid., p. 72.

These two major types of instructional supervisors are supported by data included in this report. The consultative instructional supervisor is primarily concerned with the improvement of instruction, and works closely with teachers. Teachers prefer that this type of supervisor be assigned to a specific building; the supervisor has special expertise in analyzing classroom instruction and in working with teachers for the improvement of the learning environment for students. The administrative instructional supervisor is also concerned with the improvement of instruction, but more from a controlling and coordinating level. More often housed at a central office, duties will include administrative functions such as requesting and administering Federal grants, acquisition of materials, quality control of the learning environment, and the overall coordination of the instructional program. Responsibilities of the administrative instructional supervisor are often assigned to a principal or department head at the building level, or directors/assistant superintendents/ coordinators at the district level.[82]

In summary, it can be said that the role and responsibilities of the central office instructional leader have evolved over time and have come to be more clearly defined by researchers in the field and by the individuals who hold the position. Yet there continues to be a lack of continuity among school districts on the role and responsibilities of these central office instructional leaders. Moreover, the confusion in job expectations is a key factor in the apparent lack of leadership that is attributed to the holders of this position--leadership, that is, in the identification of clearly stated goals for the instructional program and the establishment of clearly defined strategies for bringing about improvements in the instructional program.

---

[82]Ibid., pp. 72-73.

Instructional Leader as Change Agent

In reviewing the roles and responsibilities of the instructional leader such a review would have been incomplete if sufficient attention had not been given to one of the most important dimensions of leadership, that of being a change agent. For the position of central office administrator was born out of the inability or lack of opportunity for the superintendent (at the district level) and the principal (at the building level) to effect significant changes in the instructional program. In the pages that follow attention will be given to the different viewpoints that have been recorded in regard to this leader's effectiveness in bringing about improvements in the instructional program.

The close relationship between leadership and change was touched upon in the early sections of this review. The significance of change for educational institutions has become increasingly more apparent.

> Schools have changed in past years, even though the alterations are not always striking. It is erroneous to assume that schools of the 1960s . . . [were] replicas of educational institutions of the 1860s or 1760s. Today's schools neither look nor feel like their historical counterparts.[83]

The formal study of organizational change as it applies to education does not have a long history. Prior to 1955 there was no heading for "Educational Innovation" in

---

[83] Knezevich, Administration of Public Education, p. 73.

the Readers' Guide to Periodical Literature. Similarly, there was no such heading in Education Index prior to 1965.[84] However, the amount of research in the last two decades has increased at almost an exponential rate.

In addition, the literature includes research on processes related to change but are referred to as "innovation," "invention," and "adaptation." All are closely related to what Thompson calls "the generation, acceptance, and implementation of new ideas, processes, products, or services."[85] It is implied that these "new ideas, processes, products, or services" will lead to an improvement in the status or operation of the organization. However, there are more than enough sources of criticism and examples of resistance to change and innovation on the basis that such processes do not necessarily lead to improvement. It was these concerns that forced educators to seek out means by which planned changes could be realized through the use of strategies based on logic and reason.

In the face of the change crisis of the 1960s, educators turned to business and industry to take advantage of practices that had proved successful in those fields. The

---

[84]Alan K. Gaynor, "The Study of Change in Educational Organizations," in Educational Administration, ed. Luvern L. Cunningham, Walter G. Hack, and Ralph O. Nystrand (Berkeley, Cal.: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1977), p. 236.

[85]Victor A. Thompson, "Bureaucracy and Innovation," Administrative Science Quarterly 10 (June 1965): 7.

development of systems theory for planning and managing change seemed to be applicable to the school setting. For the educational system came to be recognized for what it was: a system or organization with a multitude of components that interacted with each other in such a way as to effect the total output of the organization.

Griffiths provided several definitions intended to add clarity to the situation:

> All systems except the smallest have sub-systems, and all but the largest have supra-systems which are their environments.
>
> Systems may be open or closed. An open system is related to and makes exchanges with its environment, while a closed system is not related to and does not make exchanges with its environment. Further, a closed system is characterized by an increase in entropy, while open systems tend toward a steady state.[86]

Given these parameters it was clear that schools, in general, were open systems with both subsystems and suprasystems. Griffiths contributed additionally by suggesting "conditions aiding change" in organizations:

> Proposition 1. The major impetus for change in organizations is from the outside.
>
> Proposition 2. The degree and duration of change is directly proportional to the intensity of the stimulus from the suprasystem.
>
> Proposition 3. Change in the organization is more probable if the successor to the chief administrator is from outside the organization, than if he is from inside the organization.
>
> Proposition 4. Living systems respond to continuously increasing stress first by a lag in response, then

---

[86]Daniel E. Griffiths, "Administrative Theory and Change in Organizations," in Organizations and Human Behavior, ed. Fred D. Carver and Thomas J. Sergiovanni (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1969), p. 370.

> by an overcompensatory response, and finally by catastrophic collapse of the system.[87]

Griffiths's "conditions inhibiting change" were as follows:

> Proposition 5. The number of innovations is inversely proportional to the tenure of the chief administrator.
> Proposition 6. The more hierarchical the structure of an organization, the less the possibility of change.
> Proposition 7. When change in an organization does occur, it will tend to occur from the top down, not from the bottom up.
> Proposition 8. The more functional the dynamic interplay of sub-systems, the less the change in the organization.[88]

Miles built on the work of Griffiths in pointing out that "educational systems have special properties which condition the propositions of organization theory in reasonably predictable ways." These included:

1. Goal ambiguity. For many different reasons, it has seemed difficult to specify the output of educational organizations very precisely. Some of this is realistic: change in human beings is going on, with presumably cumulative effects over a long period of time. But part of this output measurement difficulty also seems to be a form of organization defense or protection against criticism from the surrounding environment.
2. Input variability. Another, possibly unique, property of educational organizations is a very wide variation in input from the environment, particularly in relation to children and personnel. Since the school is defined in America as publicly responsible, it must accept children of a very wide range of ability and motivation to carry out its activities (this holds true, of course, for custodial and socialization goals as well as academic learning goals).
3. Role performance invisibility. Classrooms are in effect the production departments of the educational enterprise; in them teachers teach. Yet, this role

---

[87]Ibid., p. 371. [88]Ibid., p. 373.

performance is relatively invisible to status equals or superiors. Children can observe, usually very acutely, the quality of a teacher's execution of her role, but they are not allowed to comment on this, and have few (if any) sanctions to bring to bear.

4. Low interdependence. A further characteristic of educational organizations, when compared with thing-producing systems, seems to be relatively low interdependence of parts. Teacher A's failure to teach anything to her minions effects the job-relevant behavior of teacher B very little--except in a rather diffuse blaming sense, as when junior high school teachers devoutly declare their belief that basic skills are not present in newly-arrived seventh graders.
5. Vulnerability. The American public school, even more than other public organizations, is subject to control, criticism, and a wide variety of "legitimate" demand from the surrounding environment: everyone is a stockholder. Any public organization tends to generate this type of relationship with systems and persons outside its boundary. But a people-processing organization such as the school is dealing with extremely valuable property--children --who return to their parents each night with more or less accurate news of how they have been treated. Thus, in the special kind of organization termed a school, almost any role occupant--board member, superintendent, principal, staff specialist, or teacher--can be criticized by parents or citizens at large. To the system inhabitants, the organizational skin seems extremely thin.
6. Lay-professional control problems. Public schools are governed by laymen, most of whom have not been inside a school for twenty years prior to their succession to the board.
7. Low technological investment. Lastly, it seems very clear that the amount of technology per worker in schools is relatively low. From 60% to 75% of a local school system's budget ordinarily goes to salary with a fraction for equipment and materials.[89]

Knezevich placed much of the responsibility for planned change or innovation within the educational system

[89]Matthew B. Miles, "Planned Change and Organizational Health: Figure and Ground," in Organizations and Human Behavior, ed. Fred D. Carver and Thomas J. Sergiovanni (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1969), p. 382.

upon the administrator.

> Public-school administrators and supervisors are conceived as change agents as well as technicians able to keep the system operating efficiently.
>
> This is not intended to devalue effective and efficient use of resources, for there is no virtue in waste or inefficiency. The administrator or supervisor who cannot even keep the school system operating efficiently at existing levels of performance is not likely to manage change to improved achievements. The administrator or supervisor who is to be a change agent as well as a technical expert must acquire sufficient understanding of research and of practical school situations to evaluate whether an invention has merit and if it can be used effectively by teachers or administrators to improve educational practice.
>
> Identification of promising practices is only the beginning of the change agent's role. The administrators and supervisors must develop strategies for the dissemination of new ideas to classroom levels. The change agents must command the respect of professional personnel as well.
>
> School systems require change agents to remain viable social institutions. The change agents who occupy administrative and supervisory positions must be sensitive to new technology which can be applied to education, be skilled in strategies for promoting change, command the respect of professional colleagues, and be dedicated to challenges. To fulfill the role of change agent, administrators and supervisors need competence in systems techniques and approaches.[90]

Owens agreed with this orientation by saying that "the administrator must either leave change in his organization pretty much to chance or deliberately map out a strategy to foster change."[91] Owens's listing of "barriers to change in schools" included (1) an inadequate base of scientific knowledge, (2) a lack of "change agents," (3) the

---

[90]Knezevich, Administration of Public Education, pp. 83-84.

[91]Owens, Organizational Behavior in Schools, p. 161.

absence of a profit motive, and (4) the "domesticated" status of the school organization.[92]

Gaynor took issue with this perspective when he said:

> As I see it, from the perspective of the educator interested in planned change, the major weakness is the predominant emphasis in the literature upon the individual as the agent, and especially as the adopting unit of change.
>
> People operating as members of organizations are simply not as free as independent entrepreneurs (e.g., farmers and physicians) to implement significant innovations entirely on their own initiative.[93]

It was Gaynor's position that "the study of change has had multiple, sometimes conflicting, roots" and that until recently there has been virtually no literature dealing with the implementation of innovations in complex organizations.[94]

More specifically, the implementation of change at the elementary school level and within the field of instruction has been considered by many to be anything but successful in the most recent past.

> Studies of the innovations of the sixties by Goodlad and Klein and by Silberman arrive at the conclusion that the many changes widely recommended during the decade have failed to permeate the elementary classrooms of this country. A second conclusion is equally disheartening; elementary schools and classrooms are marked by a kind of gray uniformity regardless of their location, student population, or even reputed innovativeness. In reviewing the use of team teaching, educational television, nongrading, discipline-centered curricula, and computer-assisted instruction, Goodlad concludes, as does

---

[92]Ibid., p. 166.

[93]Gaynor, "Study of Change in Educational Organizations," pp. 241-42.

[94]Ibid., pp. 235-36.

Silberman, that innovations of promise are blunted on the classroom doors of the elementary school.[95]

The Seventy-second Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education cited another list of factors that inhibited change:

1. Inadequate finance
2. Value dilemmas
3. Vested interests (of individuals and groups)
4. Bureaucracy
5. Confusion in decision making
6. The leadership vacuum
7. The lack of strategies[96]

Although these factors could not be resolved very quickly, it was important to recognize that innovation and planned change must be encouraged to reduce the amount of drabness in the elementary school organization.

> More often than not, curriculum development is a haphazard process with decisions made by impulse or rule of thumb, or by whatever may be in vogue at a particular time, rather than by systematically following theoretical principles.
>
> Schools will continue to be blown in one educational direction one moment and in the opposite direction the next, and learners and society will continue to pay the penalty, unless supervision picks up the mantle for curriculum leadership. Criteria for the curriculum must be developed and systematized--and applied. This is the job of curriculum leadership; indeed, this is what is meant by curriculum leadership. Curriculum balance depends on it, curriculum continuity depends on it, improvement of learners and society depends on it. In

---

[95]Mary M. Bentzen and Kenneth A. Tye, "Effecting Change in Elementary Schools," in The Elementary School in the United States, The Seventy-second Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, ed. John I. Goodlad and Harold G. Shane (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1973), p. 352.

[96]Ibid.

> short, it is the role of the supervisor to see to it that the principles of curriculum development are followed in practice.[97]

The unique role of the leader was highlighted by Tanner and Tanner in this exerpt:

> Of enormous importance for the curriculum leader are the conditions that facilitate change. Although researchers have identified a number of factors present in successful innovations, the most important single factor appears to be the availability of expert assistance for teachers in implementing the new idea. This does not mean that the innovator convenes a teachers' meeting addressed by an expert who will bring teachers "The Word." Nor does it mean a one-shot workshop. What it does mean is working new ideas through with teachers to solve problems at the practical level.[98]

Thus it was apparent that the manner in which the leader influences changes in the instructional program is most important.

> The picture of the leader who keeps his own counsel and in the nick of time pulls the rabbit out of the hat is out of date. The popular stereotype now is the thoughtful executive discussing in committee the information supplied by a staff of experts. In fact, it may be that the brilliant innovator, in the role of manager, is rapidly becoming an organizational embarrassment as he is an asset.[99]

Babcock would agree that it was ineffective for the curriculum leader to be completely responsible for innovation in the instructional area.

---

[97]Daniel Tanner and Laurel N. Tanner, Curriculum Development (New York: Macmillan Co., 1975), pp. 639-40.

[98]Ibid., p. 637.

[99]Alex Bavelas, "Leadership: Man and Functions," in School Administration: Selected Readings, ed. Sherman H. Frey and Keith R. Getschman (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1968), p. 261.

> Provision must be made in any organizational structure for the initiation of change by any group--teachers, principals, central office administrative and/or supervisory staff, the curriculum decision-making body or groups within the community . . . . The important thing is that the channels through which curriculum proposals pass be clearly defined.[100]

Going even further the literature of the 1970s called for the greater involvement of lay persons and students as well as teachers in the initiation of changes in the instructional program at the elementary school level. However, not all administrators felt that such involvement was either necessary or appropriate.

> Administrators have another view of the curriculum. Many see themselves as "owning" the curriculum at the building level or central office level in the sense that they have the responsibility to make the official decisions or the official recommendations on curriculum matters at the operational level.
>
> Most administrators believe in involving teachers, parents, and perhaps even students in educational issues. But after this period of involvement, an administrator will tend to say "I am the one who has to decide." A few administrators have a low regard for involvement--seeing it only perhaps as good public relations or as a management technique for placating critics. Whether they seek or minimize the involvement of others in matters relating to the curriculum, many administrators oppose the notion of going beyond involvement to actual, shared decision making. They describe such a step as "organized pooling of ignorance," "copping out behind a committee," or "not having guts enough to take responsibility."
>
> Administrators who do not want teachers or students to share in deciding on curriculum are not necessarily guided by self-interest. Rather, they firmly believe that since they have the title "administrator," and are

---

[100] Chester D. Babcock, "The Emerging Role of the Curriculum Leader," in Role of Supervisor and Curriculum Director in a Climate of Change, 1965 Yearbook, ed. Robert R. Leeper (Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1965), p. 58.

paid high salaries, they either do have or at least are expected to have superior judgment in deciding all major educational issues. They also believe that their views are more altruistic than what they perceive to be more provincial views of teacher organization. Interestingly, the administrators who feel this way also tend, like the government, to describe curriculum in ways that a management system can use to provide the tangible, measurable, so called "hard" data needed to make decisions.[101]

Organizational Status

The description provided by the literature of the role of the central office administrator or supervisor who is responsible for providing instructional leadership at the elementary school level has been rather unclear. Some of the confusion can be traced to the lack of agreement upon the appropriate title to be assigned to the position. Babcock expressed little concern over the situation in 1965 when he made the following remarks:

> As we consider the matter of defining the role of the curriculum supervisor or curriculum director, we immediately encounter the problem of terminology. No well developed taxonomy exists in this area to assist us. The individual who is assigned the broad responsibility of leadership in the curriculum program is identified by many titles. He may be called director or supervisor of curriculum and/or instruction; he may be known as curriculum consultant; he may be designated as an assistant or associate or deputy superintendent in charge of curriculum and instruction, or a deputy superintendent in charge of curriculum and research. In some instances, where the elementary and secondary programs are administered as more or less distinct units, he may have the general title, "director of elementary education," or "director of secondary education." In large school systems there may be several supervisors of curriculum

---

[101]Delmo Della-Dora, "Democracy and Education: Who Owns the Curriculum?" Educational Leadership 34 (October 1976): 52.

> and instruction, with a division of labor built around special areas of competence or experience. The number of people involved is not significant because the basic principles of function still apply. The title is not, basically, important and is generally determined more by tradition than by any definitive analysis of function.[102]

Ten years later, Tanner and Tanner reported that the number of different titles for this position had hardly been reduced and that, furthermore, the situation was indicative of a lack of agreement in the field about the position in general.

> Persons in positions of curriculum leadership are known by a number of titles: curriculum supervisor, instructional supervisor, curriculum coordinator, director of curriculum, curriculum consultant, curriculum specialist, assistant supervisor for instruction, director of elementary education, director of secondary education, and helping teacher. The Title does not denote function but is, rather, a matter of local tradition. Here we have stumbled upon a persistent problem of supervision--a lack of agreement about the organization and the classification or labeling in the field. Because there has been no agreement among the professionals in supervision about interrelationships of personnel and tasks, there are a number of referents that mean different things to different people. In other words, the taxonomy in the field is not well developed, reflecting the state of the field.[103]

The lack of agreement characteristic of the instructional leader's title was also found to be apparent in the position that this leader holds within the organization. Almost all school districts are organized along traditionally bureaucratic lines with positions arranged in some

---

[102] Babcock, "Emerging Role of the Curriculum Leader," p. 58.

[103] Tanner and Tanner, Curriculum Development, p. 618.

hierarchical authority structure much similar to those described by Weber almost forty years ago.[104] Simon[105] and Parsons[106] echoed Weber's theory about the need for a clearly defined structure within the organization to facilitate decision making from level to level within the organization. Closely related were the concepts of power and authority that have been defined, described, analyzed, and discussed at length by the authors of various organization theories.

> Power supports the fundamental order of society and the social organization within it, wherever there is order. Power stands behind every association and sustains its structure. Without power there is no organization, and without power there is no order.[107]

Although power and authority were often assumed to mean the same thing, Simon described their difference by explaining that authority is the willingness of the superordinate to assume power over the subordinate.[108]

Wiles drew a distinction between "power over" and "power with" a group by suggesting that "power over" a group

---

[104] Max Weber, The Theory of Social and Economic Organization, ed. Talcott Parson (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press & Falcon Wingo Press, 1947), p. 152.

[105] Herbert Simon, Administrative Behavior, 2nd ed. (New York: Macmillan Co., 1957).

[106] Talcott Parson, Structure and Process in Modern Societies (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1960).

[107] Robert Bierstadt, "An Analysis of Social Power," American Sociological Review 15 (December 1950): 730.

[108] Simon, Administrative Behavior, p. 125.

may not allow for the release of the full power of the group.[109] In this way power can be a limiting factor. Wiles's concept of "power with" a group is explained as follows:

> Under the group approach to leadership, a leader is not concerned with getting and maintaining personal authority. His chief purpose is to develop group power that will enable the group to accomplish its goal. He does not conceive of his power as something apart from the power of the group. He is concerned with developing the type of relationships that will give him "power with" the group.[110]

However, Wiles made clear the fact that he was not suggesting that every organization can afford to depend exclusively on "power with." This was something that the school administrator, for example, must strive to attain while at the same time recognize that he may have to fall back on his "power over" the group on occasion.

The assignment of power within an organization to positions of authority resulted in the creation of what is commonly known as "line" and "staff" positions within the system. Knezevich provided some good examples of how line and staff positions have relevance within the school system.

> The line and staff concept has some value in determining types of central office personnel needed in the system. A position subordinate to the superintendency and carrying authority to act in its own right (rather than in the name of the superintendent) in relation to positions

---

[109] Kimball Wiles, Supervision for Better Schools, 2nd ed. (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1955), pp. 161-67.

[110] Ibid., p. 164.

> subordinate to it, is a line position. For example, in a district with a large number of elementary schools, the superintendent might appoint an assistant superintendent in charge of elementary schools. The assistant superintendent would have authority over the principals of the elementary schools, and they would report to him rather than to the general superintendent.
>
> A position subordinate to the superintendency but carrying authority to act only in a service capacity, is a staff position. For example, the director of personnel has no authority over assistant superintendents or principals, but he does perform the services of locating potential staff members and managing details of transfer, salary payment and welfare benefits for the teaching staff. It is a service department for the system as a whole. Another example of a staff position is the administrative assistant to the superintendent, who performs a variety of chores, always in the name of the superintendent, and never under authority which he possesses because of his position in the operating hierarchy.[111]

Lucio and McNeil had provided a shorter description with basically the same message in the following passage.

> Line officers are those who have the right to make decisions, to take action in order that things get done, and to exercise necessary control over others assigned to them. Staff officers are those whose main job is helping the line officers decide what to do as well as coordinating the efforts of all and supplying necessary services.[112]

Once again it was Knezevich who provided a historical look at where these types of positions originated and what their early positions were within the organization.

> The first assistant superintendents were concerned with supervision and coordination of instruction in various

---

[111] Knezevich, <u>Administration of Public Education</u>, p. 256.

[112] William H. Lucio and John D. McNeil, <u>Supervision: A Synthesis of Thoughts and Action</u> (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962), p. 28.

> buildings of the large system, as well as the advising principals and teachers. Friction between assistant superintendents and principals resulted. Subsequent organization considered the principal as the administrative head of the building, but subordinate to the assistant superintendent in charge of the instructional area. Early assistant superintendents rarely had much authority and depended primarily on persuasion or the soundness of advice.[113]

By 1960 the status of the curriculum worker appeared to remain unclear.

> The role of curriculum workers often appears to be ambiguous. This may be due to such considerations as the relative newness of the positions, confusion as to whether they are operating in a line or a staff relationship and the fact that they may have not had special preparation for their assignments.
>
> Where there is not continuing attention to the clarification of the rules of curriculum workers, the potentiality for disrupting influences increases. Principals may feel threatened and insecure because of a lack of clarity relative to their own role in comparison with that of the curriculum worker. In a sense the inhabitants of these two positions may have an overlapping responsibility in respect to the instructional program.[114]

The debate continued on through 1965 when Babcock suggested that such positions "occupy a service or 'staff' position rather than an authority or 'line' position in the administration of the schools."[115] However, the frustration of making definitive statements about the position led him to add that,

---

[113]Knezevich, Administration of Public Education, p. 258.

[114]ASCD, Leadership, p. 70.

[115]Babcock, "Emerging Role of the Curriculum Leader," p. 61.

> in summary, a definition of the role of the curriculum supervisor is a task complicated by many variables. So complex are the settings within which curriculum workers operate that no definitive statement, applicable to all situations, is possible. The same generalization can be made with reference to the place of the curriculum supervisor in the administrative structure and framework of a school district.[116]

At about the same time that Babcock's statements were being reviewed, Moll reported the results of a survey of 106 superintendents, 66 curriculum directors, and 94 secondary principals from unified school districts in California.[117] This study emphasized the need for superintendents and school boards to delegate both authority and responsibility for improvement of the instructional program to the curriculum director.

This finding was soundly reinforced by a similar study done in Iowa three years later by Pederson.[118] He found that directors of instruction felt their position should have a place in line of administrative authority. Authority, according to Pederson, must accompany the delegation of responsibility.

In 1976 Firth theorized that "examination of research effort in fields beyond professional education has challenged

---

[116]Ibid., p. 64.

[117]Moll, "Analysis of the Role of the Curriculum Director."

[118]Orville Joel Pederson, "The Role of the Director of Instruction as Perceived by Superintendents, Principals and Directors of Instructions" (doctoral dissertation, The University of Iowa, 1968).

some of the fundamental beliefs regarding leadership. One new view is that effective leadership requires status and power within the organization."[119]

In conjunction with the required authority to work effectively within the modern school system of today, it was incumbent upon the instructional leader to call for

> relationships with principals and teachers that are based on mutual respect, understanding of differentiated responsibilities, clearly defined goals, and realistic expectations.
> In building a genuinely cooperative relationship the archaic notions of the lone supervisor, without status, disguised as just another teacher will not suffice.[120]

In conclusion, it can be said that the early emphasis on the curriculum worker as a staff or service position has now been replaced with renewed interest in the position as one of line authority.

Evaluation

The formal evaluation or appraisal of the effectiveness of the instructional leader at the elementary school level must be considered to be of paramount importance to this review. For it is the evaluation process that most often brings clarity to the roles and responsibilities of the office holders within any organization. It was for that reason that the study of leadership taken up in the earliest

---

[119]Gerald R. Firth, "Theories of Leadership: Where Do We Stand?" Educational Leadership 33 (February 1976): 331.

[120]Harris, "Supervisor Competence and Strategies," p. 334.

sections of this chapter included a review of leadership theory, leadership styles, and leadership effectiveness. However, this section is concerned with the procedures or techniques that were recommended by the literature for evaluating the administrator's effectiveness as the designated instructional leader within his elementary school district.

The principles of evaluation that are applicable to administrators are rooted to a great extent in those theories of supervision that were developed early in the history of education for the purpose of aiding teachers to improve their instructional competencies. Those principles that were established in the latter part of the nineteenth century were, for the most part, intended to facilitate the "inspection" process that was most characteristic of early supervisory practices. There was less attention given to helping teachers to improve their skills than there was to identifying the ineffective teacher who was to be purged from the system.

Early in the 1900s scientific management swept the country and attention was directed toward greater "efficiency" and more sophisticated evaluation systems. The evaluation of teachers came to be recognized as an essential aspect of the overall effectiveness of the elementary school system's instructional program. It was during the 1950s and 1960s that research and development of theoretical models

for the supervision of teachers increased at a very rapid rate.

However, the development of evaluation systems for administrators lagged far behind the efforts of those who directed their work toward the improvement of procedures and techniques for evaluating teachers. Little can be found in the literature regarding formal evaluation systems for administrators prior to the late 1960s and early 1970s when there was a universal demand by the American people for greater accountability in their schools.

> The concept of accountability also has affected administrator evaluation. As the public, and in many cases the legislature, pressed schools to become accountable for their product, a formal administrator evaluation process became an indispensable part of school operations.[121]

The development of such a "formal administrator evaluation process" did not occur overnight. Neither was it possible to extrapolate such an administrator evaluation model from those that had become popular in their application to teaching staffs. Recognizing this dilemma, the educators turned to business and industry to examine their practices and procedures for the evaluation of management personnel.

> Traditionally, business and industry have led in the development and implementation of comprehensive management appraisal programs. Education, by contrast, has

---

[121]Terry Barraclough, Evaluation of School Administrators, NAESP School Leadership Digest Series, no. 5 (Arlington, Va.: National Association of Elementary School Principals, 1974), p. 1.

> had relatively little experience with formal administrative evaluation--especially with the integration of evaluation and other organizational processes. Administrative evaluation in the past has been largely an isolated process, based on an individual supervisory style and consisting of a superior's assessment of the personal characteristics or performance of the administrator. Usually the assessment focused on such nebulous administrative qualities as "integrity" and "leadership abilities."
>
> Recently, however, educators have incorporated the knowledge derived from research and from business experience in developing new evaluation programs for educational administrators. Many evaluation programs are now integrated with other organizational functions. Procedures such as evaluation-by-objectives, assessment by subordinates, and team accountability have been introduced. Proponents of such innovative procedures in education are optimistic about the effects that evaluation can have upon both administrative and organizational performance. Others have doubts about the appropriateness of applying such procedures in the area of education.[122]

In the face of increased demands for accountability and through the availability of appraisal systems developed and implemented in business and industry, a large number of evaluation practices found their way into the central offices of most elementary school districts. These methods of appraisal appeared to fall into either of two broad categories of evaluation systems. For lack of a better term, the "performance standards approach" was identified to include those approaches to evaluation that attempted to measure an administrator against a set of predetermined performance standards. The most common examples of this

---

[122] Evaluating Administrative Performance, Educational Research Service report (Washington, D.C.: Educational Research Service, 1974), p. 1.

approach were found in the form of checklists or rating forms. The strengths and weaknesses of this type of appraisal system were apparent to those who have had experience with its use.

> Performance standards evaluations of any kind are economical of time, energy, and money. They do, however, have some serious drawbacks. Since the evaluator is asked his opinion of how an administrator measures up to a set of standards, the evaluation is highly subjective. Many instruments are poorly designed. The administrator is rarely, if ever, consulted in establishing the standards against which he will be measured. In addition, performance standards are inflexible and do not allow for changes in circumstances or specific tasks.[123]

Nevertheless, "over three-fourths of the instruments reported in a 1971 Educational Research Service report are of this type."[124]

The second type of approach was referred to in the literature most often as the "job targets approach."

> By 1968 a growing trend to evaluate school administrators was evident, and by 1971 the trend had grown large enough to expose a subtrend toward a particular type of evaluation. That type of evaluation has been called, variously, the job targets approach, performance goals procedure, and management by objectives. The job targets approach was adopted by 25 percent of the school systems . . . [which] reported administrator evaluation procedures in a 1971 survey by the National Education Association. It has also been advocated in a number of school management monographs.
>
> The approach focuses, basically, on the improvement of a person's job performance in a nondefensive atmosphere. This atmosphere is fostered by the collaboration of the evaluator and evaluatee on all aspects of the

---

[123] Barraclough, "Evaluation of School Administrators," p. 17.

[124] Ibid., p. 15.

> evaluation procedure. That is, they must first agree on the design and operations of the evaluation process; subsequently, they work together to set goals for the evaluatee, develop a plan by which the goals can be reached, and monitor progress. This approach not only helps to assuage any defensiveness an evaluatee may feel but also, at the very least, guarantees him due process.[125]

Researchers in the field of administrator evaluation appeared to find more positive elements in the job targets approach than in the performance standards approach.

> The job targets approach is perhaps more time-consuming than the performance standards approach, but it has several advantages. The evaluation is tailored to the administrator and to the specific jobs he performs. And it provides the district with reliable evidence of the administrator's performance.[126]

The growing popularity of this approach was apparent in the literature. As was reported earlier, Poliakoff cited a survey completed in 1971 wherein it was indicated that 25 percent of the school systems which reported their procedures indicated that they used a job targets approach. In 1974 Barraclough reported that although the performance standards approach continued to be more common, the job targets approach was gaining increased credence through research in the field. In 1976 Schramm reported that a survey of the six-county metropolitan Detroit area determined that the evaluation systems were nearly evenly divided

---

[125]Lorraine Poliakoff, "Recent Trends in Evaluating School Personnel," National Elementary School Principal 52 (February 1973): 39.

[126]Barraclough, "Evaluation of School Administrators," p. 18.

between the pre-established rating form approach and the job targets approach.[127]

Regardless of the approach to evaluation during this era, there remained major problems in the minds of some experts in regard to the whole process of administrator evaluation.

> In a paper presented at the American Association of School Administrators annual convention, Campbell (1971) discusses some of the problems in administrator evaluation. Major difficulties in devising evaluation programs stem from differing perceptions of the administrator's role, confusion about the meaning of leadership, and situational constraints versus the expectation that an administrator can change the status quo. He argues that schools are conservative and that much of an administrator's time is spent in simply maintaining the organization. For these reasons, evaluation is complex and difficult.[128]

In addition, the method of evaluation continued to depend to a great extent on the ability of the evaluator.

> School administrators schooled in good management techniques frequently are not very effective when working with evaluation procedures. They may even use techniques that actually curtail the potential in other administrators equally knowledgeable in the precepts of good administration.[129]

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, the literature

---

[127] William George Schramm, "Formal Evaluation of Administrators in the Six County Metropolitan Detroit Area" (doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University, 1976).

[128] Terry Barraclough, "Administrator Evaluation," Educational Management Review Series 15 (April 1973): 3-4.

[129] Robert E. Greene, Administrative Appraisal: A Step to Improved Leadership, report by the National Association of Secondary School Principals (Washington, D.C.: NASSP, 1972), p. 1.

recommends that the purpose of administrator evaluation must be carefully determined and clearly defined in order to insure the overall effectiveness of the process. Such purposes include the development of the administrator's skills in performing the responsibilities assigned to him as the instructional leader. Moreover, it is expected that through such definition of purpose and through the proper utilization of an effective appraisal system, the roles and responsibilities of the instructional leader will be identified with greater precision than ever before. Ultimately, the combination of all of these factors will facilitate the administrator's goal of providing effective instructional leadership at the elementary school level.

CHAPTER III

PRESENTATION OF DATA

The purpose of this study was to analyze the role and responsibilities of the central office administrator or supervisor who reported directly to the superintendent and had primary responsibility for providing instructional leadership at the elementary school level. This chapter will include a summary of the data collected from thirty-three completed questionnaires and six on-site interviews with central office administrators who had previously completed the questionnaire and were willing to provide additional information to verify the findings of the questionnaire. It will be the purpose of this chapter to present the data in a straightforward manner with little or no evaluative remarks. In the following chapter, Chapter IV, this data will be analyzed, conclusions will be formulated, and implications cited. The final chapter, Chapter V, will include a summary statement along with final conclusions and recommendations.

The population of the study was composed of elementary school districts in Cook, DuPage, Lake, and Will counties in Illinois in which there was one, and only one, administrator or supervisor responsible for the instructional

program of the district. The directories that are published by each of the four county offices of the superintendent of schools were reviewed to determine which of the 300 elementary school districts in the four-county area listed such a position among their central office staff. Fifty-two school districts were identified (thirty from Cook County, eight from DuPage County, ten from Lake County, and four from Will County).

Questionnaire Results

A survey containing thirty-nine questions was sent to each of the fifty-two school districts in the sample. The initial return of thirty completed questionnaires was followed by a second request that elicited the return of nine additional questionnaires. The return rate was 75 percent. Six of the thirty-nine completed questionnaires were eliminated from further consideration when it was learned that each of the six individuals who completed these questionnaires was not the only administrative officer (other than the superintendent) who was responsible for the instructional functions at all grade levels and who devoted the major portion of his time to such functions. In most cases, the individual was assuming additional responsibilities (for example, principal) that might interfere with the acquisition of information about the particular position under review in this study.

The thirty-nine items in the questionnaire were grouped into five separate sections:

1. General Information (items 1-2)
2. Personal Information (items 3-13)
3. Information Concerning Organizational Status (items 14-22)
4. Information Concerning Duties and Responsibilities (items 23-34)
5. Information Regarding Performance Evaluation (items 35-39)

Information that was obtained from the first item included the person's name, position title, school district name, and county. From this information it was determined that there was a wide variety in titles--twenty-three in all--that were closely aligned with curriculum and instruction. Fourteen of the thirty-three responses were from curriculum directors, directors of instructional services, and curriculum coordinators while the remaining nineteen were from assistant superintendents for curriculum or instructional services or both. As already stated, six of the thirty-nine responses were from those who indicated in item 2 that they were not in positions closely aligned with those under review in this study.

Personal Information

Questions raised in this section were related to the demographic characteristics of the person who holds the

position of instructional leadership within the elementary school setting. A summary of the responses to the items in this section will follow.

The sex (item 3) of the thirty-three administrators was reported as twenty-two males and eleven females for a two-to-one ratio. The mean age of the respondents was calculated to be 46.4 years based upon the mid-point of each interval. The distribution of ages is presented in Table 1.

TABLE 1

DISTRIBUTION OF AGES OF CENTRAL OFFICE ADMINISTRATORS

Age	Number[a]
20-24	0
25-29	0
30-34	3
35-39	6
40-44	6
45-49	4
50-54	7
55-59	5
60-64	2
65+	0

[a]N = 33.

The educational background of those included in the study indicated that while eleven had their doctorate, twenty-two held master's degrees (item 5). The area of specialization (at the graduate level) was requested in item 6 and yielded the following results:

Administration . . . 24

Supervision 8

Curriculum 17

The undergraduate majors of the respondents were obtained through item 7 and are indicated in Table 2.

TABLE 2

UNDERGRADUATE MAJORS OF CENTRAL OFFICE ADMINISTRATORS

	Major						
	Elem. Ed.	Soc. Sci.	Pol. Sci./ Econ.	Arts	Sci.	Math	Eng.
Frequency	6	12	2	4	2	3	4

The administrator's length of tenure in the present position (item 9) was compared to length of tenure in the district (item 8). Fourteen of the thirty-three individuals entered their present district in the position that they currently hold while the remaining nineteen office holders moved up "from the ranks" of their own district.

The position that the administrators reported to

have held immediately prior to assuming their current position (item 10) included the following:

TABLE 3

CENTRAL OFFICE ADMINISTRATOR'S PREVIOUS POSITIONS

	Position				
	Curr. Dir.	Elemen. Princ.	Jr.-High Princ.	College Adm./Teacher	Dir. Fed. Funds
Frequency	10	11	6	3	3

The administrator's previous years of experience in education (item 11) included a variety of positions that ranged from elementary school teacher to school superintendent. The data collected under this item were summarized as follows:

1. Twenty of the thirty-three administrators had experience as elementary school teachers and eight of those twenty had five or more years of experience at that level.

2. Ten other administrators had experience as junior-high teachers and the remaining three administrators were restricted to the high school level for their classroom teaching experience.

3. Seventeen (about half) of the administrators were elementary school principals and two others were exclusively junior-high school principals. None of the

thirty-three administrators had previous administrative experience at the high school level.

4. Seven of the administrators had either full- or part-time experience at the college level.

Item 12 sought to determine the length of the current work year for the instructional leader. Twenty-nine of the thirty-three administrators had a twelve-month contract. The remainder worked either ten or eleven months out of the year.

The professional organizations in which these administrators held membership was the subject of item 13 and the responses are shown in Table 4.

TABLE 4

CENTRAL OFFICE ADMINISTRATOR'S PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIPS

Organization	Membership
Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development	31
Illinois Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development	25
American Association of School Administrators	11
Illinois Association of School Administrators	4
American Educational Research Association	3

Organizational Status

In the third section of the questionnaire, items were included that related to the instructional leader's status within the organization. Item 14 asked whether the administrator held a "line" or a "staff" position within the district. Twenty-one administrators indicated a line position while eleven marked staff position (one respondent checked both line and staff).

Questions 15 and 16 were included to provide additional information about the line and staff responses elicited in question 14. The questionnaire asked respondents to identify in item 15 the drawbacks of their position (line or staff) and how they minimized (item 16) these drawbacks. The responses were summarized as follows:

1. Seven of the line administrators stated that there were no drawbacks to this arrangement and seven others suggested that relationships with staff were more distant as a result and that there may be some lack of honesty in responses.

2. The majority of the line administrators indicated that they minimized the drawbacks to their position through close contact with the staff and by demonstrating a responsive attitude to suggestions and recommendations.

3. Four of the eleven staff administrators indicated that there were no apparent drawbacks while four others cited a lack of authority to give direction.

4. All of the staff administrators who felt that they lacked authority stated that they worked closely with the principals in their district and drew upon authority or the authority of the superintendent.

In item 17 the respondents were asked to cite the advantages of their relative positions within the organization. The answers provided by the staff administrators pointed to the development of a relationship with the staff that was free from threat. The line administrators overwhelmingly supported the stance that their authority was commensurate with their responsibility and that it was advantageous in decision making and in effecting change. References were also made in the questionnaire by the line administrators to the advantages of working in a closer relationship with the superintendent and board of education.

Item 18 was included for the expressed purpose of obtaining the respondent administrators' preferences for line or staff status for themselves within the organization. These responses were compared to their current status, thus yielding the following results:

1. Four of the line administrators and three of the staff administrators indicated that in their opinions it did not matter whether the position was line or staff.

2. Five of the staff administrators and seventeen of the line administrators stated their preferences for the same type of position that they currently held.

3. Only one of the line administrators would have preferred staff status while three of the staff administrators would have preferred a change in status to that of a line administrator.

In seeking further information about the central office administrator's relationship with the principals in the respondent's district, question 19 asked whether or not the principals were directly responsible to the central office administrator on instructional matters. Table 5 provides the distribution of responses for line and staff administrators.

TABLE 5

ARE THE PRINCIPALS DIRECTLY RESPONSIBLE
TO YOU ON INSTRUCTIONAL MATTERS?

Response	Line Administrators	Staff Administrators	Total
Yes	21	6	26
No	1	5	6
Total	22	11	33

In similar fashion, the question was raised in item 20 as to whether or not the central office administrator was involved in the evaluation of the principals. Table 6 reflects these responses.

Responsibility for instructional supervisors or consultants was assessed in item 21. A little more than

TABLE 6

DO YOU EVALUATE OR ASSIST IN THE EVALUATION OF PRINCIPALS?

Response	Line Administrators	Staff Administrators	Total
Yes	14	4	18
No	8	7	15
Total	22	11	33

80 percent of the line administrators had about five supervisors that were directly responsible to them while five of the eleven staff administrators had responsibility for two to three supervisors each.

The organizational charts of each school district involved in the study were solicited in item 22. The return of only ten organizational charts provided little information other than a verification of the type of authority that was cited by the respondents in the questionnaire.

Duties and Responsibilities

In this section of the questionnaire, data were gathered in regard to the duties and responsibilities of the central office instructional leader and the manner in which changes are effected in the instructional program. Prior to securing information about specific aspects of the administrator's responsibilities, it was learned through item 23 that twenty-nine of the thirty-three administrators included in the study had written job descriptions for their positions.

Each of the respondents was asked to rank-order his six most important areas of responsibility within the total field of instruction. These responses are shown in Table 7.

TABLE 7

RELATIVE IMPORTANCE OF INSTRUCTIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES

Responsibility	No. of Times Selected[a]	Mean Ranking
Curriculum development	33	1.6
In-service training	29	3.0
Instructional materials	27	3.9
Supervision of instruction	23	3.2
Public relations	23	4.7
Educational personnel	20	3.8
Educational testing	17	4.9
Educational research	12	4.75
Special education	9	3.33

[a]Total number of responses = 33.

In addition to seeking out each administrator's priority listing of his instructional responsibilities, item 25 was constructed in a manner identical to item 24 with one exception: in this item each administrator was asked to indicate his superintendent's ranking of these areas <u>as perceived by the administrator</u>. The data gathered from this item are included in Table 8.

TABLE 8

SUPERINTENDENT'S PRIORITY LISTING OF INSTRUCTIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES AS PERCEIVED BY THE CENTRAL OFFICE INSTRUCTIONAL LEADER

Responsibility	No. of Times Selected[a]	Mean Ranking
Curriculum development	30	1.9
In-service training	27	2.8
Instructional materials	25	4.0
Educational personnel	23	3.8
Public relations	22	4.7
Supervision of instruction	21	3.2
Educational testing	17	4.3
Special education	8	3.6
Educational research	8	4.9

[a]Total number of responses = 30.

It was determined that twenty-nine of the thirty-three administrators indicated in item 26 that they had noninstructional duties assigned to them. These included, according to item 27, the following: negotiations, federal- and state-funded programs, newsletters, records, and related pupil personnel requirements.

The manner in which the central office administrator allocated his time was identified in item 28. Each of the respondents was asked to assign the approximate percentage

of time to nine different areas of responsibility. That distribution is presented in Table 9.

TABLE 9

ADMINISTRATOR'S ALLOCATION OF TIME TO AREAS OF RESPONSIBILITY

Responsibility	Average Percent of Time	Rank
Curriculum development	27%	1
In-service training	15	2
Supervision of instruction	11	3
Instructional materials	11	4
Educational personnel	9	5
Special education	9	6
Public relations	8	7
Educational testing	6	8
Educational research	4	9
Total	100%	

The next three items in the questionnaire were directed toward determining the conditions under which the central office administrator can assume responsibility for the instructional program of the elementary school district. The question raised in item 29 was whether or not the central office administrator felt that the responsibility and authority for the instructional program could be

delegated by the superintendent to a person in his position. The response was overwhelmingly in the affirmative (thirty yes, three no).

In item 30 the administrators were asked to identify obstacles to the success of the practice referred to in item 29. About one-third of the respondents chose not to comment on this item while the others cited the following: lack of communication and/or support by the superintendents, interpersonal relations with the principals, lack of time, and the lack of recognized authority. The respondents suggested (in item 31) that these obstacles could be minimized, for the most part, through close and regular communication with the superintendent.

The manner in which the central office administrator maintained communication with the staff and community and effected changes in the instructional program was investigated in items 32, 33, and 34. Less than half (fifteen) of the administrators made use of a permanent curriculum council to bring about improvements in the instructional program. Those who did make use of such groups met on a monthly basis and included both teachers and principals on the committee. Only four of the respondents indicated that they had parents serve on this committee and none of these committees included students as members.

Changes in the instructional program were implemented by the central office administrator most often

(according to item 33) through (1) direct contact with the teaching staff--28 percent, (2) supervisors or department heads--3 percent, (3) principals--9 percent, (4) two or more of the above groups--60 percent.

The significant obstacles to the administrator's effectiveness as a leader in bringing about changes in the instructional program were solicited in item 34. The obstacles that were indicated included the following (the number of times the item was mentioned is included in parentheses after the item):

1. Time (10)
2. Teachers' resistance to change (7)
3. Principals' resistance to change (6)
4. Money (5)
5. Poor evaluation strategies (3)
6. Poor goal statements (2)

Evaluation Procedures

The items in the final section of the questionnaire were constructed to provide information about the current methods that were employed to evaluate the central office administrator's performance. It was determined through item 35 that only two-thirds of the administrators received written evaluations of their performance. Those included in this group received such an evaluation once each year. Only one administrator of the thirty-three indicated that the evaluation occurred more often.

Those included in the evaluation of the central office administrator were indicated in item 36. All twenty-three administrators who received evaluations indicated that their superintendent contributed to that evaluation. Fourteen of the twenty-three said that the superintendent was the only evaluator. In five other cases the board of education contributed "in a formal manner" to evaluation of the administrator along with the superintendent. In three other cases the superintendent, principals, and teachers contributed to the evaluation process, and in one case all four groups were represented in the evaluation of the respondent.

The method of evaluation was found in item 37 to be a rating form in two of the twenty-three cases. Five other administrators indicated that both a rating system and a performance approach were used in the evaluation process. Fifteen other administrators cited the use of performance appraisal, and one administrator added his own method to the questionnaire form: the "subjective approach."

The advantages and disadvantages of the different methods of evaluation were sought in items 38 and 39. The three administrators who were evaluated by the rating system method suggested that there were few advantages to the system and found that the system had inconsistencies and was a source of some confusion. Those who used the performance appraisal approach used the following phrases to describe the advantages of this system: tailored to district

priorities; provides opportunity for mutual goal setting; personalized; clear; specific goals; and an excellent source of feedback. The disadvantages cited of the performance appraisal system were fewer in number than the above-mentioned advantages. However, those who suggested disadvantages to this method indicated that the practice was too subjective, it was somewhat ambiguous, and it was time consuming.

Interviews

After gathering the data from the completed quesionnaires, an interview guide (see Appendix B) was developed for the purpose of gaining additional information that would have been difficult, if not impossible, to gain through the use of a written questionnaire. In addition, questions were presented in the interview guide that were intended to reaffirm the findings that were obtained from the completed questionnaires. Prior to its use in the field, the interview instrument was validated by conducting separate interviews with an assistant superintendent who had previously completed one of the questionnaires and with a professor in the Department of Administration and Supervision at Loyola University. Suggestions for improvement of the instrument were incorporated into the actual instrument as used in the study.

Interviews were conducted with three line administrators and three staff administrators. The selection of this

representative sample of administrators included individuals from each of the four counties (Cook, DuPage, Lake, and Will) that were in the original sample. All of the interviews were conducted at the offices of the administrators who were interviewed. The questions that were asked along with a summary of the responses that were obtained are included in the paragraphs that follow:

1. The survey seemed to indicate that the central office administrator for instruction should have an administrative background (especially as a principal) with a strong curriculum orientation. Would you agree? Why?

Three of the six respondents expressed strong support for the need to have been an elementary or junior-high school principal prior to assuming a central office position. All three of these individuals pointed to the importance of the role of the school principal in the supervisory process and made reference to the need for the central office administrator to have a first-hand awareness of the principal's responsibilities as well as the difficulties that the principal encounters in executing his duties.

While all three of these respondents had the experience of which they spoke, the other three administrators had never been principals and did not see the principalship as a prerequisite to success in their current positions. They did, however, recognize the importance of being sensitive to

the needs of their principals and were willing to allow that experience in that position could be extremely helpful. Furthermore, they felt that _teaching_ experience was fundamentally more important at that level than administrative experience. Regardless of experience, they felt strongly that the central office administrator must possess a personality that facilitated cooperation and communication with a wide variety of people.

2. _What is your interpretation of a "line" position v. a "staff" position?_

The consensus of opinion expressed by the administrators was that a line administrator had rather well-defined authority over individuals or groups of individuals and had a greater amount of decision-making power than the person in the staff position. The staff position was viewed as an advisor, consultant, or resource person who sought to influence the behavior of others but was required to draw upon the authority of the superintendent or the principal when conflicts arose.

3. _Give an example of how your status (line/staff) has been more effective in providing instructional leadership than if you had been a line/staff administrator?_

The examples provided by the line administrators made specific references to "power over" individuals or groups and to the ability to exert "pressure" to influence the behavior of others. Each of them pointed to the

advantages of their ability to expedite decisions that needed to be made.

The three staff administrators described how their relationship to the principals and to the teachers allowed for a mutual exchange of concerns within an environment that was virtually free of threat.

4. Who do you evaluate (formally) on a regular basis?

Four of the six respondents indicated that they do not evaluate anyone in their district while the other two listed the principals, the director of special education, the coordinator of library services, and additional personnel who were not assigned to one particular school in the district. The four administrators who said that they had no responsibility for completing evaluations included the three staff administrators and one line administrator.

5. Do you have the authority that is necessary to perform your responsibilities in an effective manner? If not, how are you restricted?

The difference of opinion between the line and staff administrators was most apparent in their response to this question. Each of the line administrators expressed satisfaction with the amount of authority assigned to them and each of them provided examples of how they exercised this authority in giving direction to personnel within the instructional program. The three staff administrators, on the

other hand, reported that they were dissatisfied with the apparent lack of authority that they had in working with principals. Each staff administrator expressed the desire to have a line position in the district's organizational plan.

6. Curriculum development was indicated to be the top priority of the central office administrator and his superintendent (according to the survey). What does the term "curriculum development" mean in your district?

A broad range of answers was obtained from this question. However, each of the respondents made reference to locally developed processes that included provisions for the evaluation of the current curriculum and the ongoing renewal of programs that needed to be modified to meet the changing needs of the staff and the community. All six of the respondents enrolled the support of curriculum committees composed of teachers and administrators who were charged with many of the following responsibilities: evaluating materials, developing objectives for students and teachers, and recommending changes in programs. In each case the curriculum director or assistant superintendent played a key role in the orchestration of the overall curriculum development process.

7. Are there yearly goals for the district and/or the instructional program of the district?

In almost all of the cases the respondents indicated

that there were both general goals for the district and more specific objectives for the instructional program. The district's goals and those of the instructional program were closely interrelated. All goals and objectives were reviewed and updated or changed entirely each year.

8. <u>Are there long-range goals for program improvements?</u>

Four of the six administrators have played a major role in the development of multiyear plans that include provision for the review of particular areas of the curriculum. Some of the plans made reference to the improvement of instructional strategies as well as the revision of content areas within the curriculum. In one case the administrator stated that a similar type of plan was currently being developed for the district (previously this district's goals were developed for the individual schools in the district).

9. <u>How are any of these goals determined and who is involved in the process--the board of education? the superintendent? the parents? the teachers? the principals? the students?</u>

The respondents suggested that, although their boards of education had the responsibility for formally adopting the goals for the school district, it was, in most cases, the administrative team that identified the goals for the board's review. In two cases the community had the opportunity to provide input into the goal-setting process

(either through a standing committee established to act in an advisory capacity or through an open meeting of the board in the fall of the year). In the remaining cases the teachers and administrators played a role in contributing to the development of the district's goals. The instructional goals were formulated for the most part by the central office administrator responsible for providing leadership within the areas of curriculum and instruction. In none of the cases were students involved in the development of goals either for the district or for the instructional program.

10. How are these goals measured?

The administrators reported that the evaluation process occurred in a number of ways depending to a great extent on the nature of the goal statement. For most districts a review of the district's goals was completed by the board of education and/or the administration and/or the curriculum council at the end of the school year.

11. What role do you play in the goal-setting process or in the evaluation process?

The central office administrators described their roles as significant in each of the processes. Although the establishment of district goals reflected the input of many groups, it was the central office administrator who provided the leadership in seeking out that input and in translating it into goal statements for the instructional program. It was the central office administrator who worked with the

teachers and the principals in gathering the data that were necessary, first, to formulate the goals and, second, to measure their attainment.

12. <u>How are changes instituted in the instructional program? Is there a procedure that is outlined in writing? What is your role?</u>

Two of the six respondents were able to refer to a written procedure that outlined the steps that were to be followed in the initiations of instructional "innovations" that might include a new course of instruction or a change in instructional strategies. Both of these procedures described the format that was required in submitting a proposal. In addition, all of the groups or individuals that were required to give approval prior to implementation of a change were clearly identified. In each case there existed a district curriculum council that screened all of these proposals.

A third respondent indicated that although there was no written procedure there was a practice that was followed in the district that was similar to the procedure described above. In this case there was a district council that reviewed all proposed changes in the instructional program. It was this group that had the responsibility for establishing subcommittees that were subsequently held accountable for the development, implementation, and evaluation of any proposed projects.

The three remaining administrators had no formal procedure for responding to the need for changes in the district's instructional program. Changes in textbooks or the adoption of new materials for use in all schools was handled by curriculum committees that were established for the purpose of making recommendations to the superintendent. Changes in teaching methods were generally the responsibility of the principal and were handled on an individual school basis.

In all cases the central office administrator for instruction made his influence felt through his presence on the district curriculum council or by working with teachers and principals who needed support and encouragement to experiment with approaches that were different from the established practices of the district.

13. <u>Is there a written procedure for adopting a new program or textbook series?</u>

None of the six districts represented had a written procedure that was specifically developed to outline the manner in which a new program or textbook series was adopted for use in the district. However, the three administrators who had district curriculum councils explained that typically a committee of teachers would be selected to do the following:

a) Develop a statement of philosophy for the program

b) Review and revise student objectives

c) Determine an evaluation tool for use in the review of materials

d) Apply that evaluation tool to those programs that are currently available on the market

e) Select two or three programs for review by the entire staff

f) Review the feedback from the staff

g) Recommend one program to the superintendent and the board of education

In all of the cases the central office administrator played an important role in providing the group with research data, consultative help, and sample materials.

14. How is curriculum development related to the annual budget in your school district?

The responses obtained from the administrators indicated that the development of the budget was closely coordinated with the areas that had been previously identified for review and upgrading during the school year. Each of the respondents indicated that he had direct input into the development of the budget by recommending appropriations into funds that provided for the "maintenance" needs of the existing programs as well as those areas of need that were identified in the instructional goals statements referred to earlier.

15. Is there an amount of money specified for "research and development"?

Although there was no "line item" for such an account, most of the respondents indicated that there were monies set aside in a number of accounts that could be called upon to purchase materials, to hire outside consultants, to provide stipends to teachers for curriculum work, or to pay for substitutes that in turn would allow teachers time for research and development. Responsibility for these funds was assigned to the central office administrator for instruction.

16. <u>In-service training was ranked second in the questionnaire. How is in-service training conducted in your school district?</u>

According to the respondents, there were several full-day institutes and half-day workshops that were included in the school calendar for the specific purpose of providing in-service training to the staff. This in-service took many forms and in most cases was correlated with the instructional priorities of the district. On these in-service days teachers were provided with the opportunity to attend meetings on an individual school basis or a district basis depending on the plans for the day. Outside speakers were often contracted, and sometimes teachers with particular talents were asked to conduct in-service sessions for their peers.

In all but one case the administrators had one or two hours each week that were set aside for additional

in-service sessions. These were times at the end of the day, one day each week, when teachers were required by contract or by board policy to stay beyond the regular school day for in-service training.

a) Who plans it?

The three districts that have curriculum councils depend largely upon these groups for organizing the in-service sessions. The administrative team plays an important role in identifying concerns and in assisting others in the implementation of in-service training in all six districts. In all cases the central office administrator had final responsibility for the district program.

b) Who evaluates it?

Written evaluation forms were completed by those staff members who participated in the in-service. These forms were usually reviewed by the principals before being forwarded for evaluation by the central office administrator for instruction. Curriculum councils and, in most cases, the administrative team, including the superintendent, are directly involved in making a final appraisal of the effectiveness of the district's total in-service program.

c) How much money is appropriated each year for in-service training?

The response to this question included a wide range of figures that depended on the number of staff members in each district and the number of sources that the respondents

included in their informal computations. Each school district had its own system for distributing funds into accounts that might not universally be considered as sources of in-service money. For example, most had money set aside for consultants' fees, materials, and similar types of expenses. Yet there were additional funds appropriated for "instructional travel" that reimbursed teachers for expenses that they incurred as a result of their attendance at a meeting outside the district. Funds were also available from grants provided through "gifted" education, Title VII, and Title IV-C.

Figures that were provided ranged from $25 per staff member to $60 per staff member with an "average" of $42 per staff member.

17. What is your role in providing the necessary instructional materials to the staff?

In responding to this question the central administrators separated "instructional materials" into those that were commonly referred to as "basic" materials and those that were known as "supplemental" materials. The "basic" materials were defined to include all of the materials associated with the programs that had been adopted by the board of education for use in all of the schools in the district. The control of these materials (inventory/ ordering) was the final responsibility of the central office administrator for instruction. Purchases were requested by

the teachers, forwarded to their principal for approval, initialed by the central office administrator, and sent out to the publisher by the business office. "Supplemental" materials were described as those items that teachers used for instruction based on their assessment of the individual needs of their students. Money for these purchases was most often obtained through individual school budgets that were under the direction of the school principal. Additional funds for purchases over and above the amounts allocated to each school were often assigned to the central office administrator for extraordinary purchases.

18. <u>Do you evaluate teachers (formally)? How often and under what circumstances?</u>

Only one of the six respondents indicated that he provided formal evaluations of teachers. These particular teachers were assigned to special assignments within the district and were evaluated once each year. The other five administrators stated that for all practical purposes they have never formally evaluated teachers while in their present positions.

19. <u>How do you maintain communications with</u> . . .

a) <u>the superintendent?</u>

All of the respondents indicated that they have tried to maintain daily communication with their superintendents on an informal basis. Only one administrator had made arrangement for a regular meeting time once each week

to review mutual concerns and to report progress. Five of the six administrators pointed to the importance of being in the same office complex, and the superintendent and one administrator actually shared the same office with the superintendent.

b) the board of education?

Three of the six administrators maintained close communications with the board of education by making a presentation on some aspect of the curriculum at each of the regular monthly meetings of the board. One other administrator reported that he made curriculum presentations at board meetings about four times each year. The two remaining administrators seldom made formal presentations at board meetings and were not expected to be in attendance. Over and above any formal presentations, the administrators reported that they provided written communications to the board members on a regular basis. This communication was in the form of a newsletter or an attachment to the superintendent's regular communication to the board members prior to their monthly meeting.

c) the principals?

All six respondents indicated that they met with their principals on a formal basis at administrative meetings that were scheduled by the superintendent on a weekly basis or at least two times each month. Each of the administrators said that he tried to visit with individual

principals when he visited schools during the week. However, many of them indicated that they had difficulty in making as many visits to the schools as they wished they could. One administrator met with all of the school principals on a formal basis two times each month for the expressed purpose of discussing curricular and instructional concerns. Another administrator, as part of his goals for himself, made it a point to develop a cooperative project that required the mutual support of both the principal and the central office administrator.

d) the teachers?

According to the respondents, the regularly scheduled curriculum committee meetings were a good source of communication between the central office administrator and the certified staff. In addition, frequent visits to the schools were viewed as important ways to "keep in touch" with the teachers. Yet it was pointed out by more than one administrator that when his weekly schedule became overcrowded with other responsibilities, the visits to the schools were the first to be reduced in number or eliminated altogether.

e) the students?

Four of the six administrators reported that they had little or no contact with students. The other two administrators said that they tried to teach a class of students at least once or twice each year in order to

maintain contact with the teaching process.

f) <u>the community?</u>

With one exception the respondents indicated that they had minimal communications with the community. Two of the administrators published a newsletter that focused on curriculum issues or projects. All of the administrators wrote occasional press releases and/or made presentations to parent groups on a limited basis. Only one administrator seemed to devote an extraordinary amount of time to making presentations to community groups on topics that were related to the district's instructional program.

20. <u>"Time" was cited as the biggest obstacle to constructive change in elementary school districts (according to the questionnaire). What does that mean to you in your situation and how do you overcome this obstacle?</u>

The response of the administrators to this question unleashed feelings of frustration that would be difficult to describe in this paper. The varied explanations of the administrators seemed to fall into two categories. One of the reasons given for the apparent lack of time in the administrator's schedule was traced to his job description. It was here that the comprehensive responsibilities of the instructional leader were revealed as ongoing, broad in scope, and open-ended in nature. The conscientious administrator might be expected to work long hours and may never enjoy the feeling of satisfaction that many positions offer

in bringing a set of tasks or projects to resolution.

Secondly, the administrators pointed to the fact that their effectiveness was a function of the time that was required to work with teachers, administrators, and others in providing support and encouragement as well as in suggesting changes and improvement. There the time limitation referred to in the question was significant not only in terms of the administrator's time but also in terms of the time limitations of the individuals with whom he must work cooperatively.

The seemingly obvious suggestions that were made by the administrators to overcome these obstacles included: setting priorities for work needing to be completed, delegating responsibilities to others, exercising good organizational practices and procedures, and scheduling work for the summer when responsibilities are fewer and the demands upon other people's time may be less. More than one administrator spoke of the importance of having an efficient secretary who can assume some of the responsibility that can be delegated by the central office administrator.

21. <u>What criteria are used to measure your overall effectiveness?</u>

Four of the six administrators indicated that the criteria used to measure their effectiveness were rather unclear and lacked definition. One other administrator said that he was subject to the same administrative rating form

that was used with the principals. The last administrator indicated that he and the superintendent established priorities in the fall of the year that were reviewed in the spring by both individuals at an evaluation conference.

22. Would you change those criteria?

Two of the four administrators who received no formal evaluation were satisfied with these arrangements. The other two would prefer to have an evaluation based on performance objectives. The administrator who received that type of evaluation already expressed no desire to change the system. The administrator with the rating form stated that the system was ineffective in giving proper direction to his efforts.

23. Should your salary increases be directly linked to your performance (by objectives)?

Three of the six administrators were in favor of such a procedure while the remaining three were reluctant to take advantage of such a system. In general, these three indicated that their evaluation on a formal basis was not a high priority in their estimation.

Summary

In closing this chapter it can be said that the data gathered from the completed questionnaires and from the follow-up interviews were broad in scope and difficult, at times, to reduce to categories or classifications. Yet the information was quantified where necessary and appropriate

and the sum total of the information was presented in the preceding pages. The next chapter will analyze the data from a number of perspectives and will provide implications that have real value to the field of educational administration.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

The purpose of this study was to analyze the role and responsibilities of the central office administrator or supervisor who reported directly to the superintendent and had primary responsibility for providing instructional leadership at the elementary school level. The preceding chapter presented data gathered from two sources: (1) a questionnaire survey of thirty-three school districts that were representative of approximately 300 school districts in Cook, DuPage, Lake, and Will counties in Illinois, and (2) on-site interviews with six central office administrators who had completed the questionnaire and were willing to provide additional information relative to the subject under review.

The findings resulting from the questionnaire/interview method will be analyzed in this chapter in the following manner:

1. A profile is developed reflecting the educational background, previous work experience, and professional credentials of the administrators in the study to determine factors that are significant to the roles and responsibilities of the position under review in this study.

2. The organizational charts and written job descriptions of the central office administrators in the study are analyzed along with the data that were obtained both from the questionnaire and from the interviews. This information is compared and contrasted with the findings of the research of the literature to determine the type and amount of authority that is exerted by this position within the local educational organization. In addition, the analysis includes a review of potential correlations among job titles, duties, and line and staff authority.

3. The data retrieved from the completed questionnaires and from the interviews with specific regard to the duties and responsibilities of the central office instructional leader are compared and contrasted with the findings of the research of the literature. The focus is on determining the areas of responsibility that are recommended to be given high priority and the relationship that exists between these priorities and their application within the framework of the administrator's actual performance of his duties. The expectations of the superintendent for the central office administrator, as perceived by that administrator, are included in the analysis. Finally, the responsibilities of the central office administrator are analyzed to determine the relative amounts of time allocated and the importance attributed to administrative versus supervisory responsibilities.

4. The evaluation practices that are currently used to provide the central office administrator with the feedback necessary to augment his performance are reviewed in the light of the findings obtained from the questionnaires and the interviews as well as the recommendations elicited from the research of the literature.

5. The central office administrator's role as an instructional leader is analyzed according to the responses gained from the completed questionnaires and the interviews regarding the manner in which he interacts with the superintendent, the board of education, the certified staff, and the community. This analysis will include an investigation of the processes that he utilizes to bring about changes in the instructional program and to provide leadership in accordance with the recommendations provided in the research of the literature.

Profile of the Instructional Leader

In developing a demographic profile of the central office administrator responsible for providing instructional leadership at the elementary school level, a great number of observations were obtained that were consistent with what might be expected to be the norms for such a population. At the same time there were observed phenomena that appeared to deviate from these norms. Both the expected as well as the unexpected are reviewed in the paragraphs that follow.

The mean chronological age of the central office administrator in this study was determined from the questionnaires to be 46.4 years. Considering the fact that at least two or three years of teaching experience is a required prerequisite for administrative certification under most circumstances, it should be expected that the typical educational administrator begins his working career at about twenty-five years of age. Since the majority of administrators close out their years of service by their sixty-fifth birthday, the median age for that distribution can be quickly calculated to be forty-five years. Therefore, the administrators in this study who ranged between twenty-five and sixty-five years of age and had a mean age of 46.4 reflected the same range of chronological age and the same average age that is characteristic of the general population of educational administrators.

The consistency that was discovered to exist between central office instructional leaders and the general population of educational administrators relative to chronological age was not as readily apparent in their sex. The fact that one-third of the administrators in the study were female was an observation that must be considered to be significantly different from the 1979 state-by-state survey by the Project on Equal Educational Rights (PEER) that found "women make up just 13 percent of school administrators."[1] It has been

---

[1]"Few Women in Top School Administrative Jobs," News Exchange, November 1979, p. 8.

traditional in the educational community for both the principalship and the superintendency to be dominated by members of the male population. Therefore, the disproportionate amount of female administrators in this particular study would lead one to believe that the curriculum director's position at the elementary school level allows greater opportunities for women to exercise their talents in an administrative position.

The educational background of the central office administrators in the study was impressive: one-third of these persons had obtained a doctorate in education with the majority of their graduate course work directed toward the areas of administration and curriculum. More surprising was the fact that from among the entire group of thirty-three administrators who were specifically assigned responsibility for providing instructional leadership at the elementary school level there were only six who cited elementary education as their major area of training at the undergraduate level (more than twice that number had majored in the broad field of social science). Thus it would seem to indicate that there is no significant correlation between elementary education instructional leaders and elementary education majors. Also, the responses to the questionnaires indicated that a strong graduate program in administration was characteristic of the instructional leader at the district level.

The previous work experience of the educational

leaders in this study indicated that several years of teaching experience at the elementary or junior-high level was of paramount importance. Similarly, a close relationship existed between the individuals who currently held the position under review in this study and their previous experience as school principals at the elementary or junior-high level. Although this type of experience was not borne out through the interviews to be an absolute necessity to success at the central office level, the respondents did indicate that a thorough understanding of the principal's role and responsibilities was important to the success of the central office administrator for instruction. The review of the literature had clearly outlined the role of the principal as the instructional leader in his school, and it was generally agreed that such training at the building level could only augment the central office administrator's efforts to demonstrate instructional leadership at the district level.

Additional information that helped to complete the picture of the central office administrator for instruction included the finding that this person is almost always employed over a twelve-month contractual period and in most cases has been appointed to the position after having served that same school district in another capacity. Membership in professional organizations was strongly bent toward those state and national organizations that were established to

provide information within the fields of curriculum and instruction.

The implications of all of this demographic information can be reduced to a few concise statements. It might be helpful for the central office administrator responsible for providing instructional leadership at the elementary school level to have several years of teaching experience at the elementary (K-8) level prior to assuming any administrative position. Furthermore, experience as a school principal at the elementary level along with a strong educational background in administration and curriculum is characteristic of central office administrators for instruction who occupy that position. Finally, the position under review in this study is one which was indicated by the administrators in the sample to be a year-round job that is less encumbered by sex biases that are apparent in other dimensions of school administration.

Authority of the Instructional Leader

The lack of clarity that is oftentimes characteristic of the role and responsibilities of the instructional leader was traced to the inconsistencies that prevailed in the assignment of titles to this position. Specific references were made in the research of the literature to the findings of Babcock in 1965[2] and those of Tanner and Tanner in

---

[2]Chester D. Babcock, "The Emerging Role of the Curriculum Leader," in Role of Supervisor and Curriculum

1975.[3] Both of these sources highlighted the lack of agreement in the field with respect to the great number of titles that were popular during those times.

Data in this 1979 study do not indicate improvement. From among thirty-three administrators who were included in the study, there was a total of twenty-three different titles. As reported earlier, there were fourteen responses from curriculum directors, directors of instructional services, and curriculum coordinators. The other nineteen titles could be effectively categorized under the more general heading of assistant superintendent for instruction. A review of the written job descriptions that were obtained from the administrators yielded no apparent relationship between the duties described therein and the titles assigned to the various positions. Moreover, there was no significant correlation between the job title and the type of authority assigned to the position. This was determined through the use of the nonparametric test of significance: chi square.

Given the fact that there were fourteen "directors" and nineteen "assistant superintendents," these two groups were further subdivided into categories of "line" and "staff" authority for analysis purposes. Table 10 describes this

---

Director in a Climate of Change, 1965 Yearbook, ed. Robert R. Leeper (Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1965), p. 58.

[3] Daniel Tanner and Laurel N. Tanner, Curriculum Development (New York: Macmillan Co., 1975), p. 618.

relationship through the use of a 2 x 2 matrix. The calculations that are required of the chi-square tests are provided below the table.

TABLE 10

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TYPES OF AUTHORITY AND JOB TITLES OF ADMINISTRATORS

Job Title	Type of Authority		
	Line Authority	Staff Authority	No.
Assistant superintendent	14	5	19
Director	8	6	14
Total	22	11	33

$$\chi^2 = \frac{(|14-9.5|-0.5)^2}{9.5} + \frac{(|5-9.5|-0.5)^2}{9.5} + \frac{(|8-7|-0.5)^2}{7} + \frac{(|6-7|-0.5)^2}{7}$$

$$\chi^2 = 1.68 + 1.68 + .04 + .04$$

$$\chi^2 = 3.44$$

Since the χ^2 value of 3.44 is less than 3.84, the minimum value required for significance at the .05 level, we cannot reject the null hypothesis that there is no significant difference between the two types of job titles in their assignment of line or staff authority.

Regardless of the lack of statistical significance in job title when compared to line and staff authority, the data collected from the questionnaires and from the interviews were still important in light of the findings of the

research of the literature. For it was discovered that two-thirds of the respondents to the questionnaire had indicated that they were in a line position in their school district's organizational chart. Such a distribution of line and staff positions was in keeping with the evolving changes in authority that were described in the literature.

The earlier pieces of literature had strongly suggested that the central office administrator for instruction should hold a staff position within the organization in order to provide advice and counsel to principals and teachers. Knezevich described this condition when he said that "early assistant superintendents rarely had much authority and depended primarily on persuasion or the soundness of advice."[4] However, the more recent trend, according to the studies of Moll[5] and Pederson,[6] indicated a greater acceptance of the need for the instructional leader to be equipped with increased authority commensurate with his increased responsibilities.

In comparing these findings of the literature with the data from the questionnaires and the interviews, it

---

[4]Stephen J. Knezevich, Administration of Public Education, 2nd ed. (New York: Harper & Row, 1969), p. 258.

[5]Loren Allen Moll, "An Analysis of the Role of Curriculum Director" (doctoral dissertation, Colorado State College, 1965).

[6]Orville Joel Pederson, "The Role of the Director of Instruction as Perceived by Superintendents, Principals and Directors of Instructions" (doctoral dissertation, The University of Iowa, 1968).

would appear that the present state of affairs greatly reflects the changing trends described in the literature. An analysis of the administrators' preferences for line or staff authority further indicated that, while only one line administrator would opt for staff authority (given the opportunity), there were three staff administrators who would have preferred a change in authority to line status. This is significant considering the fact that 77 percent of the line administrators stated that they were satisfied with their authority compared with only 45 percent of the staff administrators who expressed such apparent satisfaction.

This state of affairs was strongly reinforced by the comments of the administrators who were interviewed after completing the questionnaire. The three line administrators who were interviewed expressed complete satisfaction with the authority ascribed to their position. At the same time, the three staff administrators were forthright in expressing their anxiety over the lack of authority inherent in their position. Each of these administrators strongly spoke out for the need to be more direct in their work with their principals.

In order to gain this desired relationship with the principals it was clear from the data retrieved from the questionnaires that the central office administrator would have more success if he were a line administrator rather than a staff administrator. For 95 percent of the line

administrators indicated in the questionnaire that the principals reported directly to the central office administrator on instructional matters while only 55 percent of the staff administrators had this authority. Additional "power over" the principals was reflected in the questionnaire results that indicated that 64 percent of the line administrators as compared to 36 percent of the staff administrators had an active role in the formal evaluation of the principals.

In summary, it can be said that, although there does not appear to be a significant correlation between the title of the central office administrator for instruction and his position of authority in the organizational framework of the school district, there is a significant amount of concern that surrounds the issue of authority. The administrators who responded to the questionnaire and those who were part of the interview process supported the concern that staff administrators lack clearly defined authority in the execution of their responsibilities. Moreover, the picture of the staff administrator as an advisor, consultant, or resource person to the principals was considered by the vast majority of the administrators in the study to be an outdated theoretical position. The implications of the findings are rather clear and support the position of Wiles that the leader must strive to "develop group power that will

enable the group to accomplish its goal."[7] However, the availability of "power over" the group's members to give direction to their efforts must be assigned to the person holding the position of central office administrator for instruction. The authority to exercise this "power over" is most apparent in the position of line administrator and is firmly based in the ability of the central office administrator to direct the principals on instructional matters and to participate in their performance evaluations. Therefore, it can be concluded that the traditional principle which holds that the central office administrator for instruction should be a staff administrator so he is free of the apparent burden of being a threat to principals and teachers is a concept that has undergone scrutiny in the field and apparently has lost some of its validity. For the administrators in those positions seem to be willing to sacrifice the apparent loss of an environment that is free from threat in order to gain the authority they need to be effective in their positions of instructional leadership.

Another implication that was garnered from the questionnaires and the follow-up interviews was directly related to the central office administrator's authority. The respondents to the questionnaire had indicated that "time"

---

[7]Kimball Wiles, Supervision for Better Schools, 2nd ed. (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1955), p. 161.

was the greatest obstacle to bringing about changes in the instructional program. In the light of this finding, more than one of the administrators who were interviewed made specific reference to the advantages a line administrator had in overcoming the obstacle of "time." Caution was advised against overusing the authority inherent in the line position to expedite changes. Yet the point was strongly emphasized that the ever-increasing demands that are made upon everyone's time must be met head-on by the leader who has the authority to give direction to the group so that changes can be actualized and benefits accorded to all.

Duties and Responsibilities of the Instructional Leader

In order to properly review the duties and responsibilities of the central office administrators in this study, it was important to determine whether or not these duties had been clearly identified in writing by the local school districts that employed these administrators. The need for these duties and responsibilities to be clearly defined in writing was strongly recommended by Freese in 1955. That recommendation was repeated again and again by researchers who have made similar investigations of this position since that time. Therefore, it was encouraging to find that twenty-nine of the thirty-three administrators in this study (88 percent) have written job descriptions for their positions. Evidently the evolution of the position of central

office administrator for instruction has brought with it some degree of specificity with respect to duties and responsibilities.

In reviewing the job descriptions of the administrators and their assignment of priority levels to their areas of responsibility (according to item 24 of the questionnaire), a priority ranking was determined and presented in Table 7. Also, the priority ranking of these areas of responsibility by the administrators' superintendents _as perceived by the administrators_ was reported in Table 8. The results indicated that the central office administrators had selected the same six areas for themselves and for their superintendents from among the twelve choices that were available. However, the rankings that were assigned to the areas were not the same for the two groups. It is noteworthy that these six areas are the same ones that were identified in the questionnaire survey that Freese conducted with administrators from throughout the United States twenty-four years earlier. These six areas of responsibility are identified below along with the ranks that were assigned by the administrators, their superintendents, and the administrators in the 1955 study by Freese. The calculations that were required to determine statistical correlations of ranked variables through the use of the Spearman r formula are provided below the table.

TABLE 11

PRIORITY LISTING OF INSTRUCTIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES ACCORDING TO CENTRAL OFFICE ADMINISTRATORS, THEIR SUPERINTENDENTS, AND THE ADMINISTRATORS IN THE 1955 STUDY BY FREESE

Area of Responsibility	Ranking		
	Adm. (A)	Supt. (B)	Freese (C)
Curriculum development	1	1	1
In-service training	2	2	3
Instructional materials	3	3	5
Supervision of instruction	4	6	2
Public relations	5	5	6
Educational personnel	6	4	4

$$r\ (AB) = 1 - \frac{6\Sigma D^2}{n(n^2-1)} = 1 - \frac{48}{210} = 1 - .23 = +.77$$

$$r\ (BC) = 1 - \frac{6\Sigma D^2}{n(n^2-1)} = 1 - \frac{132}{210} = 1 - .63 = +.37$$

$$r\ (AC) = 1 - \frac{6\Sigma D^2}{n(n^2-1)} = 1 - \frac{84}{210} = 1 - .40 = +.60$$

An analysis of these statistics yields a number of conclusions. The correlation of +.77 between the administrators' rankings of their responsibilities and the rankings of these areas of responsibility by their superintendents _as perceived by the administrators_ indicates that the central office administrators' instructional priorities are highly consistent with the instructional priorities of their superintendents, as they perceived them. Specifically, the top three choices (curriculum development, in-service training, and instructional materials) were rated identically by both groups. In fact, the only difference in the two sets of rankings was in the assignment of ranks to Supervision of Instruction and Educational Personnel.

The correlation of +.60 between the rankings assigned by central office administrators in this study in 1979 and those of administrators from throughout the country in 1955 is indicative of a high, positive correlation between these two groups. The choice of Curriculum Development as the most important area of responsibility gives real direction to efforts to analyze the responsibilities of the central office administrator for instruction. This consistency in priorities over three decades is significant for those who aspire to perform effectively in this role of instructional leader. The marked differences in rankings were limited to the areas of Instructional Materials, Supervision of Instruction, and Educational Personnel.

Given the fact that Instructional Materials is an area of responsibility that has grown increasingly more complex as we strive to utilize increased technology to meet the needs of the individual student, it may be easier to understand why this area was ranked higher (#3) by the administrators in this study than it was in 1955 (#5). Similarly, the term "supervision of instruction" has undergone a metamorphosis of its own during the past twenty or thirty years. The increased amount of scrutiny that is currently given to the supervisory process as a result of teacher negotiations may have influenced today's central office administrator to view this area as one in which the principal alone holds the majority of responsibility.

A comparison of the ratings attributed to the superintendents and those of the administrators in the study by Freese holds little significance for this study and will not be reviewed further at this time.

Additional data that were important for this study were provided earlier in Table 9 and described the manner in which the central office administrator allocated his time to those areas of responsibility that were reviewed above. In comparing this allocation of time with the previously identified priority rankings of the central office administrators, it can be ascertained whether the administrators were able to reflect their instructional priorities in their weekly schedules. This comparison is provided in Table 12 and

TABLE 12

PRIORITY LISTING OF INSTRUCTIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES OF CENTRAL OFFICE ADMINISTRATORS AS COMPARED TO THEIR APPLICATION OF TIME

Area of Responsibility	Ranking	
	Importance	Time
Curriculum development	1	1
In-service training	2	2
Instructional materials	3	4
Supervision of instruction	4	3
Public relations	5	7
Educational personnel	6	5
Educational testing	7	8
Educational research	8	9
Special education	9	6

$$r = 1 - \frac{6\sum D^2}{n(n^2-1)} = 1 - \frac{108}{720} = 1 - .15 = +.85$$

makes use of the Spearman r formula that was applied earlier.

The extremely high correlation between the identified priorities of the central office administrators and the practical allocation of their time to these duties must be interpreted to be a real commendation to the participants in this study. For there are many administrators both in education and outside the field of education who willingly confess that their work priorities are not often clearly reflected in their allocation of time to their daily or weekly schedule of work. The only areas in which there were marked differences were Public Relations and Special Education. Further analysis of these discrepancies may result in finding that the administration of special education programs within today's public school is a very time-consuming project that may well overshadow its relative importance within the total instructional program. The differences in the rankings for Public Relations has important implications for all administrators. The inconsistency between the expressed importance of public relations and the amount of time allocated to this responsibility may indicate that, although there is an important need for a sound program of public relations through which the community is made aware of the efforts of the elementary school district, there is not always sufficient time and effort dedicated to this responsibility on a regular basis by the school district's personnel.

In summarizing the findings of the questionnaire, the interviews, and the research of the literature, it would appear that there exists a general agreement with regard to the most important responsibilities of the central office administrator for instruction. However, the duties of this office continue to be rather broad in scope and require that the administrator demonstrate a wide range of talents. Moreover, the reoccurring lack of agreement upon terminology continues to interfere with attempts to systematize the field in order to bring about changes in a logical, rational manner. The terms "instructional supervisor," "curriculum worker," and "central office administrator for instruction" continue to be used interchangeably in the literature. Therefore, it is difficult properly to assess the duties and responsibilities of the position under review in this study from a purely administrative or supervisory point of view. The most important area according to the questionnaire, for example, was Curriculum Development. However, such a term has many different definitions even within the curriculum field. Zais, a recognized authority in the field of curriculum, states that "curriculum development is a term that most educationists use to broadly refer to all the processes of constructing and implementing curricula."[8] Zais goes on to provide definitions of "curriculum construction" and

---

[8]Robert S. Zais, _Curriculum: Principles and Foundations_ (New York: Harper & Row, 1976), p. 17.

"curriculum engineering" and relates these terms to "curriculum development."

It was because of overlapping definitions and lack of agreement among theorists as well as practitioners that one of the interview questions sought out a fuller description of the term "curriculum development" as it was implemented within the local elementary school district. The answers that were obtained from that question were reported in the previous chapter and reflected the traditional curriculum model of Tyler which he described in detail in his classic text, Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction.[9]

It was made clear from these examples that it might be helpful for the central office administrator or supervisor who has primary responsibility for providing instructional leadership at the elementary school level to include both experience and education in curriculum foundations. At the same time, the responsibility for in-service training, which was rated as the second most important area of responsibility, requires both skills as well as training in educational administration. One final example: "instructional materials" most certainly would be included in Wiles's definition of supervision as a service to teachers to help

---

[9]Ralph Tyler, Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1949).

them to do a better job.[10] However, the coordinating, purchasing, and distributing of these materials is a clear-cut administrative function.

The resolution of some of these distortions may be found in the research of the literature that included the suggestion of Sturges that the responsibility for the instructional program be divided and that the positions of administrative instructional supervisor and consultative instructional supervisor be created.

> Curriculum directors, assistant superintendents for instruction, school principals and department heads would be examples of administrative instructional supervisors. A second category of supervisory roles could be grouped under the title of consultative instructional supervisor, and would include the direct psychological and technical support to help teachers improve their performance in the classroom.[11] (Italics Lovell's.)

Regardless of the manner in which the responsibilities are apportioned, the implication is clear that the central office administrator will need to continue to demonstrate a broad range of talents in performing the duties that are typically assigned. Furthermore, he will be expected to direct the majority of time and talents to the instructional areas of curriculum development, in-service training, and instructional materials.

---

[10] Wiles, Supervision for Better Schools, p. 5.

[11] John T. Lovell, "Instructional Supervision: Emerging Perspective," in "The Roles and Responsibilities of Instructional Supervisors," ed. A. W. Sturges et al. (report from the ASCD Working Group on the Roles and Responsibilities of Instructional Supervisors, October 1978).

Evaluation of the Instructional Leader

During the interviews with the six administrators there were several occasions when the respondents made reference to their role in coordinating the evaluation of materials, programs, and instructional innovations. The importance of program evaluation was recognized and supported by all of the administrators who were interviewed. However, that advocacy of evaluation was not reflected in their responsibilities for evaluation of personnel within their districts. The majority of the administrators were not expected to evaluate anyone on a formal basis, and most of them admitted to not having evaluated anyone for several years. More importantly, the results of the questionnaire pointed directly to lack of evaluation practices as applied to the central office administrator himself. Specifically, one-third of the administrators reported that they never received a formal written evaluation of their own performance. The interviews provided even more data which indicated that the procedures currently used to evaluate the performance of the central office administrator lacked clarity and, in most cases, gave little direction to his efforts.

The continuing investigation into the evaluation practices that are currently utilized to assess the performance of the central office administrator for instruction produced additional insights into the manner in which the

evaluations were completed (in those districts which conducted such evaluations). The data from the questionnaire indicated that the majority of the administrators who received formal evaluations did so through the use of a "performance approach" that closely resembled what the literature called a "job targets approach." The use of a rating form for evaluation was very infrequent, according to the results of the questionnaire. The interviews included one of the two administrators who were evaluated with a rating form, and it was the opinion of this administrator that this technique was very subjective. Besides, this administrator pointed out that the form had been developed for principals and as a result lacked a certain amount of reliability in evaluating his performance as a central office administrator.

The involvement of certified staff members other than the superintendent in the evaluation of the central office administrator was most uncommon. Only four administrators in the study indicated that the principals and the teachers provided input into their evaluations. For the most part, the evaluation was strictly a product of the superintendent's individual appraisal of the administrator's performance.

In comparing the findings of the questionnaire and the interviews with the research of the literature, the following conclusions may be drawn. The demand for

accountability in the schools has not been fully implemented within the office of the central office administrator for instruction. The development and implementation of evaluation procedures for this administrator have lagged behind the characteristically slow-moving evaluation efforts of school administrators in general. The use of a job targets approach to evaluation has more value to the central office administrator since his performance by objectives is integrally related to the objectives that have been identified for the instructional program. The involvement of personnel other than the superintendent in the evaluation process has little value at this time unless the identified job targets involve other staff members to a great extent. Finally, the lack of commitment of the central office administrator relative to the importance of his own evaluation is an apparent contradiction to his espoused dedication to the evaluation process in general.

The implications that follow from the findings in this section are several. The lack of definition that has pervaded the role and responsibilities of the central office administrator for instruction has been directly reflected in the evaluation practices and procedures that are in use in elementary school districts today. The responsibility for the apparent delay in developing and implementing a sound evaluation procedure for evaluating the performance of the position under review in this study must rest to

some extent with the central office administrator for instruction. However, the larger share of this responsibility must be borne by the central office administrator's immediate supervisor, the superintendent of schools. Lastly, the need is apparent for additional research and development of adaptations in the more popular educational administrator evaluation models in order to insure the applicability of these models to the central office administrator for instruction.

Instructional Leadership

In the introduction of this paper the case was made for positive and productive leadership within education in general and specifically within the area of instruction. The point was made in that section and later developed in the research of the literature that both the elementary school superintendent and the elementary school principal are frustrated in their attempts to provide the necessary instructional leadership at that level. Therefore, the position of central office administrator for instruction was created to assume responsibility for providing a large share of the instructional leadership that is so desperately needed. The manner in which this administrator demonstrates the needed leadership, if in fact he does at all, was the central purpose for analyzing the role and responsibilities of the central office administrator or supervisor who reported directly to the superintendent and had primary

responsibility for providing instructional leadership at the elementary school level.

In this, the final section of this chapter, the role of the instructional leader, as outlined in the research of the literature, will be applied to the findings that were obtained through the questionnaires and follow-up interviews with administrators in the field. The analysis will include the manner in which this leader interacts with the superintendent, the board of education, certified staff, and the community as well as the way in which he acts as a change agent in bringing about improvements in the instructional program.

From among the several definitions of leadership that are provided in the literature, there were two selected for inclusion in the second chapter of this study. The definition provided by Boles and Davenport referred to the leader taking initiative to assist the group toward the realization of its goals. Hemphill spoke of the leader initiating a new structure for accomplishing the organization's goals. Throughout the literature there was a collection of thoughts that bore repetition and made recurring references to goal setting and to providing the means by which those goals were to be realized.

The educational perspective on leadership amplified these fundamental definitions by referring to the need "to help the people of the school community define their

educational goals and objectives"[12] and "to provide adequate resources for effective teaching."[13] Furthermore, "instructional leadership suggests that administrative and supervisory personnel have a professional obligation to develop a conceptual framework for the study of curriculum and its change."[14] Finally, the evaluation of the processes that are employed to "define goals," to "study curriculum," and to "provide resources" is the last of the seemingly essential ingredients in providing instructional leadership.

In summary, it can be said that the information provided by the research of the literature mandates the inclusion of four operations in order to provide a complete picture of instructional leadership. These include:

1. Assisting the school community in determining its educational goals.

2. Coordinating the efforts of the school community in an organized way to bring about the attainment of those goals.

3. Providing the materials and services required to maintain the group in its efforts to realize its goals.

4. Directing the evaluation of the processes and

---

[12]Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Leadership for Improving Instruction, 1960 Yearbook (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1960), p. 29.

[13]Ibid.

[14]Knezevich, Administration of Public Education, p. 379.

products utilized within the system.

It should be noted that the second of these four components implies the need for procedures to bring about changes in the instructional program that will ultimately contribute to the attainment of the organization's goals. For it was previously stated in the review of the literature that "the administrator must either leave change in his organization pretty much to chance or deliberately map out a strategy to foster change."[15] In the paragraphs that follow, the data obtained through the questionnaires and interviews will be integrated within the framework of the four-dimensional description of instructional leadership that was presented above. Emphasis will be given (1) to determining whether or not each of these four dimensions is reflected in the efforts of the central office administrators for instruction who were included in this study and (2) to studying the manner in which leadership was demonstrated.

The first of the four components, the goal-setting process, was apparent in almost all of the districts represented in the study. Each of the central office administrators for instruction played an important role in determining his district's educational aims as well as the more specific

---

[15]Robert G. Owens, Organizational Behavior in Schools (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1970), p. 161.

instructional objectives for the upcoming school year. The active participation by members of the board of education as duly elected representatives of the community provided the very important endorsement of goals that had been formulated by the district's administrative team. The involvement of representatives of the board, the administration, the certified staff, and some members of the community provided representation from all but one group: the students. The development of goals for the instructional program was the primary responsibility of the central office administrator for instruction; and, in the majority of cases, this administrator had developed long-range goals for the program that were published for review by the staff and community.

In order to provide assistance to the "school community" in the development of educational goals for the district, it is essential that the instructional leader maintain close communication with all members of that school community. The administrators who participated in the interviews explained their procedures for facilitating the exchange of information among themselves and the other members of their school systems. The results indicated that there was almost daily communication with the superintendent and the other members of the administrative team. The frequency of communication with the teaching staff and board of education was less and was dependent upon circumstances such as monthly board of education meetings or regular visits to

each of the schools during the school day. Little contact was reported with the community or the student body on a regular basis. An occasional visit to a class of students or a presentation to a parent group provided the majority of opportunities for communication with the children and their parents.

In conclusion, it appeared from the data that the central office administrator played a key role in the determination of educational goals for the school community. Moreover, it was apparent that there was excellent communication within the "inner circle" of the district administrators. However, there was a gradual reduction in the flow of communication as the information passed through the board of education and the teaching staff to the community and students. The lack of contact with the students and their absence from the goal-setting process appeared as the only apparent flaw in the system.

The use of the term "curriculum development" was reviewed with each of the six administrators who had been interviewed. Their explanation of the use of teachers and administrators to serve on various curriculum committees for the purpose of reviewing and upgrading aspects of the instructional program within the confines of the district's yearly goal statements provided a clear description to the overall curriculum development process. The coordination of the curriculum development process with the school district's

annual budget demonstrated a financial commitment to the process. Appropriations of monies to various funds in that budget for the purpose of "research and development" provided additional evidence to support the validity of the coordinated efforts of the certified staff. The fact that only four administrators in the study (12 percent) included parents within the curriculum development process and the conspicuous absence of any students did expose an interruption in the normal flow of communication and cooperation. Such an observation supports the concerns expressed by Della-Dora: "Most administrators believe in involving teachers, parents, and perhaps even students in educational issues. But after this period of involvement, an administrator will tend to say 'I am the one who has to decide.'"[16]

The curriculum development process in some of the school districts incorporated within itself a written procedure for bringing about changes in the instructional program. However, the majority of the administrators indicated that no such formal procedures existed but, rather, administrators responded to concerns of the staff and community whenever they arose. Babcock cautioned against the lack of clearly defined "channels" for change.

> Provision must be made in any organizational structure for the initiation of change by any group--teachers,

---

[16] Delmo Della-Dora, "Democracy and Education: Who Owns the Curriculum?" Educational Leadership 34 (October 1976): 52.

> principals, central office administrative and/or supervisory staff, the curriculum decision-making body or groups within the community . . . . The important thing is that the channels through which curriculum proposals pass be clearly defined.[17]

In summing up the efforts of the central office administrator in providing leadership in coordinating the efforts of the school community, it must be said that each administrator had been instrumental in the development of a districtwide process for upgrading the curriculum. The level of sophistication of that process varied from district to district but, in general, reflected a strong commitment on the part of the staff to the system. The lack of parent as well as student involvement in the process must be registered as a concern. Furthermore, the failure to provide a more definite procedure for handling suggested changes in the program is a liability that is most unnecessary.

The third dimension of the instructional leadership description provided earlier in this section made reference to the need for the leader to provide materials and services that may be required by the group to realize its goals. The administrators indicated in the questionnaire that this was a high-priority item (#3), and this finding was further substantiated in the follow-up interviews. It was determined that the central office administrator for instruction had

---

[17] Babcock, "Emerging Role of the Curriculum Leader," p. 58.

primary responsibility for the authorization of purchases of most instructional materials and that substantial budgetary responsibilities were delegated by the superintendent to this administrator for curriculum materials. In general, the central office administrator was aware of and made recommendations for the purchase of most of the materials that were used by teachers in classrooms throughout the district.

The final component of instructional leadership refers directly to evaluation practices for products and processes in the instructional program. The information that was obtained from the questionnaires and interviews indicated that the typical central office administrator for instruction was deeply involved in the evaluation of the district's educational goals as well as the instructional program goals. In addition, he orchestrated the evaluation of programs that were to be reviewed by the staff and recommended for adoption by the board of education. On the other hand, this administrator played no significant role in the formal evaluation of the certified staff. Therefore, it can be said that the central office administrators in this study had a deep sense of involvement in the evaluation of "products" and "programs"; a lesser involvement in evaluation of "processes"; and little or no involvement in the formal evaluation of personnel.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The focus of this study was on analyzing the role and responsibilities of the central office administrator or supervisor who reported directly to the superintendent and had primary responsibility for providing instructional leadership at the elementary school level. Elementary school districts in Cook, DuPage, Lake, and Will counties in Illinois in which there was one, and only one, administrator or supervisor responsible for the instructional program of the district were the population of the study. The directories that are published by each of the four county offices of the superintendent of schools were reviewed to determine which of the 300 elementary school districts in the four-county area listed such a position among their central office staff. Fifty-two school districts were identified (thirty from Cook County, eight from DuPage County, ten from Lake County, and four from Will County).

A questionnaire containing thirty-nine questions was sent to each of the fifty-two school districts in the sample. The initial return of thirty completed questionnaires was

followed by a second request that elicited the return of nine additional questionnaires. Six of the thirty-nine completed questionnaires were eliminated from further consideration when it was learned that the individuals who completed the survey were not the only administrative officers (other than the superintendent) responsible for the instructional functions at all grade levels and who devoted the major portion of their time to such functions. In most cases, the individual was assuming additional responsibilities (for example, principal) that might interfere with the acquisition of information about the particular position under review in this study.

The preceding chapter included a summary and an analysis of the data that had been collected from the thirty-three completed questionnaires and six on-site interviews that had been conducted with central office administrators who had previously completed the questionnaire and were willing to provide additional information to verify the findings of the questionnaire. The findings of this study were analyzed in the following manner:

1. The educational background, previous work experience, and professional credentials of the administrators in this study were analyzed to determine common factors that were significant to the roles and responsibilities of the position under review.

2. The organizational chart and job description of

each administrator was analyzed along with the data from the questionnaires and the interviews to determine the types and amount of authority assigned to each administrator's position. This information was reviewed to determine if there was any significant correlation among job title, duties, and line/staff authority.

3. Data retrieved from the completed questionnaires were analyzed to determine the relative amounts of time allocated and the importance attributed to administrative and/or supervisory responsibilities (as indicated by the administrators in the sample). In addition, a comparative analysis was made among the priorities of the administrator, the perceived priorities of his superintendent, and those of administrators from previous studies.

4. The administrator's role as an instructional leader was analyzed according to the response gained from the completed questionnaires regarding his relationship to his superintendent and board of education and the certified teaching staff.

5. The completed questionnaires were reviewed to determine policies and procedures currently used to evaluate the performance of instructional leaders.

6. The findings gained through the analysis of the data from the questionnaire and from the interviews were compared to the findings of the research of the literature in Chapter II.

Conclusions

This study led to conclusions relating to the specific purposes as stated in the first chapter.

1. The central office administrators in this study who had responsibility for providing instructional leadership at the elementary level had experiential backgrounds that included experience as teachers and as administrators at the elementary level and educational backgrounds that were firmly based in administration and curriculum.

Although there was only a small proportion of central office administrators in the study who evidenced undergraduate backgrounds in elementary education, an overwhelming number of the administrators had experience as teachers at the K-8 level. In addition, the majority of the administrators in the study had been elementary or junior-high school principals prior to assuming their positions as central office administrators for instruction. Most of these administrators had served that same school district for several years prior to their current assignment.

There was a large number of administrators who held doctorates in education and the strongest concentration of course work was reported to be in the areas of administration and curriculum rather than supervision, special education, guidance, or related areas. Based on this information it would seem that the typical or the most popular route to the position of central office administrator for instruction

is through graduate course work in administration that eventually leads to an administrative position as an elementary or junior-high principal. From that position the administrator may then be reassigned within that district to a central office position of instructional leadership.

2. The position of central office administrator for instruction is one which should have line authority over the teachers and principals in the district.

The lack of statistical significance between the title that the administrator holds and the type of authority that is assigned to the position did not overshadow the importance that the administrators ascribed to the authority question. The overwhelming demand on the part of the administrators was for their position to be in a line relationship with the principals and teachers in the district. This point of view was shared by both line and staff administrators who cited the need for clearly defined authority commensurate with the responsibility that they held as instructional leaders for their elementary school districts. Moreover, it was the belief of the administrators that the principals should report to the central office administrator for instruction and that this administrator should have input into the formal evaluation of the principals' performance.

The findings gathered from the questionnaire and from the on-site interviews verified the research of the

literature. That is, those authorities who have contributed significantly to the development of theory within the field of education administration reported that the position under review in this study is one that has undergone substantial changes during the past fifty years. Several citations were included in Chapter II that supported the evolutionary change of the central office administrator from one of advisor and resource person to one of planner, director, and manager. The need for authority over principals and teachers to expedite changes in the instructional program was advocated by the administrators in the study and confirmed the findings of the literature.

3. The most important responsibilities of the central office administrator for instruction are curriculum development and in-service training.

A number of strategies were employed to determine the distribution of responsibility that is characteristic of the central office administrator who is responsible for providing instructional leadership at the elementary level. Prior to the initiation of any investigation into the expectations that are made of the administrative position under review in this study, the literature was reviewed to determine the recommendations of previous researchers. That review yielded a wealth of information about the duties and responsibilities of the instructional leader. There were several studies that did a particularly fine job of defining

the job expectations characteristic of this position. However, the changes that have occurred in modern education seemed to mandate a more current review of these identified responsibilities as they apply to the administrator about to embark upon the 1980s.

It was with this information as a background that administrators were asked to (1) prioritize their responsibilities, (2) prioritize their responsibilities as they perceived their superintendents would, and (3) provide a breakdown of how they allocated their time to these responsibilities. The data were analyzed to determine significant levels of correlation between each set of figures. In addition, a correlation was calculated between the priority rankings of the administrators in this study and those of a similar study completed in 1955. Each of these calculations yielded positive results that indicated that there was a high degree of consistency between the priority rankings of the administrators and those of their superintendents (as perceived by the administrators). Also, these rankings were found to be very similar to those obtained in the 1955 study reported in Chapter II. Finally, the administrators' allocation of time to their duties was highly correlated with their own priority rankings of those responsibilities.

The specific findings of these investigations and the corresponding analysis of that data yielded the following conclusion: curriculum development and in-service

training were ranked as the first and second most important responsibilities of the central office administrator for instruction. This finding was initially reported in the research study completed in 1955 and was reaffirmed in the data gained from the questionnaires and interviews in this study.

4. Central office administrators for instruction are handicapped by the lack of time available to themselves and to their teachers in their efforts to bring about improvements in the instructional program.

In reviewing the techniques and strategies that the central office administrator for instruction uses to bring about changes in the instructional program, it was discovered that there was a wide variety of ways that such improvements were realized. The use of teacher committees that reviewed specific aspects of the curriculum was found to be popular along with the practice of having a standing curriculum council at the district level which included teachers, administrators, and parents. In some instances there are written procedures for implementing changes in the instructional program. However, there seemed to be no single strategy that was common to the majority of administrators in this study.

Closely related to the review of the practices that are currently utilized to bring about changes in the program was the concern over the obstacles to change that are

apparent to those who hold the position of central office administrator for instruction. The questionnaires indicated that "time" was the most frequently mentioned obstacle to change. The on-site interviews confirmed that finding and added an additional perspective to that point: that is, the administrators explained that not only was _their_ professional time limited but also the time that their teachers were free to actively assist in the pursuit of program improvements. Therefore, it was the belief of those who were part of the study that additional time had to be provided to the staff in order to allow them the flexibility necessary to direct a concerted effort toward changes in curriculum content as well as toward the improvement of teachers' instructional competencies.

5. _The formal evaluation of central office administrators for instruction is poorly developed and inadequately administered in most elementary school districts_.

The fact that one-third of the administrators indicated that they never received a formal written evaluation of their performance provided sufficient evidence to suspect the overall quality of the evaluation of administrators at the elementary level. Additional information gathered through the on-site interviews indicated that the evaluation process lacked clarity and definition. In most cases there were no clearly defined performance objectives that could provide guidance and direction to the central office

administrator. Moreover, the evaluation process was not necessarily correlated to the salary increases that were provided to that administrator. Most importantly, there was a lack of commitment on the part of many of the administrators who were interviewed to the importance of the evaluation process. This may indeed be the underlying reason for the lack of development of the performance evaluation of the central office administrator. Yet, the primary responsibility for this lack of development in the evaluation process must rest squarely on the shoulders of the superintendent of schools.

6. _The use of the job targets approach was highly recommended for the performance evaluation of central office administrators for instruction_.

The research of the literature indicated that there were two types of evaluation commonly used for appraising the performance of educational administrators. Despite the wide gaps that were discovered in the practices that were used with the administrators in this study, there was a widespread preference for one of the two types of evaluation: the job targets approach was much more popular with the central office administrators than the performance standards approach that was used by only two administrators in the study. It was felt that the goals that were established for the instructional program should be closely related to the performance objectives of the central office administrator

who has major responsibility for that program. In addition to determining the type of evaluation that was important to the central office administrator, it was also found that in most cases the superintendent had the major share of responsibility for providing the data and the analysis of that data that resulted in the administrator's formal evaluation. In a few cases the board of education contributed to the evaluation process, but there was little input on a formal basis from staff members or community members.

7. The central office administrator under review in this study is, in fact, providing instructional leadership at the elementary school level through (a) goal setting, (b) coordinating the efforts of those within the system, (c) providing materials and services, and (d) directing the evaluation of processes and products that are used in the system.

A significant portion of the review of the literature in Chapter II was dedicated to the development of a working definition of instructional leadership at the elementary school level. That picture mandated the presence of four operations or responsibilities in order to provide a complete and comprehensive model for instructional leadership. These four operations were described in Chapter IV as follows:

a) Assisting the school community in determining its educational goals.

b) Coordinating the efforts of the school community in an organized way to bring about the attainment of those goals.

c) Providing the materials and services required to maintain the group in its efforts to realize its goals.

d) Directing the evaluation of the processes and products utilized within the system.

After identifying the component parts of the instructional leadership, the data from the questionnaires and the interviews were analyzed to determine the extent to which any or all of these responsibilities were being assumed by the central office administrator for instruction. That analysis yielded the following results:

a) The findings indicated that the administrator under review in this study performed a valuable role in maintaining close communication with all members of the school community. As a result, the process of determining goals for the instructional program was greatly facilitated and in most cases led to the definition of goals that gave real direction to the efforts of the staff.

b) The fact that curriculum development was ranked as the most important responsibility for the central office administrator for instruction was more fully developed during the on-site interviews and yielded a complete picture

of the manner in which this duty was performed. The findings indicated that the central office administrator orchestrated the efforts of teachers and administrators in striving toward the actual realization of the goals and objectives that had been previously identified for the instructional program.

c) In order to provide leadership it was determined in the research of the literature that the leader must provide the means necessary to realize the group's objectives. In the elementary school setting this concept was recognized by the central office administrator providing supplies, materials, equipment, and services that teachers and administrators needed to respond to the instructional needs of the students. Responsibility for the selection, purchasing, and distribution of instructional materials and equipment rested primarily with the central office administrator for instruction.

d) Although the central office administrator had little responsibility for the formal evaluation of personnel, it was his responsibility to direct the evaluation of the instructional goals as well as the products and processes used to attain those goals. These responsibilities were linked directly to the three previously identified components of instructional leadership. They also served as the basis for reviewing the entire curriculum development process and for bringing about changes in the operation of

the system.

Recommendations

As a result of this study, several recommendations are presented to central office administrators who report directly to the superintendent and have primary responsibility for providing instructional leadership at the elementary school level. These recommendations may also be helpful to superintendents and boards of education.

1. The central office administrator for instruction should have experience at the elementary level as a teacher and as a principal.

2. The educational background of the central office administrator for instruction should reflect a strong orientation toward curriculum foundations.

3. The central office administrator for instruction should be in a line relationship with the principals and teachers in the district.

4. There should be a written job description for the central office administrator for instruction and that description should include performance objectives that relate specifically to curriculum development and in-service training.

5. Care should be taken to monitor the excessive amount of time that the central office administrator for instruction may be required to give to the administration of special education programs.

6. There should be a written formal evaluation of the central office administrator for instruction in order to give direction to his duties and responsibilities.

7. The central office administrator for instruction should play a key role in the development of the district's instructional goals by maintaining close communication with all members of the school community.

8. There should be a well-defined procedure in writing for the ongoing development of the instructional program.

9. Students and parents need to be given a more vital role in the goal-setting process as well as the curriculum development process.

10. The central office administrator for instruction should be authorized to monitor closely the selection and purchase of instructional materials by playing a part in the standard purchasing practices of the district.

11. The central office administrator for instruction should supervise the evaluation of the program and the products and processes that are a part of that program.

In addition to the recommendations for the central office administrator for instruction, for the superintendent, and for the board of education there are recommendations to researchers for further study:

1. Researchers should investigate more thoroughly the relationship that this position may have to the normal

distribution of males and females in administrative positions in education.

2. A study should be undertaken to analyze the practices used in elementary schools to bring about changes in the instructional program and the roles played by the superintendent, principals, and central office administrator for instruction.

3. From the perspective of the superintendent and the board of education, a study should be made of the duties and responsibilities that the central office administrator should assume in order of priority.

4. Researchers should examine the role that students and parents play in determining goals and in the curriculum development process at the elementary and secondary levels of education.

5. A study should be conducted for the purpose of reconciling the conflict that is apparent in the field with respect to the title that the central office administrator for instruction should hold within the educational organization.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books/Pamphlets

American Association of School Administrators. Profiles of the Administrative Team. Washington, D.C.: American Association of School Administrators, 1971.

Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Leadership for Improving Instruction. 1960 Yearbook. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1960.

________. Role of Supervisor and Curriculum Director in a Climate of Change. 1965 Yearbook. Edited by Robert R. Leeper. Washington, D.C.: ASCD, 1965.

Babcock, Chester D. "The Emerging Role of the Curriculum Leader." In Role of Supervisor and Curriculum Director in a Climate of Change. 1965 Yearbook. Edited by Robert R. Leeper. Washington, D.C.: ASCD, 1965.

Barr, Arvil S. "An Analysis of the Duties and Functions of Instructional Supervisors: A Study of the Detroit Supervisory Program." In Bureau of Educational Research Bulletin No. 7. Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1926.

Barraclough, Terry. Evaluation of School Administrators. NAESP School Leadership Digest Series, no. 5. Arlington, Va.: National Association of Elementary School Principals, 1974.

Bavelas, Alex. "Leadership: Man and Functions." In School Administration: Selected Readings. Edited by Sherman H. Frey and Keith R. Getschman. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1968.

Bentzen, Mary M., and Tye, Kenneth A. "Effecting Change in Elementary Schools." In The Elementary School in the United States, Seventy-second Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Edited by John I. Goodlad and Harold G. Shane. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1973.

Blake, Robert R., and Mouton, Jane Srygley. The Managerial Grid: Key Orientations for Achieving Production through People. Houston, Tex.: Gulf Publishing Co., 1964.

Boles, Harold W., and Davenport, James A. Introduction to Educational Leadership. New York: Harper & Row, 1975.

Campbell, Roald. "Administrative Concepts Applied to Elementary Principalship." In School Administration: Selected Readings. Edited by Sherman H. Frey and Keith R. Getschman. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1968.

Campbell, Roald F.; Corbally, John E., Jr.; and Ramseyer, John. Introduction to Educational Administration. 2nd ed. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1962.

Campbell, Roald F.; Corbally, John E., Jr.; and Ramseyer, John. Introduction to Educational Administration. 3rd ed. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1966.

Campbell, Roald F., and Gregg, Russell T., eds. Administrative Behavior in Education. New York: Harper & Bros., 1957.

Carver, Fred D., and Sergiovanni, Thomas J., eds. Organizations and Human Behavior. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1969.

Culbertson, Jack; Farquhar, Robin H.; Gaynor, Alan K.; et al. Preparing Educational Leaders for the Seventies. Columbus, O.: University Council for Educational Administration, 1969.

Cunningham, Luvern L.; Hack, Walter G.; and Nystrand, Ralph O., eds. Educational Administration: The Developing Decades. Berkeley, Cal.: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1977.

Ellena, William J., ed. Curriculum Handbook for School Executives. Arlington, Va.: American Association of School Administrators, 1973.

Evaluating Administrative Performance. Education Research Service report. Washington, D.C.: Educational Research Service, 1974.

Frey, Sherman H., and Getschman, Keith R., eds. School Administration: Selected Readings. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1968.

Gaynor, Alan K. "The Study of Change in Educational Organizations." In Educational Administration. Edited by Luvern L. Cunningham, Walter G. Hack, and Ralph O. Nystrand. Berkeley, Cal.: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1977.

Gibb, Cecel A. "Leadership." In Handbook of Social Psychology. Edited by Gardner Lindzey. Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1954.

Goodlad, John I., and Shane, Harold G., eds. The Elementary School in the United States, Seventy-second Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1973.

Greene, Robert E. Administrative Appraisal: A Step to Improved Leadership. Report by the National Association of Secondary School Principals. Washington, D.C.: NASSP, 1972.

Griffiths, Daniel E. "Administrative Theory and Change in Organizations." In Organizations and Human Behavior. Edited by Fred D. Carver and Thomas J. Sergiovanni. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1969.

________, ed. Behavioral Science and Educational Administration, Sixty-third Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, pt. 2. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964.

Halpin, Andrew W. The Leadership Behavior of School Superintendents. Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1959.

________. Theory and Research in Administration. New York: Macmillan Co., 1966.

________, ed. Administrative Theory in Education. Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1958.

Hemphill, John K. "Administration as Problem Solving." In Administrative Theory in Education. Edited by Andrew W. Halpin. Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, University of Chicago, 1958.

________. Situational Factors in Leadership. Columbus: Ohio State University, 1949.

Hemphill, John K., and Coons, Alvin E. "Development of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire." In Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement. Edited by Ralph M. Stogdill and Alvin E. Coons. Columbus: Ohio State University, 1957.

Herzberg, Frederick. Work and the Nature of Man. Cleveland, O.: World Press, 1966.

Issac, Stephen. Handbook in Research and Evaluation. San Diego: Robert R. Knapp, 1971.

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

Knezevich, Stephen J. Administration of Public Education. 2nd ed. New York: Harper & Row, 1969.

________, ed. The American School Superintendent: An AASA Research Study. Washington, D.C.: American Association of School Administrators, 1971.

Leeper, Robert R., ed. Role of Supervisor and Curriculum Director in a Climate of Change. 1965 Yearbook. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1965.

Lindzey, Gardner, ed. Handbook of Social Psychology. Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1954.

Lipham, James M. "Dynamics of the Principalship." In School Administration: Selected Readings. Edited by Sherman H. Frey and Keith R. Getschman. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1968.

________. "Leadership and Administration." In Behavioral Science and Educational Administration, Sixty-third Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, pt. 2. Edited by Daniel E. Griffiths. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964.

Lucio, William H., and McNeil, John D. Supervision: A Synthesis of Thoughts and Action. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.

McGregor, Douglas. The Human Side of Enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1960.

Marks, James R.; Stoops, Emery; and King-Stoops, Joyce. Handbook of Educational Supervision. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1971.

Maslow, Abraham H. Toward a Psychology of Being. Princeton, N.J.: Van Nostrand, 1968.

Miles, Matthew B. "Planned Change and Organizational Health: Figure and Ground." In Organizations and Human Behavior. Edited by Fred D. Carver and Thomas J. Sergiovanni. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1969.

Morphet, Edgar L.; Johns, Roe L.; and Reller, Theodore L. Educational Organization and Administration. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1966.

Otto, Henry J. Elementary School Organization and Administration. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1954.

Owens, Robert G. Organizational Behavior in Schools. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1970.

Parson, Talcott. Structure and Process in Modern Societies. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1960.

Pierce, Truman M., and Merrill, E. C., Jr. "The Individual and Administrative Behavior." In Administrative Behavior in Education. Edited by Roald F. Campbell and Russell T. Gregg. New York: Harper & Bros., 1957.

Selznick, Philip. Leadership in Administration. New York: Harper & Row, 1957.

Shartle, Carroll L. Executive Performance and Leadership. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1956.

Simon, Herbert. Administrative Behavior. 2nd ed. New York: Macmillan Co., 1957.

Stogdill, Ralph M., and Coons, Alvin E., eds. Leader Behavior: Its Description and Measurement. Columbus: Ohio State University, 1957.

Stoops, Emery, and Rafferty, M. L., Jr. Practices and Trends in School Administration. New York: Ginn & Co., 1961.

Stoops, Emery; Rafferty, Max; and Johnson, Russel E. Handbook of Educational Administration. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1975.

Tanner, Daniel, and Tanner, Laurel N. Curriculum Development. New York: Macmillan Co., 1975.

Thompson, Victor A. Modern Organization. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1961.

Tyler, Ralph. Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1949.

Van Dalen, Deobold B. Understanding Educational Research. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973.

Watson, Bernard C. "Issues Confronting Educational Administrators, 1954-1974." In Educational Administration: The Developing Decades. Edited by Luvern L. Cunningham, Walter G. Hack, and Ralph O. Nystrand. Berkeley, Cal.: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1977.

Weber, C. A., and Weber, Mary E. Fundamentals of Educational Leadership. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1955.

Weber, Max. The Theory of Social and Economic Organizations. Edited by Talcott Parson. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press & Falcon Wingo Press, 1947.

Wiles, Kimball. Supervision for Better Schools. 2nd ed. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1955.

Zais, Robert S. Curriculum: Principals and Foundations. New York: Harper & Row, 1976.

Periodicals

The ASCD Working Group on Supervisory Practices. "Issues in Supervisor Roles: What Do Practitioners Say?" Educational Leadership 34 (December 1976): 217-20.

Barraclough, Terry. "Administrator Evaluation." Educational Management Review Series 15 (April 1973): 3-4.

Bavelas, Alex. "Leadership Theory and Administrative Behavior." Administrative Science Quarterly, March 1960, pp. 491-96.

Bierstadt, Robert. "An Analysis of Social Power." American Sociological Review 15 (December 1950): 730.

Cunningham, Luvern L. "Educational Leadership: The Curious Blend." Educational Leadership 33 (February 1976): 323-26.

Della-Dora, Delmo. "Democracy and Education: Who Owns the Curriculum?" Educational Leadership 34 (October 1976): 51-59.

Doll, Ronald C.; Shafer, Harold T.; Christie, Sarah; and Salsbury, Jerome C. "What Are the Duties of the Curriculum Director?" Educational Leadership 15 (April 1958): 429-30.

Erickson, Donald A. "Changes in the Principalship." The National Elementary Principal 44 (April 1965): 16-20.

"Few Women in Top School Administrative Jobs." News Exchange, November 1979, p. 8.

Firth, Gerald R. "Theories of Leadership: Where Do We Stand?" Educational Leadership 33 (February 1976): 327-31.

Getzels, J. W., and Guba, E. G. "Social Behavior and the Administrative Process." School Review 65 (Winter 1957): 426.

Halpin, Andrew W. "The Superintendent's Effectiveness as a Leader." Administrator's Notebook 7 (October 1958): 1-4.

Harris, Ben M. "Supervisor Competence and Strategies for Improving Instruction." Educational Leadership 33 (February 1976): 332-35.

Holcomb, John H. "Superintendents Should Push Programs--Not Paperwork." The American School Board Journal 166 (June 1979): 34.

Lewin, Kurt; Lippitt, Ronald; and White, Ralph K. "Patterns of Aggressive Behavior in Experimentally Created Social Climates." Journal of Social Psychology 10 (1939): 271-99.

Moser, Robert P. "The Leadership Patterns of School Superintendents and School Principals." Administrator's Notebook 6 (September 1957): 1-4.

Poliakoff, Lorraine. "Recent Trends in Evaluating School Personnel." National Elementary School Principal 52 (February 1973): 39-44.

Stogdill, Ralph M. "Personal Factors Associated with Leadership: A Survey of the Literature." Journal of Psychology 15 (January 1948): 35-71.

Thompson, Victor A. "Bureaucracy and Innovation." Administrative Science Quarterly 10 (June 1965): 7.

Unruh, Glenys G. "New Essentials for Curriculum Leadership." Educational Leadership 33 (May 1976): 577-82.

Unpublished Materials

Carlson, Darwin G. "A Case Study of Central Office Personnel with Designated Responsibility for Curriculum-Instruction in Four Selected School Systems." Doctoral dissertation, State University of New York at Buffalo, 1967.

Carman, Beatrice D. "Roles and Responsibilities in General Supervision of Instruction: A Synthesis of Research Findings." Doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, 1970.

Christiansen, Marvin, and Turner, Harold. "The Roles and Preparation of Instructional Supervisors." In "Certificating the Curriculum Leader and the Instructional Supervisor." Edited by Allen W. Sturges. Report from the ASCD Working Group on the Role, Preparation and Certification of Curriculum Leader and Supervisor, 1977.

Davis, Carmen B. "Roles and Responsibilities in General Supervision of Instruction." Doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, 1970.

Freese, Theron. "A Study of the Position of Assistant Superintendent in Charge of Instruction: Its History, Status, and Functions." Doctoral dissertation, University of Southern California, 1955.

Fry, Terry L. "An Analysis of the Role of Curriculum Director in Selected Illinois Schools." Doctoral dissertation, Illinois State University, 1976.

Lovell, John T. "Instructional Supervision: Emerging Perspective." In "The Roles and Responsibilities of Instructional Supervisors." Edited by A. W. Sturges, R. J. Krajewski, J. T. Lovell, E. McNeill, and M. S. Ness. Report from the ASCD Working Group on the Roles and Responsibilities of Instructional Supervisors, October 1978.

Moll, Loren Allen. "An Analysis of the Role of Curriculum Director." Doctoral dissertation, Colorado State College, 1965.

"New York City Conference Report." Formulated at the meeting of the ASCD Committee on the Professionalization of Supervisors and Curriculum Workers, New York City, January 1964.

Pederson, Orville Joel. "The Role of the Director of Instruction as Perceived by Superintendents, Principals and Directors of Instructions." Doctoral dissertation, The University of Iowa, 1968.

Puckett, Daniel W. "The Status and Function of the General School Supervisor in Selected Arkansas Schools." Doctoral dissertation, University of Arkansas, 1962.

Schramm, William George. "Formal Evaluation of Administrators in the Six County Metropolitan Detroit Area." Doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University, 1976.

Sturges, A. W., ed. "Certificating the Curriculum Leader and the Instructional Supervisor." Report from the ASCD Working Group on the Role, Preparation and Certification of Curriculum Leader and Supervisor, 1977.

Sturges, A. W.; Krajewski, R. J.; Lovell, J. T.; McNeill, E.; and Ness, M.S., eds. "The Roles and Responsibilities of Instructional Supervisors." Report from the ASCD Working Group on the Roles and Responsibilities of Instructional Supervisors, October 1978.

APPENDIX A

LETTER TO CURRICULUM DIRECTORS

APPENDIX A

Dear

I am presently conducting a study of the role and responsibilities of the instructional leader at the elementary school level. This study is being conducted with the support of and under the direction of Dr. Max Bailey of Loyola University.

The basis for your selection was determined from records that indicate that you are the one and only central office administrator in your school district who has responsibility for the instructional program and who reports directly to the superintendent.

I would appreciate it very much if you would complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it in the self-addressed stamped envelope. If possible please include a copy of your job description and the organizational chart of your school district. A follow-up interview will be conducted with a number of administrators such as yourself to discuss the implications of the findings that result from the completed questionnaires.

All districts participating in this study will remain anonymous. Your choosing to participate in this study will be greatly appreciated. As a doctoral candidate at Loyola University I will appreciate every consideration in the matter.

Sincerely,

William Loftus

WL/jk

APPENDIX B

INTERVIEW INSTRUMENT: GUIDE FOR INTERVIEWS WITH CURRICULUM DIRECTORS

APPENDIX B

1. The survey seemed to indicate that the central office administrator for instruction should have an administrative background (especially as a principal) with a strong curriculum orientation. Would you agree? Why?

2. What is your interpretation of a "line" position v. a "staff" position?

3. Give an example of how your status (line or staff) has been more effective in providing instructional leadership than if you had been a line/staff administrator?

4. Who do you evaluate (formally) on a regular basis?

5. Do you have the authority that is necessary to perform your responsibilities in an effective manner? If yes, give examples of the authority; if no, how are you restricted?

6. Curriculum development was indicated to be the top priority of the central office administrator and his superintendent (according to the survey). What does the term "curriculum development" mean in your district?

7. Are there yearly goals for the district and/or the instructional program of the district?

8. Are there long-range goals for program improvement?

9. How are any of these goals determined and who is involved in the process: the board of education? the superintendent? parents? teachers? principals? students?

10. How are these goals measured?

11. What role do you play in the goal-setting process or in the evaluation process?

12. How are changes instituted in the instructional program? Is there a procedure that is outlined in writing? What is your role?

13. Is there a written procedure for adopting a new program or textbook series?

14. How is curriculum development related to the annual budget in your school district?

15. Is there an amount of money specified for "research and development"?

16. In-service training was ranked second in the questionnaire. How is in-service training conducted in your school district?

    a) Who plans it?
    b) Who evaluates it?
    c) How much money is appropriated each year for in-service training?

17. What is your role in providing the necessary instructional materials to the staff?

18. Do you evaluate teachers (formally)? How often and under what circumstances?

19. How do you maintain communications with:

    a) The superintendent?
    b) The board of education?
    c) The principals?
    d) The teachers?
    e) The students?
    f) The community?

20. "Time" was cited as the biggest obstacle to constructive change in elementary school districts (according to the questionnaire). What does that mean to you in your situation and how do you overcome this obstacle?

21. What criteria are used to measure your overall effectiveness?

22. Would you change those criteria?

23. Should your salary increases be directly linked to your performance (by objectives)?

APPROVAL SHEET

The dissertation submitted by William J. Loftus has been read and approved by the following committee:

Dr. Max A. Bailey, Director
Associate Professor of Educational Administration, Loyola

Dr. Jasper J. Valenti
Associate Professor of Educational Administration, Loyola

Dr. Philip M. Carlin
Associate Professor of Educational Administration, Loyola

The final copies have been examined by the director of the dissertation and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the dissertation is now given final approval by the Committee with reference to content and form.

The dissertation is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education.

12-20-79
Date

Max A Bailey
Director's Signature