



1982

## The Impact of Federal Programs on the Assigned Responsibilities of Selected Elementary School Principals

McNair Grant  
*Loyola University Chicago*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc\\_diss](https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss)



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Grant, McNair, "The Impact of Federal Programs on the Assigned Responsibilities of Selected Elementary School Principals" (1982). *Dissertations*. 1993.  
[https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc\\_diss/1993](https://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_diss/1993)

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](mailto:ecommons@luc.edu).



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License](#).  
Copyright © 1982 McNair Grant

THE IMPACT OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS  
ON THE ASSIGNED RESPONSIBILITIES  
OF SELECTED ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

by

McNair Grant

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

January  
1982

McNair Grant

Loyola University of Chicago

THE IMPACT OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS ON THE ASSIGNED RESPONSIBILITIES  
OF SELECTED ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

This study was designed to examine the impact of state/federal categorical programs on the assigned responsibilities of selected elementary school principals. A total of 24 principals, who are assigned to schools in a large urban school district and who operate extensive government funded programs, responded in an oral interview to propositions developed from five research questions. The research questions requested the respondents to answer the extent to which the presence of government funded programs in their schools impacted on their conduct of leadership and supervisory activities, inservice education for staff, planning, school-community activities, and administration.

In general, the majority of principals saw the presence of government funded programs in their schools to be more beneficial than detrimental to their role as a leader, to their function as provided for inservice activities, and in their relationships with the community. The majority of the principals rejected the notion that the presence of government funded programs in a school negatively affect the principals' prerogatives to make plans, develop aims, objectives, and purposes, that the increase in paperwork is significant or that the increase in legal work that was related to the teachers' contract was significant.

All of the principals who were interviewed rejected the notion that the presence of government funded programs in their schools decreased

their role in decision making.

The study concludes that the presence of government funded programs in a school probably facilitates the principal's ability to exercise leadership, to promote professional growth among teachers, and to enhance his role in school-community relations. The study further concludes that the principal's role in planning may be altered and that he may be required to deal with an increased number of agencies as a result of the presence of government funded programs in his school.

According to the results of this study, the majority of principals rate the impact of government funded programs in a favorable manner.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many individuals, too numerous to mention, have assisted in many ways to make this manuscript possible. To my many colleagues, administrators, teachers, parents, and students in the Chicago public schools, I express my sincere gratitude and appreciation.

Deserving special mention because of their extensive help are Dr. Irving Brauer, Dr. William Jones, and Dr. Morven Ngaiyaye.

The aid and assistance of Mrs. Sandra Tolbert and Mrs. Georgia Reed were invaluable in the preparation and editing of the manuscript. I am especially appreciative to the members of my dissertation committee, Dr. Max Bailey, Dr. Philip Carlin, and Dr. M. P. Heller, whose suggestions and guidance were invaluable.

Above all, my wife, Angela, has provided the love and security so necessary to complete this project.

## VITA

The author, McNair Grant, third of ten children born to Roy and Rebecca (McNair) Grant, was born August 9, 1925, in Fort Smith, Arkansas.

His family moved to Chicago, Illinois, in 1926, where he attended public schools. His elementary education began at A. O. Sexton Elementary School. He later attended Betsy Ross Elementary School and Edmund Burke Elementary School, graduating from Burke in June 1939. His secondary education was obtained at DuSable High School, from which he graduated in June 1943.

In September 1943, he enrolled at Woodrow Wilson Junior College, but, before the semester was completed, he was drafted into the United States Army, where he served until April 1946, attaining the rank of sergeant and serving in the Far Eastern Theater of Operations.

He attended George Williams College from September 1946 to June 1950, where he was president of the senior class and was initiated into the Kappa Delta Pi Honor Society. He graduated with a Bachelor of Science in education, with a major in physical education and a minor in health education. In 1955, he received a Master of Arts in education from Northwestern University.

In 1950, he began his career as a teacher in the Chicago public schools. After successfully passing the principal examination, in 1959, he was assigned to the principalship of Drake Elementary School. He was

later assigned to the principalships of Juliette Low Upper Grade Center and Englewood High School.

In 1965, he was assigned as the District Superintendent of the newly formed experimental District 23, which was to be the recipient of extensive federal programs. In 1972, he was assigned as the Associate Superintendent of Area B, which was approximately one-third of the city of Chicago and a model of decentralization. In 1975, he was assigned as the Associate Superintendent, Department of Government Funded Programs, which is his current position.

He is married to Angela I. Imala and has three children by a former marriage. He is a member of numerous professional and civic organizations.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS . . . . .	ii
VITA . . . . .	iii
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	viii
 Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Need for the Study . . . . .	18
Purpose of the Study . . . . .	20
Procedure and Methodology . . . . .	21
Definitions of Terms . . . . .	23
Limitations of the Study . . . . .	25
Organization of the Study . . . . .	25
II. REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH AND LITERATURE . . . . .	26
The Principalsip: Legal Basis in Illinois . . . . .	26
School Code of Illinois . . . . .	27
Rules: Board of Education of the City of Chicago . . . . .	27
The North Central Association of Colleges and Schools . . . . .	28
Review of the General Literature Concerning the Principalsip . . . . .	36
Summary of the Review of General Literature . . . . .	64
Summary of the Review of Literature as Related to the Five Research Questions . . . . .	66
Research Question 1 . . . . .	66
Research Question 2 . . . . .	72
Research Question 3 . . . . .	76
Research Question 4 . . . . .	80
Research Question 5 . . . . .	83
III. THE RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURES . . . . .	88
The Purposes . . . . .	88
The Research Questions . . . . .	88
The Research Design . . . . .	89
The Subjects . . . . .	89
Characteristics of Schools Selected for the Study . . . . .	90
Data Collection . . . . .	91



The Interview Guide . . . . .	92
Instructional Leadership . . . . .	93
Inservice Training . . . . .	93
Planning . . . . .	94
Community Involvement . . . . .	95
Administration . . . . .	95
Analysis of Data . . . . .	97
 IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA . . . . .	 99
Research Question One . . . . .	102
Proposition 1 . . . . .	102
Proposition 2 . . . . .	104
Proposition 3 . . . . .	105
Summary . . . . .	108
Research Question Two . . . . .	110
Proposition 4 . . . . .	110
Minor Proposition 1 . . . . .	114
Minor Proposition 2 . . . . .	116
Summary . . . . .	117
Research Question Three . . . . .	118
Proposition 5 . . . . .	118
Minor Proposition 1 . . . . .	120
Minor Proposition 2 . . . . .	121
Summary . . . . .	122
Research Question Four . . . . .	122
Proposition 6 . . . . .	124
Minor Proposition . . . . .	125
Summary . . . . .	126
Research Question Five . . . . .	128
Proposition 7 . . . . .	128
Minor Proposition 1 . . . . .	130
Minor Proposition 2 . . . . .	131
Minor Proposition 3 . . . . .	131
Proposition 8 . . . . .	132
Summary . . . . .	133
 V. CONCLUSIONS, ANALYSES AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	 135
Summary of Analysés . . . . .	137
Conclusions . . . . .	138
Conclusion 1 . . . . .	138
Conclusion 2 . . . . .	139
Conclusion 3 . . . . .	140

Chapter

Page

Conclusion 4 . . . . .	141
Conclusion 5 . . . . .	141
Recommendations . . . . .	142
Some Recommendations for Additional Study . . . . .	143
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .</b>	<b>144</b>

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Percent of the Four Largest State/Federal Program Budgets in Relationship to the Total School District Budget . . . . .	9
2. Percent of State/Federal Compensatory Programs in Relationship to the Total School District Budget . . . . .	10
3. Amount and Percent of State/Federal Funds in a School's Educational Budget . . . . .	11
4. Number and Percent of Positions Available Through State/Federal Funds in a School's Budget . . . . .	13
5. Amount and Percent of State/Federal Funds Used for Salary Expenditures in a School's Budget . . . . .	14
6. Amount and Percent of State/Federal Funds Used for Supplies in a School's Budget . . . . .	15
7. Characteristics of Schools Selected for the Study . . . . .	90
8. Percent of Subjects Expressing Opinions to Propositions 1, 2, and 3 . . . . .	109
9. Percent of Subjects Expressing Opinions to Proposition 4 and Minor Propositions . . . . .	112
10. Percent of Subjects Expressing Opinions to Proposition 5 and Minor Propositions . . . . .	123
11. Percent of Subjects Expressing Opinions to Proposition 6 and Minor Proposition . . . . .	127
12. Percent of Subjects Expressing Opinions to Proposition 7, Minors, and Proposition 8 . . . . .	129

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

Principals of schools are perceived by many students of administration and supervision as having the most important and enduring positions in education. It is because of his position as a big figure in the educational enterprise and as the arch administrative officer responsible for the total educational program of all students in his school that the principal has been selected as the pivotal character in this study. Further, in most systems, the position of the principal may be more permanent than that of other members of the administrative hierarchy. Therefore, whatever affects the role of the principal may also affect future directions of educational systems.

The role of the principal has been discussed by many writers. The literature is replete with suggestions for what the principalship entails. In most cases, the principal is perceived to be an administrator on one hand and a leader on the other hand. Campbell draws a clear distinction between the two roles:

Unless you have helped an organization modify its purpose, modify its program, or modify its procedure, I suggest that you are not leading. Unless you have somehow been able, not just personally, but through the whole organization, to get some shift in purpose, or in program, or in procedure, you are not leading; you are maintaining an organization.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Roald F. Campbell, "Application of Administrative Concepts to the Elementary Principalship," in School Administration: Selected Readings, eds., Sherman H. Frey and Keith R. Getschman (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, Co., 1968), p. 191.

A number of writers such as Hill, Wuchitech, and Williams<sup>1</sup> have postulated the existence of a relationship between federal involvement in education and alterations in the role of the school principal. These writers have suggested that federal involvement may account for such changes as (a) lessening the responsibility of a principal to make decisions affecting the curriculum and other types of educational programs provided children in the schools; and (b) in general, defining the job of a principal in terms of administrative rather than instructional functions.

The NAESP<sup>2</sup> and NASSP<sup>3</sup> report that principals complain of increased numbers of specialists with whom to deal; of the confusing mandates and judicial decisions affecting implementation of programs at the local school; of the increase in the rules to follow; and the increasing complexity of the job. If the points made in these studies are valid, then the changes occurring in the role of the principal may have important implications for the quality of instruction. For instance, if a principal's major concerns center on how to deal with various federal dictates and regulations, then it could be asked--How much time does the principal have left to spend in the classrooms or with teachers to promote professional growth?

---

<sup>1</sup>Paul T. Hill, Joanne Wuchitech, and Richard Williams, The Effects of Federal Education Programs on School Principals, N-1467-HEW (Santa Monica, California: The Rand Corporation, February 1980).

<sup>2</sup>National Association of Elementary School Principals, Survey Report (Arlington, Virginia: NAESP, May 1980).

<sup>3</sup>Gilbert R. Weldy, Principals: What They Do and Who They Are (Reston, Virginia: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1979).

Perhaps one of the most useful sources of information on the subject of effects of federal involvement in education is a report by Hill, Wuchitech, and Williams, "The Effects of Federal Education Programs on School Principals."<sup>1</sup> The authors believe the principal is facing: increased numbers of contacts with specialists and officials and parent groups associated with federal programs; added paperwork; multiple program demands and noninstructional concerns like student health, nutrition, and due process rights; less time for supervising teachers and dealing with students; busier days, more night work, less discretionary time, more scrutiny and criticism, and less autonomy than was commonly given years ago.

Improved federal policy would attempt to alleviate the increased administrative burden on principals, especially in those schools which are the recipients of many programs because they have students who qualify for many categorical programs. Hill, Wuchitech, and Williams<sup>2</sup> conclude that federal programs have placed a complex administrative burden on a very simple organization.

A Rand document by Paul Hill, "Do Federal Education Programs Interfere With One Another?"<sup>3</sup> speaks to the problem of multiple federal programs. The document distinguishes among five types of federal

---

<sup>1</sup>Hill, Wuchitech, and Williams, The Effects of Federal Education Programs on School Principals.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.

<sup>3</sup>Paul T. Hill, "Do Federal Education Programs Interfere With One Another?" Report No. 06416-HEW (Santa Monica, California: The Rand Corporation, September 1979).

programs: Supplementary service, separate and addition, desegregation aid, matching funds, and unfunded mandates which set new standards but provide no money. Each of these programs, with or without financial obligation, contributes to the administrative burden. Programs seem to place greater demands on the local school system than can be met either by the superintendent or principal as they vie for administrative attention; create uncertainties about eligibility regulation; may cross-subsidize students' needs and compete for local funds.<sup>1</sup> Principals in these situations must interpret the rules, plan for improved service and give an accurate accounting of the funds received. An additional problem in the accountability of the principal for government programs in his school is his responsibility to program and fiscal auditors from both governmental agencies and the central office.

It is important that school systems, colleges, universities, and federal, state, and municipal funding agencies are aware of and sensitive to the impact of funded programs on the principal. This dissertation is concerned with the impact of federal programs on the assigned responsibilities of selected school principals and whether the impact is positive or negative.

Governmental categorical funds, which are used to purchase supplemental, categorical education programs, are different from regular funds in that they may only be used to provide supplementary programs for certain eligible students. These students must be identified and are usually served on a most needy basis. Programs are monitored by the funding agency and misuse of funds or deviations from the approved and agreed upon proposal can result in audit exceptions, which may eventually require repayment

---

<sup>1</sup>Paul T. Hill, "Do Federal Education Programs Interfere With One Another?"

of funds and loss of future funding.

There is a very formal and contractual relationship that school systems and individual schools must make with the state or federal agencies for the conduct of categorical programs. Most often, this relationship is initiated by a Request for Proposal (RFP) from the funding agency to which the school system responds. Under ideal circumstances, the school principal is involved in the entire process of proposal development and negotiations with funding agencies, because once the agreements are negotiated the major responsibilities for executing the specific elements of the agreement become the responsibility of the local school principal.

The school principalship has remained an enduring position in education in America. Additional comments will be made in the section devoted to a review of literature on the elementary school principalship and the many ways the position can be perceived both from the theoretical and practical precepts. The elementary school principal has maintained his importance as the chief administrative and supervisory officer at the local school and in that capacity has inherited the duty to guide each wave of innovative program to a successful conclusion whether it be initiated by him, the central office, the school board, or through federal and state codes or laws. Just as the principal's position in education has been an enduring and expanding one, so too has the federal government's interest in education been equally consistent. Regardless of the fact that the federal constitution has no explicit language dealing with the public schools, the federal government has always been involved in public education. The early federal legislation pertaining to education



was primarily dealing with land grants and the establishment of land grant colleges.

The ordinance of 1785 and other ordinances reserved lots of every township for the maintenance of public schools within those townships. As sections of the territories became states, they petitioned congress for grants of public lands to establish colleges. In 1862, the Morrill Act passed which appropriated 30,000 acres for each senator and representative for the endowment support and maintenance of at least one college where the leading subject shall be among others, Agriculture and Mechanical Arts.

Additional legislation pertaining to land grant colleges were the following:

Hatch Act of 1887 (established experimental stations)

Second Morrill Act of 1890

Nelson Amendment of 1907 (training of teachers)

Bank Head Jones Act of 1935 (extended some functions)

The Smith Hughes Act was passed in 1917 and was a support for vocational education. The act originally required states and local school districts to match the federal funds which were in part to pay the salaries of teachers, supervisors, and directors of agricultural subjects and teachers of trade, industrial, and some home economics subjects.

Some authors believe that federal involvement in education will increase as exemplified in the following statement by Stoops, Rafferty, and Johnson:

Everything points to eventual adoption of the principle that the birthright of every American is a decent education. There are strong indications that the vast majority of Americans here already adopted this as a part of the American ideal, although congress may be the

last to realize it. With the increasing acceptance of the doctrine, federal aid to needy states and school districts on some sort of equalization basis will be natural and inevitable. In the century and a half since the first steps were taken that involved the United States government in education, the trend has been clear. Federal interest and financial contributions have intensified and multiplied in areas undreamed of by the founders of our form of government. It remains now only to implement the principle logically and efficiently.<sup>1</sup>

Halperin says that the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) is responsible for breaking the log-jam in federal aid to education, and states:

From the Civil War to the bitter school aid fights of the late 1950's, divisive struggles over church/state questions, aid to parochial schools, desegregation, apportionment formulas, and fear of federal control of education has prevented passage of any large scale federal aide to elementary and secondary schools.<sup>2</sup>

On April 11, 1965, President Lyndon B. Johnson signed the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-10) and subsequently a number of federal aid statutes were passed and the American government and its people were once again very actively involved with the schools. During the decade between 1965 and 1975, \$16.7 billion were appropriated for Title I. In 11% of the school districts of America, more than 7% of the schools' budgets were comprised of ESEA funds.

In Chicago, the urban community being researched in this study, the figures are comparable to those quoted above. In the 1980-81 school year, the total budget of \$1.3 billion included a figure of \$67 million

---

<sup>1</sup>Emery Stoops, Max Rafferty, and Russell E. Johnson, Handbook of Educational Administration: A Guide for the Practitioner (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1975), p. 36.

<sup>2</sup>Samuel Halperin, "Federal Takeover, State Default, or a Family Problem," Phi Delta Kappan 57 (June 1975), p. 147.

for ESEA Title I, which was approximately 5% of the total budget (see Table 1).

Governmental programs, which include ESEA Title I, Special Education 94-142, Transitional Bilingual Education, Head Start, and Follow Through, are the large categorical programs affecting elementary school principals in Chicago. These programs serve thousands of students in 90% of the schools. Many schools have two or more programs, which means that the principal may have a number of students who qualify for more than one categorical program and, therefore, special decision making is required to determine the individual education programs for these students. Consideration must be given in these instances not only to the educational needs of the students, but also to the legal implications of the decision.

It is important to note that although the highest percent of governmental funds in the total school budget was 13% in the 1979-80 school year, individual schools can have a much higher percentage of their total budgets funded via governmental funds (see Tables 2 and 3).

One of the indicators of the difficulty of a particular administrative position is the number of staff under the direct supervision of that position. Many of the critics of government involvement in education refer to the proliferation of nonteaching positions when school districts accept government programs. Ziegler, Tucker, and Wilson make the following statement: "It is estimated that 25 percent of Title I and Title III money was expended for administrative salaries. In one urban district, the size of the 'administrative' staff tripled between 1966 and

TABLE 1

PERCENT OF THE FOUR LARGEST STATE/FEDERAL PROGRAM BUDGETS\*  
IN RELATIONSHIP TO THE TOTAL SCHOOL DISTRICT BUDGET

School Year	Total Budget	State/ Federal Budget	Percent of the Total Budget
1976-77	\$1,084,044,643	\$ 66,731,422	6%
1977-78	\$1,107,154,715	\$ 68,605,279	6%
1978-79	\$1,243,118,034	\$ 88,167,928	7%
1979-80	\$1,288,819,449	\$111,598,993	8%
1980-81	\$1,272,424,907	\$ 99,228,918	7%

\*These programs are Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, state-supported bilingual education programs, Head Start, and Special Education, specifically Public Law 94-142.

TABLE 2

PERCENT OF STATE/FEDERAL COMPENSATORY PROGRAMS  
IN RELATIONSHIP TO THE TOTAL SCHOOL DISTRICT BUDGET

School Year	Total Budget	State/ Federal Budget*	Percent of the Total Budget
1976-77	\$1,084,44,643	\$101,503,471	9%
1977-78	\$1,107,154,715	\$121,881,760	11%
1978-79	\$1,243,118,034	\$145,303,729	11%
1979-80	\$1,283,819,449	\$170,573,690	13%
1980-81	\$1,272,424,907	\$139,652,793	10%

\*These figures do not include free lunch budgets or certain vocational education or driver education budgets.

TABLE 3

AMOUNT AND PERCENT OF STATE/FEDERAL FUNDS  
IN A SCHOOL'S EDUCATIONAL BUDGET

School	School's Total Educational Budget	School's State/Federal Funds	Percent*
A	\$1,056,783	\$363,647	26%
B	\$ 888,010	\$199,708	18%
C	\$1,018,730	\$482,298	32%
D	\$ 968,339	\$231,218	19%
E	\$1,545,979	\$522,736	26%

\*These figures represent the percent of state/federal funds used for educational programs in relation to the school's total educational budget.

1975, while the number of students and staff remained constant."<sup>1</sup>

Although administrative staff accounts for approximately 5% of the funds in the urban center in this dissertation, government funded programs were responsible for considerable growth in both professional or teaching staff and paraprofessional or teacher aides at the local school level. Tables 4 and 5 illustrate the increase in the number of professional and paraprofessional positions available through state and federal funds at the local schools.

Table 4 illustrates the total number of professional and paraprofessional staff assigned to the individual school, the percent of the staff members who are accounted for from regular sources, and the percent of staff members who are accounted for as a result of government funded programs. In the five schools randomly selected from the study, a range of 11% to 25% of the professional staff can be attributed to the presence of government funded programs. From 25% to 61% of the paraprofessional staff can be attributed to the presence of government funded programs. Table 5 translates staff numbers into dollars and illustrates the percentage of total professional and paraprofessional staff costs which can be attributed to the presence of government funded programs. Table 6 depicts the total amount of funds allocated to five randomly selected schools for supplies. From 31% to 51% of these funds allocated for supplies can be attributed to funded programs.

---

<sup>1</sup>Harmon L. Ziegler, Harvey J. Tucker, and L. A. Wilson, "How School Control Was Wrested from the People," Phi Delta Kappan 58 (March 1977): 535.

TABLE 4

## NUMBER AND PERCENT OF POSITIONS AVAILABLE THROUGH STATE/FEDERAL FUNDS IN A SCHOOL'S BUDGET

School	Total No. of Professional Positions	No. of Prof. Positions			Per- cent*	Total No. of Career Ser. Positions	No. of Car. Serv. Pos.		
		From a School's Budget	From State/ Federal Funds	Per- cent*			From a School's Budget	From State/ Federal Funds	Per- cent*
A	48	35.5	12.5	26%	12	9	3	25%	
B	34.5	28.5	6	17%	11.5	8.5	3	26%	
C	43	32	11	26%	24	14	10	42%	
D	36	32	4	11%	16	8	8	50%	
E	48.5	36.5	12	25%	18	7	11	61%	

\*These figures represent the percent of positions available through state/federal funds in relation to the total number of positions available.



TABLE 5

## AMOUNT AND PERCENT OF STATE/FEDERAL FUNDS USED FOR SALARY EXPENDITURES IN A SCHOOL'S BUDGET

School	Total of Prof. Costs	Professional Costs			Percent*	Career Service Costs			Percent*
		From a School's Budget	From State/Federal Funds			Total of Career Service Costs	From a School's Budget	From State/Federal Funds	
A	\$1,081,446	\$804,608	\$276,838	26%	\$156,460	\$130,136	\$ 26,324	17%	
B	\$ 799,885	\$663,439	\$136,446	17%	\$148,109	\$118,516	\$ 29,593	20%	
C	\$1,100,649	\$818,229	\$282,420	26%	\$242,224	\$127,821	\$114,403	47%	
D	\$ 828,998	\$745,181	\$ 83,817	10%	\$204,889	\$122,097	\$ 87,792	40%	
E	\$1,216,734	\$911,391	\$305,343	25%	\$478,290	\$353,538	\$124,752	26%	

\*These figures represent the percent of state/federal funds used for salaries in relation to the school's educational budget.

TABLE 6

AMOUNT AND PERCENT OF STATE/FEDERAL FUNDS USED FOR SUPPLIES  
IN A SCHOOL'S BUDGET

School	Total of School's Supply Budget	From School's General Budget	From State/Federal Funds	Percent*
A	\$17,383	\$11,466	\$ 5,917	34%
B	\$12,321	\$ 8,539	\$ 3,782	31%
C	\$27,583	\$13,535	\$14,048	51%
D	\$16,280	\$10,104	\$ 6,176	38%
E	\$30,203	\$14,978	\$15,225	50%

\*These figures represent the percent of state/federal funds used for supply costs in relation to the total amount spent for supplies.

Government funded programs have a major impact on the staffing patterns and material resources of the schools where funded programs are located. The principal, as the chief executive officer and educational leader, guides the utilization of these resources. The purpose of this study is to investigate the role performance of principals who are impacted by government funded programs.

For example, one of the schools in this study has an average daily membership of 632 students. A total of 240 of these students are in Title I classes, 173 in transitional bilingual classes, 40 in Head Start, and 45 in special education classes which include educationally mentally handicapped pupils and learning disabled students. A total of 7 of the 34 teachers who are assigned to this school, approximately 20% of the staffing costs, are funded by supplementary funds. In addition, these programs fund two teacher aides and funds for materials and equipment. The total cost for government funded personnel and materials in this school is \$199,708.

As the finishing touches are being put on this research paper, in the spring of 1981, the greatest changes in federal education programs in the last 20 years are taking place. As a part of President Reagan's fiscal reforms, many social programs, including many educational programs, are being cut for the first time in two decades. In fact, this will be the first year that many of the education programs have not actually received an increase. The President's initiatives in education actually have three parts. Part one deals with actual cuts in funding; a lesser amount of money will be available for most programs. Part two deals with deregulation; the Reagan administration hopes to dispense with many of

the rules, regulations, and procedures which have been funding requirements. Part three deals with consolidation or block grants which will provide a "bucket" amount of money from which states and local educational agencies may decide which programs they wish to fund.

The Secretary of Education, T. H. Bell, made the following statement in a news release on April 29, 1981, in regard to consolidation:

For the past 15 years, the federal government has tried, with varying degrees of success, to administer patchwork legislative programs tailored to fit an ever-growing list of unmet needs.

Millions of school children who need help have been identified because of the efforts of the federal, state, and local governments. This administration believes that the help these students need is closer to them at the state and local levels than in Washington, D.C. In the beginning, the needs, the money, the children, and the control of education were all state and local. Too much of the money and the control shifted to Washington in that process. There are few needs that cannot be met by a determined coalition of parents, teachers, superintendents, boards, and legislators at the state and local level.

On behalf of well-intentioned programs, the government slowly entangled the money, the needs--and American education itself--in a web of federal laws and rules.

I am proud to be part of an historic effort by the Reagan administration to put things back where they belong, at the local and state level...

The 50 states must regain control of education and hold on to it. This is their big chance...

The Consolidation Act of 1981 is a major step in the right direction. In the 44 categorical programs embraced in this one piece of legislation, we estimate the laws for them would fill 253 printed pages and the regulations 398 pages more. Beyond the laws and regulations, you could find uncounted thousands of pages of policy clarifications, guidelines, and letters attempting to explain what all those other documents mean. The proposed consolidation eliminates nearly all of this...

Because this represents a major break with the past, I have given most emphasis in my statement to this administration's new outlook on the federal role in education. This is a States Rights Administration. Education must also bear its share in the national determination to reduce federal spending. That, too, is a part of the package.

But you should understand that if there were no budget cuts there would still be a Consolidation Act to reduce the paperwork burden and diminish federal controls; and if there were no Consolidation Act there would still be proposed budget cuts.<sup>1</sup>

Regardless of the changes to be made by the federal government, there still is no question that programs funded with federal funds and initiatives will have a great effect on the role of the principal. The literature seems to suggest that the presence of federal programs in a school along with the increased number of legal issues associated with them are affecting the very nature of the principal's job. This point is germane to this study and underlies its purpose. The information gleaned from the study should provide a better understanding of the actual activities performed by the principals and their perceived needs to improve their effectiveness as administrators and supervisors. In addition, the information should be useful to accrediting agencies and policy makers at the local, state, and national levels and to universities that provide the professional training for future administrators.

#### Need for the Study

A little over ten years ago, Burke<sup>2</sup> feared the existence of some relationship between federal financing of education and federal control. He noted that the multiple title and programs within the 1965 Act, when

---

<sup>1</sup>U.S. Department of Education, "Statement re: Elementary and Secondary Education Consolidation Act of 1981," by T.H. Bell, Secretary of Education (Washington, D.C.: United States Department of Education News, for release 9:30 a.m. (EDT), Wednesday, April 29, 1981.)

<sup>2</sup>Arvid James Burke, The Financing of Elementary and Secondary Schools: The Theory and Practice of School Finance (Chicago: Rand-McNally and Company, 1969).

added to the many found in preceding acts, required the existence of a large and rapidly growing federal and state bureaucracy. The existence of this hierarchy and the power given to it to approve programs and methods of distributing funds, according to Burke, would generate federal controls over state and local operations not explicit in the laws themselves. He also stated that the shift in power and control needs to be studied very carefully in terms of its effects.

Perhaps one of the effects of the increase in federal financing for education and the resultant control over state and local school purposes may be a change in the manner in which principals fulfill their roles. Burke noted that although the total federal funds amount to only 8% of the total public school budget, the management of federal funds demanded more of the time and effort of local program administrators than the management of the funds which comprised 92% of the budget. If this is so, it can be theorized that principals must be rearranging priorities in the performance of their duties in order to satisfy federal requirements.

However, the extent to which the role of the principal in schools with federal financing may be changing or the direction in which that role is changing remains to be determined. Meanwhile, the point that becomes clearer than ever is that federal interest in and control of educational policy will continue. (This point is borne out in part also by the establishment of a Department of Education at the cabinet level.) Hence, it behooves students of educational administration to look anew at the roles of school administrators in view of the changing times and to devise alternatives to the traditional methods of deploying principals

and of assigning auxilliary staff personnel to the principal's office. This point is germane to this study and leads to its purpose.

### Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study is to investigate role performance of principals involved with federally funded programs, to analyze these practices in terms of leadership theory, administrative theories, and conventional practices; also, to develop recommendations for the management of educational programs in order to maximize operational efficiency and promote quality education.

The study focused on the impact of categorical programs on selected urban elementary school principals who have programs in their schools involving more than 30% of the student enrollment.

Five major research questions served as the starting points for this investigation. These research questions were developed from a review of literature as well as an examination of municipal, state, and federal job descriptions of the principalship; Board of Examiners, City of Chicago; North Central Association's criteria for schools and administrators; discussions with the superintendent of personnel of a major urban school system; the vice chairman of the Board of Examiners; members of the Department of Administration and Supervision in a prominent university; central office administrative staff in a large urban school system; and principals and field staff in a large urban school system.

The research questions were directed to five areas considered crucial to the operation of elementary schools and mandatory responsibilities of all principals: supervision and instruction; inservice and

professional improvement; planning, both long- and short-range; community involvement; and administration. In preliminary field test interviews with principals and other administrators, the following research questions were again verified as major areas of concern:

1. What is the impact of federal programs on the role of the principal as one charged with the responsibility to supervise the program of instruction?
2. What is the impact of federal programs on the role of the principal as one charged with the responsibility to provide a program of staff development and inservice training for teachers?
3. What is the impact of federal programs on the role of the principal as one charged with the responsibility to carry out long-range educational planning?
4. What is the impact of federal programs on the role of the principal as one charged with the responsibility to conduct school-community relations?
5. What is the impact of federal programs on the role of the principal as the chief administrative officer of the school?

#### Procedure and Methodology

Since the investigation was concerned with principals of schools with budgets that reflected a significant involvement with state or federal agencies, 24 subjects were randomly selected from a population of 250 principals with ESEA Title I programs in their schools. Adjustments were made in the selection process to ensure the following: racial balance of principals and the school populations that they served; balance



in the number of male and female participants; balance in the geographic locations of the schools; and a balance in the number of schools with bilingual education, programs designed for Chinese students, and programs designed to meet the needs of white migrant pupils.

With the five research questions serving as the basic fabric of the questionnaire, principals were interviewed for approximately one and one-half hours with one hour being taped. Principals were encouraged to speak freely regarding their responsibilities. They were assured that their comments were confidential and neither they nor their schools would be singled out or recognizable in the study.

Data from the interviews supplemented a plethora of information which was available concerning each of the schools in the study. The major purpose of the interview guide was to solicit from the principals information that would aid in determining the impact of government programs on their administrative and supervisory roles.

An important second objective was to collect specific information on changes induced by federal programs. The analysis of the data dealt with the following research question:

- What is the impact?
- How intense is the impact?
- Can the impact be modified?
- Is the impact positive or negative?
- What are the recommendations of principals involved in the study?
- What are the overall recommendations?

## Definitions of Terms

The following terms used in the study are defined below:

Government Funded Programs are programs funded by municipal, state, or federal agencies. Programs which are funded through the regular state formula are not included in this category.

Supplementary Programs are programs which are in addition to the programs funded through the state formula and local efforts.

Categorical Programs are programs specially designed for pupils who meet rigidly prescribed conditions.

Comparability in a school or school district exists when the regular expenditures for pupils or schools are nearly equal or within a certain percentage of being equal.

Educational Planning refers to those activities the principal engages in to chart in advance a course of action.

Staff Development and Inservice are those activities the principal engages in to improve the skills and abilities of staff members. Among the activities to be considered in this category are: faculty meetings, conferences, exchange teaching institutes, professional meetings, college classes and workshops.

Supervision is defined by Marks, Stoops, and King-Stoops as follows:

"The modern interpretation of supervision would be action and experimentation aimed at the improvement of instruction and the instructional program."<sup>1</sup> Among the specific activities principals will engage in under

---

<sup>1</sup>James P. Marks, Emery Stoops, and Joyce King-Stoops, Handbook of Educational Supervision: A Guide for the Practitioner (Boston: Allyn and Bacon Inc., 1971), p. 15.

this category are classroom visitation, professional conferences, and professional evaluation.

Administration in this study is used primarily to denote those activities that the principal conducts in his office alone or with secretarial help-- in other words, desk work. Among the activities are: reading mail and other correspondence, responding to mail, calling and answering the telephone, dictating letters, preparing schedules, preparing reports, and ordering supplies. Stoops, Rafferty, and Johnson define administration in the following manner: "Administration at the local level mobilizes personnel and resources to provide maximum learning opportunities in harmony with legal stipulations."<sup>1</sup>

School-Community Activities are the wide range of activities conducted by the principal which ensure cooperation and collaboration of the school with its community. Activities with the parents of children in the school are exemplified by Parent-Teacher Association and local school council activities. These and other related community activities become of paramount importance in this study because of the mandate in many federal, state, and municipally funded programs to have advisory council, parent and community program monitoring and evaluative committees, and the legal requirement in some programs to have citizen sign-offs before program approval is granted.

---

<sup>1</sup>Stoops et al., Handbook of Educational Administration, p. 6.

## Limitations of the Study

The study is concerned with the roles of principals in schools with extensive federal financing of programs to determine if a relationship exists between federal financing and any alterations in the role of the principal as that role is defined conventionally. The study is thus limited in this respect.

The study is also subject to the following limitation: As designed, the study was conducted in selected school districts in the City of Chicago. As such, the districts may or may not be representative of various types, kinds, and sizes of school districts across the nation.

## Organization of the Study

The study consists of five chapters, a select bibliography, and appendices.

Chapter I includes an introduction to the study, need for the study, the purpose of the study, procedure and methodology, definitions of terms, and limitations of the study.

Chapter II contains a review of related literature and research relative to the role of the principal in federally-funded school systems.

Chapter III covers the description of the questionnaires and data sheets used in the study, methods used to administer the instruments, and procedures.

Chapter IV includes an analysis of the data derived from the questionnaires and interviews.

Chapter V provides an overview of the study. A summary of the study along with the conclusions, implications, and recommendations are also included in Chapter V.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH AND LITERATURE

The review of the literature is divided into three main areas: review of the legal basis for the position of the principal in the State of Illinois; review of general research and literature concerning the principal; and specific focus on the literature and research pertinent to the five research questions.

Congressional reports and state and federal codes and laws as well as book, reports, journals, papers, and speeches related to this topic were used. In addition, other resources, such as ERIC, Dissertation Abstracts, Research in Education, Dissertation Abstracts International, Encyclopedia of Educational Research, and Educational Index were used.

#### The Principals: Legal Basis in Illinois

An initial step in a study of the impact of federal programs on the principal is an investigation of the legal documents which establish the position of the principal. These documents provide more specific information for the following two questions: What are the legal responsibilities of principals as defined by codes and laws? What do principals consider their most important responsibilities as determined by their day-to-day priorities?

It is important to establish the difference between the principal's responsibilities as established by the legal documents and the principal's responsibilities as he sets priorities on a day-to-day basis. The following commentary is intended to discuss and to reconcile these two views using the commonly accepted educational definitions and terms.

The legal role of principals for the State of Illinois, recorded in The School Code of Illinois under the duties of superintendents, Sec. 10-21.4a, is as follows:

To employ principals who hold valid supervisory or administrative certificates who shall supervise the operation of attendance centers as the board shall determine necessary.

The principal shall assume administrative responsibilities and instructional leadership, under the supervision of the superintendent, and in accordance with reasonable rules and regulations of the board, for planning, operation and evaluation of the educational program of the attendance area to which he is assigned.

The principal shall submit recommendations to the superintendent concerning the appointment, retention, promotion, and assignment of all personnel assigned to the attendance center.<sup>1</sup>

The key words in the state's definition of duties of the principal are "administrative responsibility" and "instructional leadership." Further delineation of responsibility is inherent in the phrase "...for planning, operation and evaluation of the educational program of the attendance area to which he is assigned."

The legal role of principals in the City of Chicago is expressed in Rules: Board of Education of the City of Chicago, Chapter VI, School Policies, Section 6-12, which is as follows:

---

<sup>1</sup> State Board of Education, The School Code of Illinois (St. Paul, Minnesota: West Publishing Co., 1977).

Principals of schools are the responsible administrative heads of their respective schools and are charged with the organization, supervision, administration, and discipline thereof. They shall establish and enforce such regulations, not contrary to the rules of the Board of Education or the regulations of the General Superintendent of Schools, as in their judgment may be necessary for the successful conduct of their schools.<sup>1</sup>

The role of the principal is further defined by the policies or standards of accrediting agencies. The North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, in its publication titled Policies and Standards for the Approval of Elementary Schools 1980-1981, in the section titled "Standard III: Organization, Administration, and Control," states:

...The principal of the elementary school is the administrative head of the school and is given sufficient autonomy and authority to insure the successful functioning of all phases of the school's programs. This includes the creation of a climate fostering planned change. The quality of leadership provided by the principal is a prime factor in the effectiveness of the school's program. Effective board/staff and central office/local staff relationships obtain....

#### Standards Relating to People

- 3.05 In order to permit the principal to have sufficient time to engage in improvement of instruction, if the school enrollment exceeds 650 at least one half-time assistant principal or the equivalence in professional (certificated) personnel shall be provided....
- 3.09 The principal shall be involved in the selection, assessment, evaluation, retention, and promotion of all personnel assigned to the school.
- 3.10 All personnel working in the elementary school shall be responsible to the principal for the performance of their duties.

#### Standards Relating to Tasks

- 3.20 The principal shall be responsible for the improvement of instruction and shall have the authority and the resources needed to accomplish this goal.

---

<sup>1</sup>Board of Education, Rules: Board of Education of the City of Chicago. Published by Authority of the Board of Education of the City of Chicago - Revised to December 1, 1974. p. 55.

- 3.21 The principal shall have the responsibility and the authority to initiate those appropriate changes which adapt the school to the needs of its students.
- 3.22 The principal shall make provisions for staff development to improve the teaching/learning process.
- 3.24 The principal shall have the responsibility and the authority for the administration of the noninstructional programs in the school.
- 3.25 Records and reports needed for effective planning, operation, evaluation, and reporting shall be kept relative to the following components of the educational program: )1) pupil personnel, (2) staff, (3) instructional supplies and equipment, (4) curriculum, (5) pupil activities, (6) media services, (7) guidance, (8) school plant, (9) administrative operations, and (10) health services.
- 3.27 The principal shall have the responsibility for planning and administering the internal budget of the school. The principal shall involve the staff cooperatively in the preliminary development of the budget, in establishing expenditure alternatives, and in setting priorities for the budget.
- 3.28 The principal shall be responsible for the evaluation of all personnel under his/her direction.
- 3.29 The principal shall be responsible for the continuous evaluation of the school.

#### Board/Staff Relationships

- 3.46b The working relationships between the superintendent and the principal shall be such as to insure cooperative and effective administration and operation of the educational program within the school.
- c The working relationships between the principal and the staff shall be such as to insure cooperative and effective administration and operation of the educational program within the school.
- d At both the central office and individual school level, administrative procedures shall be developed by democratic processes which utilize the appropriate abilities and contributions of all staff members.



Central Office/Local School Relationships

- 3.50 The principal shall be involved as fully and as soon as possible in those board and central office decisions affecting the school under his/her direction.
- 3.51 Lines of administrative and supervisory authority between central office staff and the principal shall be defined clearly in writing and be as direct as possible.
- 3.52 The roles and responsibilities of central office personnel as they affect the local elementary school and the elementary school principal shall be delineated clearly in printed form. These descriptions shall be reviewed periodically on a cooperative basis.
- 3.53 While working with the faculty, staff, or children in the school, all central office personnel shall be under the authority of the principal.<sup>1</sup>

These documents describe the principal in four ways. First, he is described by the requirement necessary for the position, i.e., the necessary certification. Second, he is described by definitions of general categories of concern, such as administrative head or chief supervisory officer, etc. Third, he is described by actions that he must take, such as supervising, coordinating activities, etc. Fourth, the principal is described by his reporting relationship to the superintendent and his responsibility to work within the framework of the Rules: Board of Education of the City of Chicago. The following information is taken from the Rules: Board of Education of the City of Chicago.

Requirements: What is needed-

- Hold valid supervisory or administrative certificates

Definitions: Descriptions-

- Are the responsible administrative heads of their respective

---

<sup>1</sup>The North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, Policies and Standards for the Approval of Elementary Schools 1980-1981 (Boulder, Colorado: Commission on Schools, 1221 University Avenue), pp. 9-13.

schools and are charged with the organization, supervision, administration and discipline thereof

- Shall be responsible for the improvement of instruction. Shall be given the authority and resources to accomplish this goal

Activities: Actions-

- Shall supervise the operation of attendance centers
- Shall assume administrative responsibilities and instructional leadership for the planning, operation and evaluation of the educational programs
- Shall help clarify the purposes of the school
- Shall coordinate the various activities

Relationships - Reporting Relationships

- Shall establish and enforce such regulations, not contrary to the rules of the Board of Education or the regulations of the General Superintendent of Schools, as in their judgment may be necessary for the successful conduct of their schools.

Following is a list of the general statements, which were devised from the legal statements describing the role of the principal. This procedure was undertaken in an attempt to isolate each responsibility ascribed to the principal. Each responsibility has been written as an action statement.

- Shall hold a valid supervisory or administrative certificate
- Shall supervise the operation of attendance centers
- Shall assume administrative responsibility for planning the educational program

- Shall assume administrative responsibility for evaluation of the education program
- Shall assume instructional leadership for planning the educational program
- Shall assume instructional leadership for operation of the educational program
- Shall assume instructional leadership for the evaluation of the educational program
- Shall be the responsible administrative head of their respective schools
- Shall be charged with the organization of their respective schools
- Shall be charged with the supervision of their respective schools
- Shall be charged with the administration of their respective schools
- Shall be charged with the discipline of their respective schools
- Shall establish such regulations, not contrary to the Board of Education or the regulations of the General Superintendent of Schools, as in their judgment may be necessary for the successful conduct of their schools
- Shall enforce regulations, not contrary to the Board of Education or the regulations of the General Superintendent of Schools, as in their judgment may be necessary for the successful conduct of their schools
- Shall assume responsibility for the improvement of instruction
- Shall be given the authority to improve instruction
- Shall help clarify the purposes of the school

- Shall help obtain resources for the school
- Shall coordinate the various activities of the school
- Shall promote continuous evaluation.

In the following section, the itemized statements are regrouped, according to the most prominent idea in the statement. Of the 22 itemized statements, 13 can be placed under three headings: supervision, administration, and instructional leadership.

#### Supervision

- Shall supervise the operation of attendance centers
- Shall be charged with the supervision of their respective schools

#### Administration

- Shall assume administrative responsibility for planning the educational program
- Shall assume administrative responsibility for operation of the educational program
- Shall assume administrative responsibility for the evaluation of the educational program
- Shall be the responsible administrative head of their respective schools
- Shall be charged with the administration of their respective schools

#### Instructional Leadership

- Shall assume instructional leadership for planning the educational program
- Shall assume instructional leadership for operation of the instructional program



- Shall assume instructional leadership for evaluation of the instructional program
- Shall assume responsibility for the improvement of instruction
- Shall be given the authority to improve instruction
- Shall be given the resources to improve instruction

#### Organization

- Shall be charged with the organization of their respective schools

#### Discipline

- Shall be charged with the discipline of their respective schools

#### Establish Regulations

- Shall establish such regulations, not contrary to the Board of Education or the regulations of the General Superintendent of Schools, as in their judgment may be necessary for the successful conduct of their schools

#### Enforce Regulations

- Shall enforce such regulations, not contrary to the Board of Education or the regulations of the General Superintendent of Schools, as in their judgment may be necessary for the successful conduct of their schools

#### Clarify Purpose

- Shall help clarify the purposes of the school

#### Obtain Resources

- Shall help obtain resources for the school

#### Coordinate Activities

- Shall coordinate the various activities of the school

### Promote Evaluation

- Shall promote continuous evaluation.

The review of the legal documents which define the role of the principal in the Chicago public schools supports the importance of the major research questions selected for study. The review of these documents, however, highlighted a problem which plagues educational researchers, that is, changing the use of words and terms in the same discussion or, even more confusing, the use of a word as a noun in one sense and as a verb in another. An excellent example of this problem is taken from Rules: Board of Education of the City of Chicago, Sec. 6-12, and reads as follows:

Duties of Principals. Principals of schools are the responsible administrative heads of their respective schools and are charged with the organization, supervision, administration, and discipline thereof....<sup>1</sup>

Note that the statement emphasizes that the administrative head is responsible for organization, supervision, and administration. The word--administration--which denotes such an important area of concern should perhaps be defined more rigidly.

Campbell, Cunningham, and McPhee speak of a similar problem of the many uses of the word "organization."

The word "organization" is a broad term. At times it will be used in this book in a form, legal sense. Thus, we shall speak of the organization of education at the federal, state, and school district levels. We shall also deal with the organization of intermediate units, most often at the county level, and of attendance areas or single schools.

---

<sup>1</sup>Board of Education, Rules: Board of Education of the City of Chicago, p. 55.

At other times we shall speak of "organization" in an extra-legal or less formal sense. Thus, we shall deal with the organization of the board of education, the administrative structure of a school system, and the formal and informal organization of teachers. Despite these many uses of the word "organization," we shall do our best, through modifiers and contextual clues, to clarify our usage of the term.<sup>1</sup>

This problem of language is an ongoing one and important enough for specialized research. In this study, after acknowledging the problem, an attempt will be made to define how the words and terms will be used and to be consistent in the use of those definitions.

#### Review of General Literature Concerning the Principalsip

The modern concept of a school principal has been over one hundred years in its development. This evolution in America has been influenced by democratic concepts as well as the influences of the established school systems of Europe.

Some authors of administration and supervision (Campbell, et al,<sup>2</sup> for example) state that to understand educational administration it is necessary to get a sense of the development of administration generally. It has been suggested that information pertinent to the development of the present concept and molding of the image of today's educational organization and its executives can be found in treatises on public administration, business management, industrial psychology, military leadership and in other writings.

---

<sup>1</sup>Roald F. Campbell, Luvern L. Cunningham, Roderick F. McPhee, The Organization and Control of American Schools, 2nd ed., (Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1962), p. 4-5.

<sup>2</sup>Roald F. Campbell, John E. Corbally, Jr., and John A. Ramseyer, Introduction to Educational Administration, 2nd ed., (Boston: Allyn and Bacon Inc., 1962), p. 60.

It is important to review some of the works of writers who have had an effect on the development of educational administrative and supervisory concepts and theories and, therefore, on the principalship.

Frederick Taylor is often called the father of the scientific management movement. His work was in industry and, in 1911, he published "The Principles of Scientific Management."<sup>1</sup> Some of the major points summarized in this early study were: time-study principles, piece-rate principles, separation of planning from performance principle, managerial-control principles, scientific methods of work principle, and functional management principle. Taylor took a narrow view of management, for he ignored the psychological and human aspects involved in mobilizing effort toward goal achievement. However, his work exemplified efficiency and his influence is still felt in administrative studies.

Henri Fayol wrote his book, Administration Industrielle et Generale, in 1916, and it was translated into English in 1929 and made generally available in the United States in 1949.<sup>2</sup> Fayol emphasized the possibility of teaching the principles and elements of management which were planning, organizing, command, coordination, and control.

In comparing Taylor and Fayol, it could be said that Taylor works at the operating level, with his greatest concern being with the workers, while Fayol worked at the managerial level with his greatest concern being with the executives. Both were concerned with increased efficiency in

---

<sup>1</sup>Frederick W. Taylor, Scientific Management (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1947).

<sup>2</sup>Henri Fayol, General and Industrial Management (London: Sir Isaac Pitman and Sons, Ltd., 1949).



industry or government and both tended to stress organizational process and to ignore the psychological needs of the individuals involved in that process.

Mary Parker Follett published a book titled Creative Experience in 1924.<sup>1</sup> She contended that the fundamental problem of any enterprise, whether it be educational, governmental, or business, is the building and maintenance of dynamic and yet harmonious human relations.

While Mary Parker Follett was one of the first proponents of the human relations aspect in administration, it remained for Elton Mayo<sup>2</sup> to provide, in 1923 to 1932, the empirical data in support of such a view with his now famous studies done at the Hawthorne Plant of the Western Electric Company, near Chicago. Mayo's findings were that while working conditions and wages are important to the worker, they rank second to social relationships and that how the worker thinks and feels is an important aspect of his productivity. Mayo's work greatly influenced the human relations and democratic emphasis in administration and supervision which followed in the 1940s and 1950s.

In Chester Barnard's book, The Functions of the Executive,<sup>3</sup> he emphasizes the universal character of formal organizations and stresses the need of a theory to explain their behavior. Barnard recognized the

---

<sup>1</sup>Mary Parker Follett, Creative Experience (New York: Longmans and Green, 1924).

<sup>2</sup>Elton Mayo, The Human Problems of an Industrial Civilization (Boston: Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University, 1946).

<sup>3</sup>Chester I. Barnard, The Functions of the Executive (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1938).

informal organization within the formal structure and realized that effectiveness and efficiency have to do with the organization achieving its goals. This achievement of goals has a direct relationship to the feelings of satisfaction derived by the worker as a member of the organization. Barnard is given the credit as being one of the first writers to introduce the interrelationship between organization achievement and individual satisfaction. If the principal is spending his time effectively, it is being spent conducting activities directed toward achieving the goals of the educational enterprise. Historically, writers in administration and supervision, like Gulick and Urwick,<sup>1</sup> have attempted to categorize the acts of leadership for all types of organizations in order to clarify and define executive responsibility. Gulick's answer was POSDCoRB, which is an acronym for the following activities: planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting, and budgeting. It is interesting to note that Fayol was a French engineer who later became an administrator in industry and, although his elements of administration were derived from his experiences in industry, his contributions to students in both public administration, educational administration, and private industry were great.

According to Campbell,<sup>2</sup> perhaps Jessie B. Sears should be indicated as the first writer in education to adapt the administrative process directly to the public schools. Acknowledging his indebtedness to

---

<sup>1</sup>Luther Gulick and L. Urwick, eds., Papers on the Science of Administration (New York: Institute of Public Administration, 1937).

<sup>2</sup>Campbell et al., Introduction to Educational Administration, p. 72.

earlier researchers, he concludes that the administrative acts are: planning, organization, direction, coordination, and control. Campbell cites the contributions of the AASA yearbook, Russell Gregg, Griffith and Hemphill, and Simon in formulating administrative activities. In 1955, the AASA yearbook described the crucial administrative activities as: planning, allocation, stimulation, coordination, and evaluation. Russell Gregg described the process as decision making, planning, organizing, communicating, influencing, coordinating, and evaluating. Gregg was among the first to introduce a new emphasis on decision making as an important part of the administrative process. Griffith and Hemphill, as a result of simulated activities with elementary school principals, offered the following formulation of the administrative process.

- Recognizing a problem and the need to be prepared to make a decision
- Preparing for clarification of the problem
- Initiating work in preparation
- Organizing and judging facts, opinions, and situations
- Selecting alternatives
- Deciding and acting.

Simon notes that the administrative processes are decisional processes and that the decision making with which we are concerned is not individual but organizational decision making.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>American Association of School Administrators, Staff Relations in School Administration (Washington: AASA, 1955), Chapter 1; Russell T. Gregg, "The Administrative Process," in Administrative Behavior in Education, eds. Roald F. Campbell and Russell T. Gregg (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957), Chapter 8; Daniel E. Griffith, John Hemphill et al., Administrative Performance and Personality (New York: Bureau of Publication, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1961); Herbert A. Simon, Administrative Behavior, 2nd ed., (New York: MacMillan Company, 1950), pp. 8-9, cited by Campbell et al., Introduction to Educational Administration, pp. 135-137.

Decision making is an important function in any human enterprise. Educational administration is no exception, as exemplified in this statement by Morphet.

Every organization must make provision for effective planning and decision making. Policies, goals, and programs are all defined by the planning process. Decisions have to be made concerning what goals, purposes, objectives, policies, and programs will be accepted by the organization as being legitimate. Decisions need to be rendered continuously with respect to the implementation of policies and programs.<sup>1</sup>

The principal's role of decision maker and instructional leader is a phenomenon of this century. His responsibilities and status have grown to the point that many scholars and educators consider his role the most important in the total educational scheme. The dynamics of society, however, keep the responsibilities ever changing.

Weldy notes the evolving role of the principal.

The principal's role expectations have undergone radical and significant changes in recent years. With teacher militancy, tight budgets, student activism, declining test scores, declining enrollments and new efforts to hold school administrators accountable for their schools, principals themselves have experienced some ambivalence and uncertainty about what their role should be.<sup>2</sup>

In 1974, the Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity of the United States Senate issued a report on the role of the school principal. The following statement, taken from that report and originally written by Epstein, is often quoted by educational writers.

In many ways the school principal is the most important and influential individual in any school. He is the person responsible for all the activities that occur in and around the school building.

---

<sup>1</sup>Edgar L. Morphet, Roel Johns, and Theodore L. Reller, Educational Administrative Concepts, Practices and Issues (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1959), p. 61.

<sup>2</sup>Gilbert R. Weldy, Principals: What They Do and Who They Are, p. viii.

It is his leadership that sets the tone of the school, the climate for learning, the level of professionalism and morale of teachers and the degree of concern for what students may or may not become. He is the main link between the school and the community and the way he performs in that capacity largely determines the attitudes of students and parents about the school. If a school is a vibrant, innovative, child-centered place, if it has a reputation for excellence in teaching, if students are performing to the best of their ability, one can almost always point to the principal's leadership as the key to success.<sup>1</sup>

A recent study by Weldy reaffirms the complexity and variety of responsibilities of the principalship.

Principals deal with a variety of issues and are in constant demand by staff members and consultants. Principals reported in the NASSP's study of the principalship (1978) that their typical work week was 56.5 hours. They reported spending their time in (1) school management, (2) personnel development, (3) student activities, (4) student behavior, (5) program development, (6) district office, (7) planning, (8) community activities, (9) professional development.<sup>2</sup>

The job of the principal has been described in a number of interesting and often colorful ways. According to Scott:

Principals are found everywhere--behind desks, at PTA meetings, in halls, on stairways, on buses, in and out of classes, up and down between fourth-floor storerooms and first-floor shops. School boards question them; teachers plague them; students alternately respect, fear and resent them; parents wonder at them and expect them to teach Johnny how to be a millionaire and still keep out of jail in sixty easy lessons.<sup>3</sup>

Ovard states:

The secondary school principal has been regarded as a warden, a boss, an autocrat, a will-o'-the-wisp, a slave driver, a good Joe, and occasionally a capable administrator. He sees himself as a person

---

<sup>1</sup>Benjamin Epstein, Principals: An Organized Force for Leadership (Reston Virginia: The National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1974), p. v.

<sup>2</sup>Gilbert R. Weldy, Principals: What They Do and Who They Are, p. 30.

<sup>3</sup>M.B. Scott, "What Is a High School Principal?" Clearinghouse (September 1957), p. 30.

who is harried, tired, lonely, imposed on, Jack-of-all-trades, back patter, father confessor, office boy and revolutionizer of the curriculum.<sup>1</sup>

Even the humorous descriptions of some aspects of the principal's responsibilities do not detract from the obvious need for the principal in this modern society to be a multitalented person. He must work with teachers, students, parents, and community as well as other professional colleagues and superiors. He is responsible for a physical plant often valued at several millions of dollars, and in addition, the business operation that he manages may be equally extensive. In all of these activities, including the major goal of the enterprise which is the education of students, he is the responsible person, the major domo, the chief executive, i.e., the "buck" stops at his desk.

One approach in organizing and studying the multifaceted perceptions of what the principalship entails is to review the research on the principalship. This research can be organized into four groups: the man, the social setting, the tasks, and the process. Following is a set of questions, provided by Ovard, which relates to each of these groups.

The man approach emphasizes the man as the person, the principal as a personality. What personal qualities are necessary to be a principal? What skills must he possess? Can these qualities be developed?

The social setting emphasizes the complex social forces that affect the secondary school enterprise. How does the social setting affect education? How do these forces affect the man and his position? Are all school situations the same or is each one different--just as the principals are different?

---

<sup>1</sup>Glen F. Ovard, Administration of the Changing Secondary School (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1966), p. 3.

The process approach emphasizes the dimensions of the administrator's actions or processes. What acts does he perform? What are the processes involved in secondary school administration? Are these acts common to all principals and school administrators?

The tasks approach emphasizes the specific jobs to be done. What does a principal need to know about organizing the school day, financial affairs, physical facilities, community relations? How does he work with faculty, staff, and students? What are his major functions.<sup>1</sup>

Studies of what constitutes effective leadership have been written in areas of government and business as well as in education. Leaders have been analyzed for leadership traits in the hope that some universal traits which were characteristic of all leaders could be discovered. In 1940, Charles Bird<sup>2</sup> surveyed the studies concerned with the trait approach and he discovered 79 traits which were identified in 20 different studies. There were only five percent of these traits which were common to four or more of the investigations.

From the 1940s to the present time, there has been a shift in the type of studies dealing with the trait approach from leadership typology, studies related to the biographies of leaders, studies of motivation to the present emphasis which is the study of leadership in the group setting. The studies of effective leadership seem to indicate that leadership and the person being studied cannot be separated. Personal characteristics and leadership abilities are closely intertwined; however, the role of leaders in a specific situation may require a very special and unique set of characteristics while another situation may require an

---

<sup>1</sup>Glen F. Ovard, Administration of the Changing Secondary School, p. 4.

<sup>2</sup>Charles Bird, Social Psychology (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1940), p. 564, as cited in Ovard, p. 5.

entirely different and opposite set of characteristics. Ovard believes that the placement of a principal should be in terms of the situation and its needs and that the principal's personality should meet the needs of the situation. He does concede that there does exist an image of the modern principal and the required characteristics of that person.

Research studies also tend to agree that a principal ought to be: intelligent, healthy, self-confident, sociable, considerate of others, professional-minded, and morally strong.

It is impossible to understand the social setting of the school principal without understanding the complex and dynamic changes of society that continue to impact on the schools. The past several months have brought some interesting times. Newspapers, in the spring of 1981, ran headlines that one out of every four teachers nationwide (25 percent of the teaching force) would be without teaching jobs by the fall of 1981. National inflation in this period is seldom calculated in single figures. School boards have bitter battles with communities which vote down all bond issues and yet refuse to close schools that have declining populations and accumulated safety hazards because maintenance has been deferred. In this same period, there is a reduction of the federal role in education expressed in budgetary retrenchment, consolidation and block grant proposals, and deregulations.

The restrictive forces have not muted the knowledge explosion or the continued demand for education for an increased number of people from all social classes. There also remains the great stress on scientific discovery and the anxiety over world tensions and the threat of war and an atomic catastrophe. These national and international pressures are



exacerbated in some areas, particularly urban communities in the northeastern and midwestern regions of the United States by a high unemployment rate.

Lortie states that in all of the variations of characteristics necessary for conducting the school principalship, two of the most common areas were the principalship as a highly personal, interactive role, and the principal as the head of the school.<sup>1</sup> In his role as the chief administrator, the principal has a number of formal and informal encounters daily with individuals and groups who have some involvement with the school. These persons--teachers, pupils, parents, administrators, colleagues, supervisors, monitors from the central, district, state, and federal offices, and community and business persons--are all functioning in and affected by events of their social environment. The principal, as the official leader in the school setting, has a number of these encounters, which may be intense or casual, formal or informal, but it is in these milieus that he must make a myriad of decisions in each working day.

Van Cleve Morris<sup>2</sup> calls attention to the fact that in the 1950s and 1960s scholars took a cue from social science research and management literature to direct attention to the client publics the school administrators must deal with--the people the principal works for, works with, and works against--in performing their daily administrative tasks. The

---

<sup>1</sup> Dan C. Lortie, School Teacher: A Sociological Study (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1975).

<sup>2</sup> Van Cleve Morris, Robert L. Crowson, Emanuel Hurwitz, Jr., and Cynthia Porter-Gehrie, The Urban Principal: Discretionary Decision Making in a Large Educational Organization. The report of a research project funded by the National Institute of Education to the College of Education, University of Illinois at Chicago Circle, Chicago, Illinois, March 1981.

principal is expected to respond to an array of individuals and groups, among whom are teachers, pupils, superintendent and central office staff, members of the Board of Education, parents, community groups, government agencies, the courts, and business organizations.

It is evident that, as educators and researchers seek commonalities in social forces affecting all schools, each school and local community is different. It is this difference, this uniqueness, that must be addressed if the principal is to attune his attributes and characteristics to the special needs of his school.

Writers and researchers who study the principalship, stressing the process approach, are concerned primarily with the authority and responsibility of the principal and the process of administration by which specific acts are executed.

According to Ovard, "Two of the essentials in an adequate analysis of effective leadership are authority and responsibility. Authority without responsibility brings chaos. Responsibility without authority creates ineffectiveness."<sup>1</sup>

Whenever human beings band together to work out problems or to plan for improvement, some type of organization, either formal or informal, is the result. For an organization to be effective, individuals must assume certain responsibilities and specific tasks must be performed in a predictable manner. When these tasks are performed effectively, the goals of the organization are achieved.

---

<sup>1</sup>Glen F. Ovard, Administration of the Changing Secondary School, p. 25.

The state governments have delegated certain areas of responsibilities for education to local school boards which have, in turn, delegated certain responsibilities to superintendents, principals, and teachers. In addition to the legal responsibilities delegated by school boards, educational personnel have a psychological and professional responsibility to the educational profession to which they belong. This responsibility, both legal and psychological, is necessary for the school system to operate properly.

In order to carry out their responsibilities, school personnel are awarded the necessary authority. Ovard relates some of the definitions associated with authority: "...legal or rightful power, a right or command to act, to have jurisdiction; power due to opinion or esteem, influence of character, station, mental or moral superiority; claimed or appealed to, in support of opinions, actions or measures...."<sup>1</sup>

Many of the responsibilities delegated to the principal are psychological. Many of the expectations of the clientele he serves emanate from the psychological position he holds as the educational leader and chief executive officer of the school. The teaching and nonprofessional staff look to him for leadership and expect him to give guidance and direction. The title of principal is in itself an indication that he is a person of status and in effect has the authority and prestige of the official educational organization behind his decision.

As related earlier, in the section on the legal basis for the principalship in Illinois, the principal receives most of his

---

<sup>1</sup>Glen F. Ovard, Administration of the Changing Secondary School, p. 26.

responsibilities through laws, policies, and rules set forth by the state codes, the board of education, and through the superintendent. Since it is true that, as the responsible head of his school, the principal must exercise his authority to achieve organizational objectives, it is the process by which this authority is exercised that denotes the quality of leadership.

Owens states, "It is difficult to separate the role of a principal as an administrator and as a leader as at time these roles may be in conflict."<sup>1</sup> He further states that he believes that the role of administrator and leader are in conflict because the behaviors appropriate for each of these roles are mutually exclusive.

Leadership, as described by Tannenbaum, is "...interpersonal influence exercised in a situation and directed through the communication process towards the attainment of a specific goal or goals."<sup>2</sup> Stressing that leadership is a primary function of the school principal, Ovard states that the improvement of instruction and the instructional program is the principal's unique task. He draws the following conclusions regarding the principal's duties and the manner in which he spends his time. Ovard's nine points are as follows:

- The principal performs a wide variety of tasks.
- The principal needs extensive skills and experience.

---

<sup>1</sup>Robert G. Owens, Organizational Behavior in Schools (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1970), p. 126.

<sup>2</sup>Robert Tannenbaum, Irving R. Weschler, and Fred Massarik, Leadership and Organization: A Behavioral Science Approach (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1969), p. 316.

- The principal's response to the job situations determine whether the position is lonely or friendly, autocratic or democratic, open or closed.
- Total time spent on the job is over 50 hours per week.
- Certain routine duties monopolize an excessive amount of time.
- Important responsibilities such as improvement of instruction are often neglected for less important duties.
- The manner in which the principal spends his time depends somewhat on the size of the school.
- The demands of the job require the principal to have an adjustable personality.
- The gap between how the principal should spend his time and how he actually spends it can be improved.<sup>1</sup>

Decision is defined in Webster's Dictionary of the English Language as "...the act of deciding or settling a dispute or question by giving a judgment; the act of making up one's mind; a judgment or conclusion reached or given."<sup>2</sup> Since the element of choice or judgment is involved in all human activities, it becomes somewhat difficult to isolate decision making as a process. The process and function of decision making are crucial to the conduct of human affairs and worthy of all attempts to improve its conceptualization and operation.

Griffith states:

The key concept of this discussion is decision making. The position taken is that the central function of administration is directing and controlling the decision-making process.... It is becoming generally recognized that decision making is at the very center of the process of administration...."<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>See Ovard, pp. 20-21, for a more detailed discussion of the nine principal's tasks.

<sup>2</sup>Webster's Dictionary of the English Language, Unabridged, Encyclopedic Edition, s.v. "decision."

<sup>3</sup>Daniel E. Griffith, "Administration as Decision Making," in Administrative Theory in Education, ed., Andrew W. Halpin (Chicago: University of Chicago, Midwest Administration Center, 1958), pp. 121-122.

For many writers in the field of educational administration, the control of the decision-making process is the most important concept in educational administration. The other functions of administration can best be explained in terms of their relations to the decision-making process. It is therefore imperative that the concept of decision making be examined and the process of decision making be understood.

In the dictionary definition presented in a preceding paragraph, a decision is viewed as a judicial proceeding--information is presented and then a judgment is made concerning it. The judgment that is made determines an action. According to Griffith,

Decisions are closely interrelated with action, that is, change the direction of the action to a noticeable degree. A decision may be made to permit the present course of action to continue.

Decisions are totally pragmatic in nature, that is, the value of a decision is dependent upon the success of the action which follows it. Since all rational action is in terms of goals, the value<sup>1</sup> of a decision is related to the degree to which goals are attained.

It should not be assumed that all decisions take place over an extended period of time. Although the process assumes a number of steps, it is possible that the time periods may be minimal. The term "decision" is usually applied to all judgments which affect a course of action, regardless of the time frame. The concept of decision making not only refers to the actual decision and the steps leading to the decision, but also the activities and actions necessary to implement the decision.

---

<sup>1</sup>Daniel E. Griffith, "Administration as Decision Making," in Administrative Theory in Education, p. 123.

Practically every decision is one of a series. This practice of continuous decision making can be readily observed in the life of an organization. Decisions must continuously be made. Often it is impossible to determine which decisions are unique ones. This phenomenon is known as the sequential nature of decision making. Probably the most explicit example of sequential decision making can be found in the laws. Court cases serve as precedents for decisions which later become the basis for future decisions. In educational organizations, sequential decision making is also apparent but not as pronounced or formal. In educational organizations, those persons who most often affect the decisions are administrators. Morphet provided one of the best summaries of this phenomenon.

...Therefore, every organization, in order to be effective, must have the ability to make decisions. These decisions may be made by the leader, by the group, by authorities external to the group, or by a combination of methods. Regardless of how they are made or who makes them, an organization cannot operate unless decisions are rendered.<sup>1</sup>

It is important to understand that decision making is a series of activities (stages) which culminate in a decision or judgment being made. The decision or judgment action, however, is usually an important high point in a sequential flow of organizational events. The following series of writings were used as a basis for developing an understanding of decision making.

---

<sup>1</sup>Morphet et al., p. 91

The authors of Educational Evaluation and Decision Making

(Phi Delta Kappan) consider decision making as essentially a rational process which has a minimum of four steps.

- Awareness of need for a decision
- Assembly of alternatives
- Selection of the alternative which has the highest probability for success
- Implementation.<sup>1</sup>

Odiorne's book is written mainly for operating managers, heads of departments, and other personnel who make decisions and solve management problems. He lists five steps.

- Specific definition of problem
- Commitment
- Use of analytical tools to strap the facts and goals into a model for decision
- Screen options
- Transferring decisions into action.<sup>2</sup>

In addition, he suggests that the following steps be followed:

- Have an objective in mind before you start.
- Collect and organize all the pertinent facts.
- Identify the problem (the difference between what actually exists now and your objectives) and its course.
- Work out your solution and some options to it.
- Screen these options through some decision criteria.
- Set up some insurance actions to prevent failure in the form of controls.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Phi Delta Kappa National Study Committee on Evaluation, Educational Evaluation and Decision Making (Itasca, Illinois: F.E. Peacock Publishers, Inc. 1971.)

<sup>2</sup>George S. Odiorne, Management Decisions by Objectives (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1969.)

<sup>3</sup>Ibid.



In order to visualize the decision-making process, Kurfman offers the following ideas:

- Identify Decision Occasions and Alternatives
  - Define the decision to be made
  - Identify the goals of the decision maker
  - Identify available alternatives
- Examine and Evaluate Decision Alternatives.<sup>1</sup>

The decision-making process has been studied from many perspectives and by many different disciplines. Mathematicians and statisticians have attempted to develop comprehensive decision-making modes. Industrial psychologist and organizational analysts have recently focused on the processes which executives use in making effective decisions. Social studies teachers have examined the decisions made by presidents and other politicians in an attempt to help students learn from the past. Finally, developmental and career psychologists are currently focusing on the making of personal and career decisions.

Campbell states:

Decision making can be irrational or rational. In the first instance, the decision maker acts on the basis of whim or caprice, whereas in the second he deliberates and acts only after a careful diagnosis of the situation and a thorough consideration of the means used to achieve a given end. Our concern is with the latter. Rational choice has two major phases: problem analysis and decision. Problem analysis is aimed at finding the cause of a difficulty while the task of decision making is to select a course of action which will eliminate the problem or reduce its negative effects.<sup>2</sup>

Providing leadership in schools involves both problem analysis and decision making.

---

<sup>1</sup>Dana F. Kurfman, ed., Developing Decision-Making Skills, 47th Yearbook (Arlington, Virginia: National Council for The Social Studies, 1977.)

<sup>2</sup>Roald F. Campbell, Edwin M. Bridges, John E. Corbally, Jr., Raphael O. Nystrand, and John A. Ramseyer, Introduction to Educational Administration, 4th ed., (Boston: Allyn and Bacon Inc., 1971), p. 190.

According to Campbell, there are three important steps.

- Find precisely what is wrong.
- Locate what is producing the difficulty.
- Possible alternate courses of action.

For each alternative there are multiple consequences. Some are intended, others are unintended. The unintended side effects may be either positive or negative.<sup>1</sup>

A major task of the decision maker during this second phase is to prepare himself for these unintentional reactions, to evaluate their consequences, and to place them in the framework of the continuing decision-making cycle.

Literature in the general area of decision making is voluminous. This section of the review of literature will focus on the research concerned with decision-making models. A discussion of an educational decision-making model should include the Getzels-Guba decision-making model.<sup>2</sup> In this model the administration is viewed as a series of superordinate-subordinate structures operating within a social system. The fact that a superordinate-subordinate relationship exists within the social system leads to a hierarchy of relationships. There are two dimensions in this model: the nomothetic, which involves primary consideration being given by the decision maker to the goals of the institution; and the ideographic, where the major considerations are given to

---

<sup>1</sup>Roald F. Campbell et al., p. 191.

<sup>2</sup>Jacob W. Getzels, "Administration as a Social Process, Chapter 7, in Administrative Theory in Education, ed., Andrew W. Halpin (Chicago: University of Chicago, Midwest Administration Center, 1958.) Note Getzels credits Egon Guba with assisting him in developing his theoretical formulations.

the individual and personal needs of the individual involved. The Getzels-Guba model anticipates some role conflict as different interest groups relate to one another and to the decision maker in the decision-making process.

Braybrooke and Lindblom (Phi Delta Kappan) call the model most often espoused by decision-making theorists the "synoptic idea."

It is synoptic because it aspires to a high degree of comprehensiveness. In this respect, it requires the consideration of all possible consequences for all possible alternatives in terms of all relevant criteria. It is termed ideal because it is almost never possible to meet the conditions of comprehensiveness. When all conditions required by this model are met, the decision maker is led to choose the best alternative from among all possible alternatives.<sup>1</sup>

Another decision-making model of note is the disjointed incremental model. Braybrooke and Lindblom propose the use of this model in incremental decision settings, which are situations that provide for developmental activity for continuous improvement of a program.

Many so-called innovations are of the incremental type. They are attempts to make improvement in the present program without risking a major failure. Although there is little information to support them, the adjustments are small enough so that corrections can be made as problems are detected. As might be expected, such changes are based on trial and error and are iterative and serial in nature. They often require allocations of special resources such as provided by Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. "Congruence evaluation" systems are needed to support incremental change, and basically they would focus on the congruence between intended and actual increments of program change.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>David Braybrooke and Charles E. Lindblom, A Strategy of Decision (New York: The Free Press, 1963), as cited in Educational Evaluation and Decision Making, Phi Delta Kappa National Study Committee on Evaluation, Inc., 1971, p. 70.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid, p. 69.

In a further explanation of the disjointed incremental model, the following statement is given:

This model assumes that the decision maker wants to bring about small changes only incrementally different from the status quo and that he has little information on how to achieve this. His focus is more on the current needs and problems and less on ultimate goals and his method is problem analysis and successive approximation of a solution. Rather than attempting to consider all possible alternatives or to arrive at the best possible solutions, he continuously explores to improve the means currently in use. The kind of change he seeks to effect is developmental, rather than restorative or innovative.<sup>1</sup>

Griffith feels that decision making is more important than the other functions of administration and supervision. He states:

The key concept in this discussion is that of directing and controlling the decision-making process. It is not only central in the sense that it is more important than the other functions, as some writers have indicated; it is also central in that all other functions of administration can best be interpreted in terms of the decision-making process.<sup>2</sup>

He further states:

A decision does not by its nature have to be a long and painful process.... The term "decision" is applied to all judgments which affect a course of action.... All organization is built around a system of sequential decisions. Those who effect the decisions are functioning as administrators.<sup>3</sup>

The principal functions as the chief administrator of the school or, as some writers entitle him, the school's educational leader.

---

<sup>1</sup>Braybrooke and Lindblom, p. 71.

<sup>2</sup>Daniel E. Griffith, "Administration as Decision Making," in Organizations and Human Behavior: Focus on Schools, eds., Fred D. Carver and Thomas J. Sergiovanni (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1969), p. 140.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid, pp. 140-141.

Cribbin relates that, "An annoying aspect of managerial leadership is that the phenomenon is readily observed in any organization; yet how one becomes a leader defies precise explanation."<sup>1</sup>

Cribbin further states:

It seems clear from the discussion thus far that thinking of managerial leadership in terms of absolutes is futile. It is far wiser to think of it in terms of the interaction of several variables. The first is the personality of the leader....

The qualities that the manager possesses or lacks are not nearly so important as his understanding of what kinds of behavior and which characteristics are likely to attract or alienate the work group....

Finally, even the most outstanding personal qualities need a suitable area to be exercised effectively.<sup>2</sup>

Halpin suggests that we will greatly increase our understanding of leadership if we abandon the notion of leadership as a trait and focus on an analysis of the behavior of leaders. The behavior of the principal as a leader is greatly influenced by the formal requirements of the organization and the expectations of both his superiors and the persons he must supervise. Halpin further states, in regard to the dilemma presented by the term "leadership" that--

This dilemma of definition emerges from the fact that we have incorporated into the term "leadership" both a description and evaluative component, and burdened this single word (and the concept it represents) with two connotations: one refers to a role and the behavior of a person to this role, and the other is an evaluation of the individual's performance in the role. We have compounded this confusion even more by conceptualizing leadership as an essential

---

<sup>1</sup>James J. Cribbin, "Fifty-Seven Varieties of Leaders," in Readings in Educational Management, ed., John W. Goode (New York: AMACOM - A Division of the American Management Association, 1973), p. 168.

<sup>2</sup>Ibid, pp. 177-178.

innate capacity of the individual to manifest with equal facility regardless of the situation in which the leader finds himself.<sup>1</sup>

One of the most common complaints of principals is that they do not have enough time to complete their jobs. Principals are constantly in conflict between what they regard to be important and the daily minutia which seems to be necessary to complete, and yet prevents, adequate performance of the more important tasks. As one examines the variety of tasks performed by principals, it becomes understandable why the principal is called a jack-of-all-trades. The increase in the amount of work for some principals demands increasing amounts of time being spent on the job and more work taken home for evening and weekend completion.

Studies on how the principal spends his time have been common since the early 1920s. Davis and Billet stated that although principals were spending less time teaching, they were "spending too much time in routine administration and activities and not enough time on curriculum."<sup>2</sup>

Davis<sup>3</sup> believes that principals of small schools spend more time teaching and principals of larger schools spend more time in curriculum and instruction and in problems of staff. Davis and McPherson, Salley,

---

<sup>1</sup>Andrew W. Halpin, "How Leaders Behave," in Organizations and Human Behavior: Focus on Schools, eds., Fred D. Carver and Thomas J. Sergiovanni (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1969), pp. 287-288.

<sup>2</sup>H. Curtis Davis, "Duties of High School Principals," Part I, 50th Yearbook, North Central Association, 1921, pp. 49-69; "National Survey of Secondary Education," Bulletin No. 17, Monograph III (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, 1932), p. 117 as cited in Glen F. Ovard, Administration of the Changing Secondary School (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1966), p. 17

<sup>3</sup>H. Curtis Davis, "Where Does the Time Go?" California Journal of Secondary Education (October 1953): 359-60.

and Baehr<sup>1</sup> contend that there is a direct relationship between the size of the school and the manner in which the principal distributes his time.

McPherson, Salley and Baehr had as a particularly significant thrust in their research the need to determine if written tests were job related or were valid devices for selecting principals. They quoted that the research findings of Erickson, et al; Gross and Herriott; Hemphill, et al; Lipham; Peble; and Shultz, had generally attested to the lack of high correlation between academic preparation and on-the-job performance as a school principal.<sup>2</sup> These issues had come under fire in civil rights court cases as a result of the amended Civil Rights Act of 1972, which for the first time brought state and local governments and their agencies and public and private schools under the provisions of Title VII of the act. This and other issues provided McPherson, Salley and Baehr to embark on a research project on the principalship which had six major goals:

- To describe the basic functions of the principal's job
- To describe the many different conditions under which principals work

---

<sup>1</sup>R.B. McPherson, Columbus Salley, and Melany E. Baehr, A National Occupational Analysis of the School Principalship, Industrial Relations Center, University of Chicago, 1975.

<sup>2</sup>Donald A. Erickson, R. Jean Hills, and Norman Robinson, Educational Flexibility in an Urban School District (Vancouver: Educational Research Institute of British Columbia, 1970); Neal Gross and Robert E. Herriott, Staff Leadership in Public Schools: A Sociological Inquiry (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1965); John K. Hemphill, Daniel E. Griffith, and Norman Frederiksen, Administrative Performance and Personality (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1962); James Lipham, "Personal Variables of Effective Administrators," Administrator's Notebook 9 (September 1960); Kenneth J. Preble, Jr., "Success in Administration: The Judges and the Judged" (doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1962); William C. Schultz, Procedures for Identifying Persons with Potential for Public School Positions (Berkeley: University of California, Cooperative Research Project No. 1076, [1966]).

- To develop training programs to help prepare principals
- To develop job classification programs--whereby principals and their supervisors could reach agreement as to what functions were the most important in a particular school
- To establish procedures for the selection of principals which were consistent with findings
- To design improved evaluation methods.<sup>1</sup>

This research produced three major findings:

1. Variables related to type and size of school accounted for the greatest number of differentiations in the way principals described their jobs, although socioeconomic status and ethnic composition of student body and teaching staff made a sizeable contribution.
2. Personal characteristics of the principal produced the fewest differentiations. There were, however, some differentiations based on race and sex that should not be overlooked.
3. The age of the principal and years in present position yielded no significant differentiations.<sup>2</sup>

The major job dimensions in McPherson's study were relations with people and groups, curriculum, personnel administration and general administration. The other variables considered were the personal characteristics of the principal, individual school characteristics and ethnic and socioeconomic characteristics of the student body.

It would be safe to state that there is no controversy as to what are the most important tasks the principal should complete. Researchers seem to agree that the major objective of the school is education--the primary function of the principal being the administration and supervision of all resources toward the most complete achievement of that objective.

---

<sup>1</sup>McPherson et al., p. 3

<sup>2</sup>Ibid.



Changes in society, however, have impacted on schools principally in assigning to the school tasks which are no longer provided by the family or other social institutions. Social welfare of students is now considered a prerequisite to learning, and a host of programs from free meals to free medical and dental services fall under the jurisdiction of the school and therefore impact on the responsibility of the school principal.

Administrative style and educational theory come together in the day-to-day actions of the principal as he conducts his responsibilities as the administrator of the school. According to Newton,<sup>1</sup> most principals operate their schools on the basis of an eclectic educational theory. After years of professional preparation and observation of other administrators, they have developed a number of practical conclusions, attitudes, and beliefs which serve as guides to their daily decision making. How the principal perceives himself as a person compiled with how he perceives others also serves as an important part of that eclectic educational theory. Since the work of Elton Mayo at the Hawthorne Plant in Cicero, Illinois,<sup>2</sup> most models of organizational theory have had at least two dimensions: organizational structure and human activities within that structure.

---

<sup>1</sup>Robert R. Newton, "Educational Theories and Administrative Styles," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin 64 (March 1980): 76-86.

<sup>2</sup>Elton Mayo

Educational researchers have derived a body of knowledge regarding the principal from their interest in role theory and leadership behavior. An example is Lipham and Hoeh.<sup>1</sup> Other examples are studies by Halpin<sup>2</sup> in which he used the Leadership Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) to determine the qualities of initiating structure and consideration among school principals; the Halpin and Croft research of Organizational Climate Description Questionnaire (OCDQ) in 1963,<sup>3</sup> and the Gross and Herriott<sup>4</sup> investigation of the impact of the elementary school principal in influencing teachers.

Van Cleve Morris, et al feel that the emphasis on role theory and leadership in past studies may have resulted in a body of literature that has been overly keyed into questions of administrator-teacher interaction, instructional leadership, and school change. Morris, et al state:

It has become a fundamental tenet of the job, that the site level administrator in education should be "instructional leader" of his or her school (see Jacobson, Loysdon, and Wiegman, 1973; Roe and Drake, 1980; and Lipham and Hoeh, 1974). What hasn't been clear over the years, however, is whether the on-the-job behavior of the school principal is at all consonant with such a role emphasis.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>James M. Lipham and James A. Hoeh, Jr., The Principalship: Foundations and Functions (New York: Harper and Roe Publishers, 1974).

<sup>2</sup>Andrew W. Halpin, Theory and Research in Administration, with a Foreword by Roald F. Campbell (New York: The MacMillan Company, 1966.)

<sup>3</sup>Andrew W. Halpin and Donald B. Croft, "The Organizational Climate of Schools," Administrator's Notebook XI, no. 7 (March 1963).

<sup>4</sup>Neal Gross and Robert E. Herriott, Staff Leadership in Public Schools (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1965).

<sup>5</sup>Morris et al., p. 13.

## Summary of the Review of General Literature

The position of school principal has its legal basis in state school codes, in the rules and regulations of local boards of education, and in the local school system's membership in regional accrediting agencies. These documents describe the position in terms of the requirements necessary for the position, in general categories, such as chief supervisory officer; by the actions he (the principal) must take, such as supervision, coordinating, administering, and lastly, by his reporting relationships to the Board of Education and to the general superintendent.

The position of school principal has evolved to a professional position borrowing concepts liberally from other professions, such as the military, government, business and public administration. The thrust of school leadership theory has moved from scientific management to the more democratized and human-related theories of human resources management. Contributors to this historical development, to name a few, have been Taylor, Fayol, Follett, Mayo, and Barnard. POSDCoRB is the acronym for: planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting, and budgeting. This list of functions of the executive, developed by Gulick, has had a profound and lasting effect on a conceptualization of educational administration and supervision.

The functions of the executive may remain constant--how he carries them out may change radically. Leadership may be exercised in a democratic or autocratic manner. Decisions may be determined by individuals or groups. Research into leadership styles and active social science research have greatly impacted on the "what" and "how" of how an administrator and supervisor should operate. Some recent studies have indicated that previous

research may have been too prescriptive oriented and not based on the actual day-to-day development of the profession.

Today's school principal operates in an environment of great social change. Federal involvement in education reached its zenith from 1965 to 1980, developing budgets in the billions and influencing 90 per cent of the nation's public schools. The Reagan administration, however, beginning in 1981, begins to plan and initiate cuts in the budget, some deregulations, and consolidation of many programs into block grants.

The school principal continues to conduct his responsibilities according to formal and legal mandates and yet the social imperatives, such as teacher militancy, increased parental involvement, increased non-academic pupil needs, and declining test scores are unavoidable determinants to the way he spends his time and the way he conducts his operation. He is influenced also by his professional training, how he views both personnel and his responsibilities. As the chief decision maker of the school, every major impact on his school must be calculated in terms of its ultimate positive or negative contribution to the achievement of the school's objectives.

Government programs have provided increased professional and para-professional staff, materials, and resources at the local school level. These programs have also required proposals, reports, evaluations, special groupings of pupils, and a myriad of other activities which the principal must engage in and administer.

Summary of the Review of Literature  
As Related to the Five Research Questions

Research Question 1. What is the impact of federal programs on the role of the principal as one charged with the responsibility to supervise the program of instruction?

The improvement and maintenance of the instructional program is recognized by researchers and practitioners as perhaps the most important function of the principal. Some difficulty is encountered in isolating this activity because practically all activities can be included under the broad heading of "improvement of instruction" or "educational leadership." The literature in the general section and in the section on supervision deals primarily with task definitions, leadership studies, and studies of time distribution. Information regarding the impact of federal programs or other impact remains to be determined. The Rand Studies, Berman and others (1977),<sup>1</sup> Berman and others (1975),<sup>2</sup> and Hill and others (1979),<sup>3</sup> are initial investigations regarding general impacts on the principal as the administrator.

Supervision in this study is defined as action aimed at the improvement of instruction and the instructional program. Among the specific activities the principal will engage in are classroom visitation and the conferences which might follow evaluation conferences, and instructional meetings concerning lesson plans and teaching strategies. Thirteen of the twenty-two itemized statements developed from the rules and regulations of the Board of Education of the City of Chicago, the Illinois school code, and The North Central Association of Schools and Colleges can be

---

<sup>1</sup>Paul Berman et al., ...Factors Affecting Implementation and Continuation, R-1589/7-HEW (California: The Rand Corp., April 1977).

<sup>2</sup>Paul Berman and Milbrey Wallin McLaughlin, Implementing and Sustaining Innovation: Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Vol. VII: The Findings in Review, R-1589/8-HEW (California: Rand Corp., 1975.)

<sup>3</sup>Hill et al., 1979.

placed under the heading of supervision, administration and instructional leadership. Supervision of the program of instruction, included with instructional leadership, is recognized in the literature and by the principals themselves as perhaps their number one concern.

Sergiovanni and Starratt give the following definition of supervision:

Broadly defined, it encompasses all the functions and problems that are associated with the upgrading of performance and ultimately the very quality of school programs depends on the insight, the skill and the dedication of these persons who are charged with overseeing and helping teachers in their work with children and youth.<sup>1</sup>

The above definition of supervision, like most definitions of supervision, has as the centralizing idea the improvement of performance and, as an ultimate rationale, the improvement of instruction. In their study of the sustained effects of federally supported innovations, Berman and McLaughlin list three elements which characterize a successful program: the quality of the working relationships among teachers, active support of the principal, and the effectiveness of the project director. The principal is the unique contributor in giving moral support to the staff and creating an organizational climate that gives the project "legitimacy." The principal's support is also crucial for continuation of the project. Unless the principal actively promoted innovations, even successful projects would wither away. The authors also express a growing belief that policy makers have overstated the influence of federal incentives on local practices. What is needed at the federal level, the authors suggest, is "more realistic premises" for programs.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Thomas Sergiovanni and Robert J. Starratt, Supervision: Human Perspectives (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1979), p. ix.

<sup>2</sup>See Berman and McLaughlin (Rand, 1978).

Calvin Grieder states:

The function of school systems is to provide programs of instruction through which educational purposes can be achieved. Personnel, buildings, equipment, supplies and everything else provided by a school district can be justified only in terms of their contribution to the program of instruction. Educational administration exists only to serve the instructional program... One of the major responsibilities of administration is to provide leadership for improving the program of instruction.<sup>1</sup>

Sarason elaborates this point in the following statement:

I have yet to see any proposal for system change that did not assume the presence of a principal in the school. I have yet to see in any of these proposals, the slightest recognition of the possibility that the principal by virtue of role, preparation, and tradition may not be a good implementer of change.<sup>2</sup>

It is obvious that the school principal is of paramount importance in any program for the innovation, improvement or maintenance of instruction.

To date, the research dealing specifically with the impact of government funded programs on the principal's ability to conduct his responsibilities as the leader in supervisory and instructional improvement activities is not extensive. The Rand Studies, developed by Paul Hill and others,<sup>3</sup> are one of the best sources dealing directly with federal program impact on the principal. In most other studies, for instance Herriott and others,<sup>4</sup> and Berman, Paul and Pauly,<sup>5</sup> the impact on specific aspects of

---

<sup>1</sup>Calvin Grieder, Truman M. Pierce, and K. Forbes Jordan, Public School Administration, 3rd ed., (New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1969), p. 203.

<sup>2</sup>Seymour B. Sarason, The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change (Boston: Allyn & Bacon Inc., 1971), p. 111.

<sup>3</sup>Paul Hill et al., 1980.

<sup>4</sup>Herriott and Gross, 1979.

<sup>5</sup>Berman et al., 1975.

the principal's responsibility must be derived. One study (ERIC ED. 196-982, titled "The Changing Role of the Principal in California"), discusses the increased pressures on the principal, the lack of time, the necessity to take work home, increased tension and loss of authority. The great demand on the principal's time is stressed but with little or no analysis of the impact itself or the principal's adjustment and reaction to it.

Some recent researchers, Wolcott,<sup>1</sup> Sproul,<sup>2</sup> Peterson,<sup>3</sup> Martin,<sup>4</sup> and McPherson,<sup>5</sup> studied how the principal spends his time. In general, these findings tend to indicate that supervision of instruction, classroom observation, curriculum development, and teacher inservice are not being accomplished as if they were as important to the principalship as the literature and principals attest.

Morris<sup>6</sup> relates that the principal's major commitments from a number of research studies are: working with students' and teachers' non-instructional needs, keeping up with things, social pleasantries, overseeing organizational maintenance, pupil control and extracurricular

---

<sup>1</sup>Harry F. Wolcott, The Man in the Principal's Office: An Ethnography (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1973).

<sup>2</sup>L. Sproul, "Managing Education Programs: A Micro-Behavior Analysis," 1979.

<sup>3</sup>K.D. Peterson, "The Principal's Tasks," Administrator's Notebook 26 (1977-78): 1-4.

<sup>4</sup>W.J. Martin, "The Managerial Behavior of High School Principals" (doctoral dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1980).

<sup>5</sup>McPherson et al.

<sup>6</sup>Morris et al.



involvement. Roe and Drake summarize this problem:

What is needed now is an honest national appraisal of the principal's role and an honest answer by parents, board members, teachers, superintendents and principals themselves to the question, "Do we really want the principal to be primarily an instructional leader or do we expect him to be primarily a manager of people and things?" Under present circumstances it is expected that the principal be primarily an administrator and manager. The instructional leadership talk is often lip service paid to create a greater self-respect within the professional group itself.<sup>1</sup>

According to Sergiovanni and Starratt:

Present supervisory practices in schools are based on one, or a combination, of three general supervisory theories--traditional scientific management, human relations, and neoscientific management. Traditional scientific management represents the classical autocratic philosophy of supervision in which teachers are viewed as appendages of management and as such are hired to carry out prespecified duties in accordance with the wishes of management. Control, accountability, and efficiency are emphasized in an atmosphere of clear-cut boss-subordinate relationships. Vestiges of this brand of supervision can still be found in schools, though by and large traditional scientific management is not currently in favor.<sup>2</sup>

Historically, the work of Frederick Taylor and Henri Fayol would be considered as the classic contributors to this point of view.

Human relations supervision has its origin in the democratic administration movement advocated in the 1930s and fueled by the writings of Mary Parker Follet (1924) and the now famous Hawthorne Studies conducted by Elton Mayo from 1923 to 1932. Teachers were viewed as whole people in their own right rather than as inputs of energy, skills, and aptitudes which could be related to effectiveness and efficiency by supervisors. In human relations supervision, supervisors worked to create a feeling of satisfaction among teachers, the assumption being that if

---

<sup>1</sup>William H. Roe and Thelbert L. Drake, The Principalship (New York: MacMillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1980), p. 10.

<sup>2</sup>Sergiovanni and Starratt, p. 3.

teachers had the feeling that administration was interested in them as people, they would respond by being more satisfied as workers, work harder, feel more useful and important and therefore be easier to work with, to lead and to control.

Sergiovanni and Starratt state:

Human relations supervision is still widely advocated and practiced today, though its support has diminished. Human relations promised much but delivered little. Its problems rest partly with misunderstandings as to how the approach should work and partly with faulty theoretical notions inherent in the approach itself. The movement actually resulted in widespread neglect of teachers. Participatory supervision became permissive supervision, which in practice was laissez faire supervision. Further, the focus of human relations supervision was and still is an emphasis on "winning friends" in an attempt to influence people. To many, "winning friends" was a slick tactic which made the movement seem manipulative and inauthentic, even dishonest.<sup>1</sup>

Neoscientific management is the most recent image of supervision and is basically a reaction against human relations supervision. This view of supervision shares with the traditional scientific management movement a great interest in control, accountability, efficiency and effectiveness. Many of the code words in this movement are "teacher competencies," "performance objectives," and "cost benefit analysis." The connection to business, industry, and management is obvious. This renewed interest in the task dimension and highly specified performance objectives at the expense of the human dimension of the enterprise has created a lack of acceptance on the part of some teachers for this view of supervision.

According to some researchers, all three images of supervision share a lack of faith and trust in teachers to exhibit the same concern for the welfare of the school and its educational program as school

---

<sup>1</sup>Sergiovanni and Starratt, p. 4.

administrators, supervisors and the public. Sergiovanni and Starratt state:

In traditional scientific management, teachers are heavily supervised in an effort to ensure for administrators, supervisors, and the public that good teaching will take place. In human relations supervision, teachers are nurtured and involved in efforts to increase their job satisfaction so that they might be more pliable in the hands of administrators and supervisors, thus ensuring that good teaching will take place. In neoscientific management, impersonal technical or rational control mechanisms substitute for face-to-face close supervision. Here it is assumed that if visible standards of performance objectives, or competencies, can be identified, then the work of teachers can be controlled by holding them accountable to these standards, thus ensuring, for administrators and supervisors, and the public, better teaching.<sup>1</sup>

In contrast to the aforementioned views of supervision, the human resources supervisor views satisfaction as a desirable end toward which teachers will work. Teachers are viewed as professionals who consider the accomplishment of important and meaningful work as a desirable end in itself. The human resources supervisor would adopt shared decision-making practices because of their potential for better decisions, teacher commitment and shared ownership of the decision-making process--all of these activities increasing school effectiveness.

Research Question 2. What is the impact of federal programs on the role of the principal as one charged with the responsibility to provide a program of staff development and inservice training for teachers?

Staff development activities in general are inadequate, whereas, the need for good programs are more crucial than ever. Teachers begin their careers inadequately prepared (Steig, et al),<sup>2</sup> and programs are

---

<sup>1</sup>Sergiovanni and Starratt, p. 5

<sup>2</sup>Lester R. Steig and Frederick Kemp, School Personnel and Inservice Training Practices (West Nyack, New Jersey: Parker, 1970.)

lacking in teacher involvement (Jones).<sup>1</sup> Studies dealing directly with the principal, inservice, and federal programs were lacking, although the literature relates that federal programs provided inservice for teachers and grants for teacher improvement. Programs such as Teacher Corps fall in this category.

Staff development and inservices are defined in this study as those activities conducted by the principal to improve the skills and abilities of staff members. Among the activities to be considered in this category are faculty meetings, conferences, exchange teaching institutes, professional meetings, college classes, and workshops.

There are some educational writers and researchers who feel that teachers are ill-trained and ill-equipped to teach today's students. Saunders,<sup>2</sup> in an article titled "Developing New Muscles to Meet New Challenges," examines the input of school colleges and departments of education in teacher education and exhorts them to improve.

In addition to bringing substandard teachers up to level, the principal is faced with the fact that education is not a static field. Children change, information grows, priorities change, and, most importantly, the school initiatives, which impinge on the school, change. Government involvement in education has brought with it many changes which

---

<sup>1</sup>Nina F. Jones, "A Study of the Effects of Individualized Instruction on the Attitudes and Behavior of Teachers and Pupils in the Middle Elementary Grades" (doctoral dissertation, Loyola University, 1975).

<sup>2</sup>Robert L. Saunders, "Leadership Development of Administrators: Developing New Muscles to Meet New Challenges," Journal of Teacher Education XXXI (January-February 1980):25-9.

demand teacher inservice and staff development. Individualized instruction, mastery learning, special education, individualized learning programs, basic skills, computerized instruction, and pre-school education are among those areas reemphasized or stressed in compensatory programs. These activities are coupled with the non-educational activities that are a part of the federal package which includes parent involvement and pupil benefits, which include food services at school and medical and dental services.

At the time when pupils come to school lacking many of the skills necessary for school success, a greater portion of time is required to service their non-academic needs. Steig and others state, "Improving the quality of teaching in the public schools has become an added concern in most American communities."<sup>1</sup>

The concern for the improvement of instruction and, in fact, the renewed interest in education for all Americans, characterized by the renewed federal support of education in the sixties, carried with it a commitment to improve the quality of teaching. Grants for advanced training became available and an integral part of most compensatory programs was their teacher inservice component.

The problem of adequate resources for inservice training at the university level is criticized in an article by Snyder and Anderson, who state:

Similarly existing programs will have to be reviewed with unprecedented rigor, university-level pedagogical practices will have to be critiqued and updated, inservice staff development programs for

---

<sup>1</sup>Steig et al., p. 102.

university personnel will have to be designed and energetically pursued, and the roles played by colleagues not only in the universities but also in the public schools will have to be reexamined and redefined.<sup>1</sup>

It is understandable that inservice programs are most often thought of in the context of teacher improvement. In its broadest meaning, however, it includes all staff. Jerry Valentine<sup>2</sup> relates that we often overlook the very obvious responsibility of the principal as the promoter of professional growth, especially the growth of fellow administrators. The members of the school administrative team, such as assistant principal, counselors, and dean of students, should surely be a part of the school's inservice program.

A review of the literature reveals that there has not been too much general success according to writers and researchers. Jones<sup>3</sup> relates that teachers have not been sufficiently involved and there remains the need to measure the effectiveness of programs.

Both the literature and the principals themselves, however, view the inservicing of staff as one of the major components of instructional leadership and the improvement of instruction. A recent article in The Practitioner, a newsletter for the National Association of Secondary School Principals, states:

The most prominent--and common--component of successful schools is a motivated teaching staff. Other factors such as community location, school size, income and occupation of parents and student expenditures tend to vary from one outstanding school to another. A motivated

---

<sup>1</sup>Karolyn J. Snyder and Robert H. Anderson, "Leadership in Education: A System's Approach," Journal of Teacher Education XXXI (January-February 1980): 11-20.

<sup>2</sup>Jerry Valentine, "Preparing Your Assistant for the Principalship," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin 64 (May 1980): 40-43.

<sup>3</sup>Jones, 1975.

faculty, one that "makes things happen," is the one constant for all good schools. Without this critical factor, the school tends to become ordinary and routine. And, as with other school attributes, the principal is the key to a motivated and dedicated staff.<sup>1</sup>

The article continues to define motivation as a devise toward fulfillment of personal needs and improvement of one's perceived status in relationship to Abraham Maslow's<sup>2</sup> "Hierarchy of Human Needs."

Arnold Gallegos thinks that the flurry of activity surrounding staff development is to a large extent due to economic and political pressures. He states, "Inservice training is to a large extent due to economic and political pressures with a direct relationship to power, to the control of salaries granted, and in the case of higher education, to survival."<sup>3</sup>

Research Question 3. What is the impact of federal programs on the role of the principal as one charged with the responsibility to carry out long-range educational planning?

The literature related to long-range planning most often considers this area as being primarily a responsibility of the superintendent rather than the principal. Interestingly, however, federal programs, with their stress on innovation (Berman and Pauly)<sup>4</sup> and their annual proposals, evaluations and funding (Cronin),<sup>5</sup> have made an impact on the schools'

---

<sup>1</sup>The Practitioner: A Newsletter for the On-line Administrator Providing Leadership for Teacher Motivation, National Association of Secondary School Principals V (November 1978): p. 1.

<sup>2</sup>Abraham Maslow, Eupsychian Management (Homewood, Illinois: Richard D. Irwin Inc., 1965).

<sup>3</sup>Arnold M. Gallegos, "Politics and Realities of Staff Development," Journal of Teacher Education (January-February 1980): p. 21.

<sup>4</sup>Berman and Pauly, 1975.

<sup>5</sup>Joseph M. Cronin, "The Federal Takeover: Should the Junior Partner Run the Firm," Phi Delta Kappan 57 (April 1976).

approach to long-range planning. The literature is sparse or nonexistent, however, in regard to specific impact or how principals have adjusted to it. The literature (Campbell);<sup>1</sup> (Roe and Drake),<sup>2</sup> stresses the leadership role of the principal and includes policy development as a major function of that role. As related by Morris,<sup>3</sup> however, some of the emphasis researchers and writers have placed on certain areas have not been considered nearly as important by practicing administrators.

In this study, educational planning refers to those activities the principal engages in to chart in advance a course of action. Of particular concern are those activities engaged in with teacher and/or parental committees to formulate semester, or annual, or even longer educational policies and instructional objectives.

Most often, the surveyed literature related long-range planning to the needs and responsibilities of school superintendents rather than to principals, although one reference, from a study published by Oregon State University (1970) covering "Issues and Problems in Elementary Administration," was located. It seemed, in the schools investigated,

...quite clear that two ingredients...determine whether the program is highly successful or...mediocre--the teacher and the building administrator. The best programs had strong...teachers working in close coordination with the building principals. Together they provided good supervision of...the program and developed long-range plans for effective teachers.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Campbell, in Frey and Getschman, 1968.

<sup>2</sup>Roe and Drake, 1974.

<sup>3</sup>Morris et al., 1981.

<sup>4</sup>Gerald Becker, Issues and Problems in Elementary Administration (Corvallis, Oregon: Oregon State University, Center for Educational Research and Service, February 1970), p. 6.



The extensive Rand reports documenting "Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change" focus attention on the importance of the school principal as the "'gatekeeper' of change, either facilitating or inhibiting implementation" of an innovation (Berman and Pauly.)<sup>1</sup> In the discussion of the process of change in the same series, the authors point to a "critical mass" of factors that is needed to "generate a norm for change in a school," and the major attribute of this critical dimension is administrative support. Examples relate to the value of administrative guidance for staff development, the instructional program, and needed modifications in school organization.

The Dynamics of Planned Educational Change, edited by Herriott and Gross, relates how federal assistance affects localities. The experiences of five school districts are reported in Chapter 3 titled, "The Federal Context: Planning, Funding and Monitoring." Successful management of educational change, according to Chapter 9, takes broad-based support and "collegial" efforts.<sup>2</sup> Michael Kirst discusses "top-down" versus "bottom-up" strategies for change in Chapter 11, "Strengthening Federal-Local Relationship Supporting Educational Change." He reiterates the importance of the principal and refers to the 1975 Rand report cited earlier. A promising method for generating esprit at the local level reported by Kirst is MAR (management and review) teams which bring in four

---

<sup>1</sup>Berman et al., (Rand, 1975).

<sup>2</sup>Herriott and Gross (eds.), Chapters 3 and 9.

or five visitors to observe and share their impressions and recommendations with local school leaders.<sup>1</sup>

In Educational Futurism 1975: Challenges for Schools and Their Administrators, the authors wrote (in 1971) their expectations for the schools of the coming decades and added an annotated bibliography.<sup>2</sup>

Educational Planning, by Banghart and Trull, defines the planner as contractor, implementer of guidelines, and monitor and evaluator of projects. He should be flexible, an institutional leader, a monitor of the political atmosphere, a communicator, and promoter of the project. The book draws on architectural examples from the past to illustrate successfully planned environments.<sup>3</sup>

Historically, planning is considered as an important aspect of the administrative function as far back as Fayol. Planning is represented in that famous acronym POSDCoRB by the first letter P. Morphet believed that every organization, if it is to be effective, must make provisions for effective planning and decision making.<sup>4</sup>

The role of the elementary school principal in developing policy and in the development of aims, objectives and purposes for the school program may be much more prominent in the literature than in common practice, especially in urban schools. The surveyed literature, as stated in

---

<sup>1</sup>Michael W. Kirst, "The Future Federal Role in Education: Parties, Candidates and the 1976 Elections," Phi Delta Kappan 58 (October 1976): 155-8.

<sup>2</sup>National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration, Educational Futurism 1985: Challenges of Schools and Their Administrators (Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1971).

<sup>3</sup>Franklin Banghart and Albert Trull, Jr., Educational Planning (New York: MacMillan Company, 1973, Chapters 1 and 2).

<sup>4</sup>Morphet, 1959.

the opening sentence in this section, most often related long-range planning to superintendents. Deeper investigation may reveal that the changing role of the principalship carries with it changes in the practice and subsequence of planning which has not yet been communicated by the literature.

Research Question 4. What is the impact of federal programs on the role of the principal as one charged with the responsibility to conduct school-community relations?

The general literature relates to school-community responsibilities in prescriptive terms as being of great benefit to schools. The concept of community power has placed new responsibility on the school administrator according to Burdin and Whitt.<sup>1</sup> The literature cites that mandated parental activities take a large amount of administrative time (NEP, 1977).<sup>2</sup> Most of the federal programs mandate parental councils. To date, most of the literature has only dealt with cost in terms of time. Unquestionably, the demand of the federal government and certain state agencies that programs must have parent involvement, and in some instances a parent sign-off, has created an entirely new relationship between the principal and some of his community. The Rand Studies (Hill, et al, 1980)<sup>3</sup> stress the additional burden that parental councils have placed on parents. The research by Morris and others<sup>4</sup> has begun to isolate in detail the amounts of time urban principals spend with their various publics.

---

<sup>1</sup>Larry Burdin and Robert L. Whitt, The Community School Principal - New Horizon (Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Company, 1973).

<sup>2</sup>National Elementary Principal, 1977.

<sup>3</sup>Hill et al., Rand Studies, 1980.

<sup>4</sup>Morris et al., 1981.

School-community activities are defined in this study as those activities conducted by the principal which ensure cooperation and collaboration of the school with its community.

Burdin and Whitt state:

Community power is a coming reality. The previous view that the local school could remain aloof and isolated from those that it was purported to serve is no longer a viable one. The changing concept of democracy that means all people are to be involved, not just those in power, places new responsibility on the building administrator.<sup>1</sup>

Roe and Drake<sup>2</sup> discuss the problem of defining community. Communities have been studied from the viewpoints of space, population groupings, groups with identical interests, interactions between local people, power structure and recently, social systems. Much of the current literature stresses the concept of community as a social system. With an awareness that a social system the size of a school district can be made up of several sub-systems, this study will accept the school attendance boundaries as defining the basic area of concern for the principal. All persons living and working in this area plus all persons working and attending the school are the principal's concern and a part of his immediate school community. In addition, the principal must be aware of the input from the other social systems and the output of his sphere into other systems.

An article by Winston Turner in the National Elementary Principal aptly states that the multiple demands on administrators place "Principals in the Pressure Cooker." Federal programs, for example, have mandated parent advisory councils which require large chunks of the administrative

---

<sup>1</sup>Burdin and Whitt, p. xiii.

<sup>2</sup>Roe and Drake, Chapter 9.

time available, along with the paperwork required by the sponsoring agencies.<sup>1</sup> The U.S. Commissioner of Education in 1978, Ernest Boyer,<sup>2</sup> reported at that time on the attempts of his agency to recodify regulations in "clear and simple English" and to cut the quantity of text. Boyer also called for ESEA funds to be expended in Leadership Institutes for principals to help them to grow professionally.

Fantini and Gittle<sup>3</sup> want federal funds to serve as incentives for broad-based decentralization of schools along with increased local control, both of these moves would place further demands on the principals to keep up contacts with the community.

Hill and others relate that mandated consultation with parents is an additional burden on principals. The authors further state, "ESEA Title I, the earliest and largest federal program, has required district-wide parent advisory councils (PACs) since 1965, and school-level councils since 1975. Other federal and state programs have followed suit."<sup>4</sup>

Some of the schools in the study have as many as six or seven different parent groups. The activities which mandate a parent-school cooperative relationship are:

- The regular school-parent governing group which may be a PTA group, a local school council or a combination.

---

<sup>1</sup>Winston Turner, "Principals in the Pressure Cooker," National Elementary Principal 56 (March-April, 1977): 74-7.

<sup>2</sup>Ernest Boyer, "Access to Excellence." An address given at the annual convention of the National Association of Secondary School Administrators, Anaheim, California, February 12, 1978.

<sup>3</sup>Mario Fantini and Marilyn Gittel, Decentralization: Achieving Reform (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1973).

<sup>4</sup>Hill et al., (Rand, 1980), p. 5.

- Title I ESEA
- State Bilingual Transitional
- Title VII Bilingual Education
- Head Start
- Follow Through
- Title IVc Experimental Programs

In addition, the principal has some legal and formal responsibilities in pupil identification, evaluation and placement in Public Law 94-142. Particularly demanding in this regard is the formal evaluation staffing conferences and the development of the Individual Learning Program for the student.

Morris and others,<sup>1</sup> in their ethnographic study of principals in Chicago, relate that the time principals spent with parents was almost completely devoted to conferences and frequently these conferences related to student misbehavior.

Research Question 5. What is the impact of federal programs on the role of the principal as the chief administrative officer of the school?

The literature stresses in detail the additional administrative burdens created for the principal in the form of administrative tasks. Berman and others (1977),<sup>2</sup> Hill and others (1980),<sup>3</sup> and Hill and others (1979),<sup>4</sup> all report the proliferation of paperwork and reports caused by

---

<sup>1</sup>Morris et al., 1981.

<sup>2</sup>Berman et al., 1977.

<sup>3</sup>Hill et al., 1980.

<sup>4</sup>Hill et al., 1979.

involvement in federal programs. Cronin<sup>1</sup> even stresses the need for proposals in order to get federal programs.

Administration in this study are those activities that the principal conducts in his office alone or with secretarial help. Among the activities are reading mail and other correspondence, responding to mail, calling and answering the telephone, dictating letters, preparing schedules, preparing reports and ordering supplies.

The recent literature in school administration highlights the increase in administrative trivia associated with government programs. ERIC ED. 196-982 calls the increased pressure on principals "demanding," with no alleviation in sight.<sup>2</sup> Newsweek magazine, in an article titled "Burnt-out Principals," relates how principals have new problems piled on "already weary shoulders."<sup>3</sup> Winston Turner, in the National Elementary Principal, has titled his article, "Principals in the Pressure Cooker."<sup>4</sup>

From the Rand Study, by Hill and others, virtually all of the respondent principals cited paperwork as a source of change in their jobs.<sup>5</sup> Their estimates ranged from nearly half of their time to two or three hours per week. The average growth was 25 percent or 10 hours per week.

In a study by Abramowitz and Tenenbaum, conducted at the high school level, 42 percent of the principals rated paperwork connected with

---

<sup>1</sup>Cronin, 1976.

<sup>2</sup>ERIC ED. 186-982, "Changing Role of the Principal in California."

<sup>3</sup>"Burnt-Out Principals," Newsweek (March 13, 1978): p. 76.

<sup>4</sup>Turner, "Principals in the Pressure Cooker," pp. 74-77.

<sup>5</sup>Hill et al., (Rand, 1980).

federal programs as a serious problem.<sup>1</sup> A study by Washington<sup>2</sup> reports that government relations ranked high as a cause of job stress.

According to a 1980 study by Diane Reinhart,<sup>3</sup> a federally funded project follows a life cycle consisting of the following steps: planning and initiation, building a temporary system, development and implementation, finally ending in institutionalization. Throughout, the principal plays a dynamic role that can either facilitate or restrain program accomplishment. His ability as a negotiator with competing pressures as well as commitment to the project are essential to its effectiveness.

The influence of state and federal governments is on "education," not the principal, in the book by Sergiovanni and others, titled Educational Governance and Administration.<sup>4</sup> Principals are the "line generalists," and although the chief executive officers of the school, they are symbols limited to their local communities.

Hanrahan,<sup>5</sup> writing in the NASSP Bulletin in 1976, suggests that the principal be organized, develop contacts, learn his way through the

---

<sup>1</sup>Susan Abramowitz and Ellen Tenenbaum, High School 77: A Survey of Public Secondary School Principals (Washington, D.C.: The National Institute of Education, 1978).

<sup>2</sup>Kenneth R. Washington, "Urban Principals and Job Stress," Phi Delta Kappan 61 (May 1980): 646.

<sup>3</sup>Diane L. Reinhart, "Life Cycles of Funded Projects and the Principal's Role: Principals' Behaviors that Facilitate or Restrain Project Accomplishment." A paper given at the American Research Association Conference, Boston, April 1980.

<sup>4</sup>Thomas J. Sergiovanni et al., Educational Governance and Administration (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc. 1980).

<sup>5</sup>Robert P. Hanrahan, "Influencing the Federal Legislative Process," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin 60 (January 1976): 62-7.



thickets of the education division offices and programs. On the other hand, Nathan Glazer,<sup>1</sup> a contributor to the section on training educational administrators, in The Changing Politics of Education, warns that the "scale and form" of governmental services is changing. We seem to be entering a "phase of regulation" where the "tone" is changed and becoming "punitive and peremptory."

There is no question that the complaints of school officials have provided impetus for the changes in federal legislation which are being proposed and enacted in the spring and summer of 1981. Proposed are bills which will minimize paperwork by deregulating many of the current reporting requirements. Block grants are passed to consolidate and allow state discretion in the selection of over one hundred programs, all of which at one time had their own specific RFPs, regulations and evaluations. T.H. Bell, the Secretary of Education (see page 17), calls the Consolidation Act of 1981, a step in the right direction.

Joseph M. Cronin, in a Phi Delta Kappan article titled "The Federal Takeover: Should the Junior Partner Run the Firm?" relates that federal regulation in education has increased much more rapidly than financial support. Cronin lists the following requirements for school districts accepting federal programs.

1. Many programs require a comprehensive written proposal to secure the money, and most programs and grants require considerable documentation and formal evaluation.

2. The congress in the seventies required more than two-dozen additional reports and studies to which the states and local schools

---

<sup>1</sup>Nathan Glazer, "On Serving the People," in The Changing Politics of Education: Prospects for the 1980s, eds., Edith K. Mosher and Jennings L. Wagoner (Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1978), pp. 29-41.

must respond. (For example, on violence in the schools or on the impact of title programs.)

3. The Buckley Amendment added new procedures regulating the keeping of student records and prescribing access to student information.

4. Other federal acts, such as the Environmental Protection Act, added new requirements for school safety and sewage and heating systems.

5. School districts in states using federal revenue-sharing funds for education must document compliance with the Civil Rights Act of 1964 upon request.<sup>1</sup>

Cronin goes on to relate that the end of federal regulation is not in sight.

Ziegler and others believe that parental political disenfranchisement, as exemplified in federally mandated busing, has occurred in phases. Phase I was the period of maximum feasible participation or full control by lay boards from 1835 to 1900. Phase II, the period from 1900 to 1968, is called the period of reform and efficiency, and Phase III, from 1954 to 1975, the period when the school came to be viewed by the political reformer elite as an agent of social and economic change. The current period, 1975 to the present, is Phase IV, a period of failure which the writers actually began in Phase II at the turn of the century.

Ziegler and others, in relating the ills of federal programs, state:

In its implementation, the ESEA created a new pattern of interaction, making the notion of lay control through school boards obsolete. To compete for Title I and Title II grants, local schools felt compelled to hire more administrators to write grant proposals. When proposals were funded, more administrators were hired to establish and maintain programs. Thus, the local bureaucracy expanded to do business with a national bureaucracy.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Cronin, pp. 499-500.

<sup>2</sup>Ziegler et al., p. 537.

## CHAPTER III

### THE RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURES

The purposes of the study, as presented in Chapter I, are to investigate role performance of principals involved with federally funded programs, to analyze these practices in terms of leadership theory, administrative theories, and conventional practices. The preceding chapter presented theoretical discussions and reports of research studies related to the job of the principal. These theories and studies provided a basis for refining the definition of the problem to which the study is related. Five research questions were formulated as a result of the review of literature. The research questions are as follows:

1. What is the impact of federal programs on the role of the principal as one charged with the responsibility to supervise the program of instruction?
2. What is the impact of federal programs on the role of the principal as one charged with the responsibility to provide a program of staff development and inservice training for teachers?
3. What is the impact of federal programs on the role of the principal as one charged with the responsibility to carry out long-range educational planning?
4. What is the impact of federal programs on the role of the principal as one charged with the responsibility to conduct school-community relations?
5. What is the impact of federal programs on the role of the principal as the chief administrative officer in the school?

The five research questions provided the direction for collection of information pertinent to the investigation as well as a basis for analyzing the data and drawing conclusions regarding the influence on the job

of the principal by federal activity in the financing of educational programs.

Chapter III presents the research design and procedures utilized in the investigation. A description of these follows in the discussion presented below.

### The Research Design

#### The Subjects

In accordance with the purposes of the study, the investigation was concerned with principals associated with schools whose budgets reflected a significant involvement by the state and national government agencies. Twenty-four subjects were thus randomly selected from a population of principals associated with the schools with federal and state funded education programs. Adjustments were made to ensure representation in the sample of schools with: (a) programs designed for educationally deprived pupils, (b) bilingual education(Hispanics), (c) programs designed for Chinese bilingual programs, or (d) programs designed to meet the needs of children of the migrant white population. The subjects, therefore, represented schools with white, black, and latino principals as well as populations. The schools from which the subjects were drawn were not located in any one geographic area of the city. Rather, they were scattered throughout much of the city. Both male and female principals were represented in the sample. Table 7, on the next page, presents characteristics of schools with which the subjects were associated. This table indicates that among the 24 schools in which the subjects of the study worked, the size of the schools ranged from 575 to 1237 pupils, in terms

TABLE 7  
CHARACTERISTICS OF SCHOOLS SELECTED FOR THE STUDY

School	Characteristics				School	Characteristics			
	A*	B*	C*	D*		A*	B*	C*	D*
1.	751	56	12	21%	13.	858	86	26	30%
2.	575	47.5	16	34%	14.	889	58	20	34%
3.	680	57	12	21%	15.	1,026	56	18	32%
4.	710	45.5	11	24%	16.	644	41	9	22%
5.	590	39	11	28%	17.	830	78	29	37%
6.	1,181	73	26	36%	18.	1,237	74.5	19	26%
7.	763	50.5	10	20%	19.	644	44	12.5	28%
8.	980	65	17	26%	20.	885	47	12	26%
9.	585	36.5	11	30%	21.	976	57.5	17	30%
10.	734	54	21	39%	22.	666	43	4	9%
11.	607	36.5	7	19%	23.	740	45.5	13	29%
12.	622	43.5	15	34%	24.	830	78	29	37%

\*A = Size of school in terms of average daily membership  
\*B = Total number of professional and paraprofessional positions

\*C = Number of government funded positions  
\*D = Percent of total positions funded by government agencies

of average daily membership. The size of the faculty ranged from 36.5 to 86 professional as well as paraprofessional personnel. The figures show that a ranking of the schools, in terms of the indicator used for school size, would not necessarily be identical to the ranking of the size of the faculty associated with each school. The discrepancy between such rankings would probably be an indication of a number of things. First, the average daily membership may sometimes be a poor indicator of the true size of the school in terms of actual numbers of pupils enrolled. Second, the staffing ratio for schools must vary with the needs of students. Thus, although all the schools targeted for the study were selected from a pool of schools considered eligible for federal funds in terms of student needs, yet the degree of need varied among the schools, resulting in a situation where two schools of the same size would have different size faculties.

#### Data Collection

In order to carry out the purposes of the study, it was decided, after a preliminary review of the literature and discussions with advisers and professionals within the field of educational administration, that the face-to-face interview was probably the best method of data collection. The interview technique was considered to have the following advantages over survey questionnaires: (1) the interview permits greater depth, (2) the technique allows the investigator to probe in questioning to obtain more complete data and (3) the researcher is afforded the opportunity of checking and assuring the effectiveness of communication between the respondent and the interviewer.

To reduce the likelihood of subjectivity and personal bias confounding the results, particularly in cases where respondents might be eager to please the interviewer, the following measures were taken.

First, the interview was scheduled in such a manner that ample time was allowed at the beginning to establish rapport with the subject and to assure the respondent that the information collected would be treated confidentially and would be used for no other purpose other than to answer the five research questions and to formulate recommendations for restoring the proper role of the principal where detrimental effects, if any, occurred. Second, each subject was given, ahead of time, a copy of the list of items to be used as lead questions during the interview. The procedure of allowing respondents to have the list of questions ahead of time allowed each subject to assure himself or herself that there was no other agenda for the interview other than what had already been communicated previously through a letter or telephone conversation.

The interviews were held in the principal's office in all cases. This location was chosen in order to afford the respondents maximum comfort. Further, it was assumed that such a setting would enable the subjects to recall as many aspects of the job as possible, since reminders of what the job entails abound in the principal's office.

### The Interview Guide

The interview instruments used in the investigation consisted of five sections, in accordance with the five research questions. As stated previously, these were: (1) Instructional leadership, (2) Inservice training, (3) Planning, (4) Community involvement and (5) Administration. In each of these areas, the perceptions of subjects were explored through a series of propositions to which respondents were to react. A description of the format follows.

Instructional Leadership. This area was explored by a series of three propositions. Proposition 1 dealt with the extent to which the role of a principal as an instructional leader was affected by the presence of government financed programs in the school. Specifically, the subjects were asked whether they felt the presence of such programs has a negative or positive impact on the principal's job in the instructional leadership area. This question was followed by propositions 2 and 3, where the subjects were asked: (a) Do you agree that government funded programs tend to decrease a principal's time for supervising the instruction program? and (b) Do you agree that government funded programs tend to increase the principal's involvement with administration and coordination of programs? These last two questions were asked in order to assess whether the amount of time a principal allocated for the supervision of teachers in the classrooms was affected adversely with the presence of government funded programs. The assumption underlying propositions 2 and 3 was that a principal cannot provide adequate leadership in the instruction area unless the principal's schedule allowed some time to be devoted to leadership activities. Where much of the principal's time was taken up by administrative duties, the thesis of this study holds that such a phenomenon would negate or suppress any activities on the principal's part to provide for the direction, motivation and evaluation of the instructional program.

Inservice Training. To lead off the discussion in the area of inservice training, the subjects were asked the following question? Does the presence of government funded programs in a school interfere with or enhance the role of a principal to promote professional growth



among staff? The question was followed by two propositions. These were (a) The presence of government funded programs tends to increase the work of a principal related to program monitors and evaluation teams from central office, state or federal agencies; and (b) The presence of government funded programs tends to decrease the time for the principal to spend with teachers and students talking informally. The last two propositions were asked as checks and trends suggested in other studies. A number of writers had previously believed that government funded programs had the effect of taking a principal's time away from the inservice training of teachers in order for the principal to spend more time with auditors and evaluators of programs from outside government agencies.

Planning. In the area of planning, the interview was initiated by the following question: Does the presence of government programs in a school enhance or interfere with the role of the principal in making plans for the educational program? In support of the question, two propositions were advanced: (a) Do you agree that the presence of government programs in a school tends to create conflicts for the principal in the development of aims, objectives, and purposes for the educational program? and (b) Do you agree that the presence of such programs in the school tends to decrease the involvements of the principal in developing policy for the school program? Additional questions were asked, depending on whether the intent of the investigation was accomplished by the first three questions mentioned here.

Community Involvement. Two questions were asked with respect to the role of the principal in community involvement. They were (a) Does the presence of government programs in a school enhance or interfere with the role of a principal in school-community relations? and (b) To what extent do you agree with the proposition that government programs tend to increase the time a principal spends working with parents? These questions were often followed by others where it was felt necessary to seek clarification in the comments made by a subject.

The area of community relations was included for investigation simply because of the statements in some publications that federal government mandates for community participation in government funded programs would impose a heavy burden on the principal. Thus, the subjects were asked whether they perceived such regulations to enhance or interfere with their roles.

Administration. For the purpose of the study, administration was defined to be managerial activities carried out by the principal which were conducted in his office without the assistance of teachers. These activities would include writing, scheduling, and other communication activities. The purpose of the investigation in the area of administration was to determine the extent to which the paperwork and deskwork associated with government programs kept the principal in the office rather than in the classroom observing teachers and students at work. Thus, the subjects were asked: Do government funded programs have a positive or negative effect on the role of a principal as the administrator and the head of the school? The terms "positive" and "negative" effects were defined as follows: A positive effect was associated with increased

involvement with the tasks of administration at the expense of other functions a principal was expected to perform. A negative effect was defined to mean the opposite of increased involvement, or a decrease in the degree of involvement.

A number of statements was proposed for the subjects to react to with respect to administrative duties. They are as follows:

The presence of government funded programs in a school tends to--

(a) increase in general the amount of paperwork for the principal

(i) I agree \_\_\_\_\_ (ii) I disagree \_\_\_\_\_

(b) increase for the principal only the paperwork associated with programs designed for pupils with special needs

(i) I agree \_\_\_\_\_ (ii) I disagree \_\_\_\_\_

(c) increase in work related to teacher union contract

(i) I agree \_\_\_\_\_ (ii) I disagree \_\_\_\_\_

(d) increase in dealing with the legal aspects of the job (i.e., seeking clarification in regulations and statutes pertaining to implementation of special programs).

(i) I agree \_\_\_\_\_ (ii) I disagree \_\_\_\_\_

The final proposition dealt with the views of the subjects concerning where the overall impact of government funded programs might be. With respect to this objective, the statement read: Do you agree with the proposition that the presence of government funded programs in a school has the effect of displacing the principal as a decision maker and leader of the school?

## Analysis of Data

The investigation was concerned with the perceptions of subjects who had first-hand experience with federal government involvement in education. With the aid of a tape recorder, the views of the respondents were recorded for later analysis. The tape recorder technique was used because the judgments given by the various subjects were orally expressed. The information obtained was analyzed in a manner similar to that of the factor analysis statistical model, except no conversions of responses to numerical values were made. This procedure proved to be appropriate for analyses purposes. The decision to avoid quantifying the data was based on the nature of information, size of the sample, as well as the number and types of items or questions discussed.

As in the factor analysis model, the goal of the analysis was to determine commonalities existing among the judgments expressed by various respondents. Each question or item was therefore analyzed separately. A consensus was determined for those who agreed with, as well as those who disagreed with, any given proposition. Percentages of subjects expressing opposing views, or merely different points but not necessarily in opposition to each other, were also calculated for the purpose of determining both the trends and direction of perceptions where a majority opinion existed. Finally, the perceptions of the majority, as well as the minority categories, were compared and contrasted with recognized administrative and supervisory theories. Conclusions derived from the analyses were based on these final analyses.

Results of the data analyses are reported in Chapter IV. The overview of the study and conclusions derived from the findings of the investigation are reported in Chapter V. Recommendations for future studies, as well as for policy making, are also contained in Chapter V.

## CHAPTER IV

### PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

The purpose of Chapter IV is to present and analyze the relationships existing between the presence of government funded programs in a school and the role of the principal. Chapter I indicated that the purposes of the study were to assess the roles performed by principals involved with government funded programs and analyze the practices in terms of leadership theory, administrative theories, or conventional practices. Five research questions were formulated for the investigation. They are (1) What is the impact of federal programs on the role of the principal as one charged with the responsibility of instructional leadership? (2) What is the impact of federal programs on the role of the principal as one charged with the responsibility to provide a program of staff development and inservice training for teachers? (3) What is the impact of federal programs on the role of the principal as one charged with the responsibility to carry out long-range educational planning? (4) What is the impact of federal programs on the role of the principal as one charged with the responsibility to promote community involvement in the school? and (5) What is the impact of federal programs on the role of the principal as the chief administrative officer of the school? The research questions were derived from a review of the literature regarding the theoretical and practical aspects of the principalship.

Chapter III presented procedures utilized in the investigation. Twenty-four principals, each associated with an inner-city school, participated in the study. The subjects represented a mixed group in terms of race, ethnicity, sex, the institution from which professional training was obtained, and the highest degree received. Such a mixture of personal and professional characteristics was desired in order to have for the study a group of subjects with a broad perspective, combined, and who are capable of discerning whatever alterations were occurring in the role of the principal as a result of increased government involvement in education.

In the investigation, the research interview technique was employed as the major vehicle for collection of primary data. During the interview sessions, subjects reacted to a series of propositions relating to each of the five research questions cited previously. The total reactions of the subjects to each set of propositions formed a basis for judging the direction of response to a research question. Since the study dealt with the impact of government funded programs on the role of the principal, the initial point to begin each interview was to have the subject describe what he thought were the most important tasks for the principal to accomplish. Thus, the first question was designed to allow each respondent to describe which responsibilities of the principalship he believed were most important. Specifically, the respondents were asked: "How do you perceive your role as a principal?" "What are the important tasks a principal should accomplish?"

1. The 24 subjects appeared to be evenly divided with respect to their perceptions of the role the subjects performed as principal. One-half seemed to see themselves primarily as administrators, coordinators, organizers, or facilitators. In such roles, much emphasis was placed upon the accomplishment of objectives that were handed down to the school from the district office and central office, or from an outside government agency. There was little emphasis on objectives generated within the school. Speaking for many members of this group, one principal said: "I see my job as a facilitator. We are guided by bulletins and mandates. The school is already in place--I do not create my school; I do not see the decision making." Many in this group, however, seemed to sense a discrepancy between the role they performed and the role a principal should perform. According to one subject, "I think my major responsibility is to be a leader in instruction...an instructional leader. That's the way I like to see myself, but that's not really what happens."

2. The other 50% perceived the major role they performed as being related to the improvement of instruction above anything else. Responding to the question--"How do you perceive your role as a principal?"--one principal replied: "Basically, first and above all, an educational leader." Expanding on this point and elaborating, another subject stated:

The primary responsibility and role of the principal is to motivate and work with staff to get maximum amount of effort and productivity out of teachers and related staff in the school; in other words--"leadership role." I think many of the other kinds of maintenance or technical kinds of responsibility can be delegated in many cases and should be delegated. I think it's the educational program of the school, implementing the program, monitoring and evaluating the program, making adjustments, relating the program to the district and central office and integrating the goals and objectives of the overall system into the local program.



These comments, reflecting the perceptions of the subjects regarding the role they performed as principal, provided a basis for analyzing alterations in the job of the principal as perceived by the practitioners themselves. The results of that analysis are discussed in the following sections.

### RESEARCH QUESTION ONE

WHAT IS THE IMPACT OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS ON THE ROLE OF THE PRINCIPAL AS ONE CHARGED WITH THE RESPONSIBILITY OF INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP?

The research question was analyzed through a series of three propositions to which subjects were to react. A presentation of the reactions to each proposition follows.

Proposition 1: To what extent do government funded programs affect the role of a principal as an instruction leader?

On a scale of five with alternative choices ranging from a response of "very positive" to "very negative," none of the 24 subjects viewed the presence of the programs in the school as having a negative impact on the role of the principal as the instructional leader. On the contrary, the majority of principals responded that the impact of such programs was positive. Seventy-one percent rated the impact to be "very positive" and 21% indicated a "positive" reaction. Two of the principals did not fit into any of the two categories. These principals stated that the influence of government funded programs was neither positive nor negative and their roles as leaders were not affected at all, one way or the other.

Among those who saw a positive influence, the following was a typical reaction:

I think the effect of government funded programs is to expand the leadership role. [It the presence of the programs] gives you additional staff; it gives you additional community kinds of relations to work with; you have to have first input of the community, consider they are partners in selection of the various or wide variety of programs; there are more supervising responsibilities, more monitoring responsibilities. It does give you a chance to be more creative in that you can widen or expand the basic program offerings within the school. It also gives you a chance to meet specific needs. For example, if you needed small classrooms or highly individualized instruction, because you have students who have specific needs in those areas, you have a chance to utilize a particular Title I program.

I think without Title I you would have a narrower program offering, you would have to be more creative and innovative within the existing basic Board of Education funded programs. I think it presents outstanding opportunities to widen your program offerings and meet the needs of your particular students.

One of the respondents, who was among the 8% who stated that the presence of government funded programs does not have any impact on the principalship, had the following reaction:

I don't think there is too much of an impact on an instructional leader because it doesn't give you anything extra; it doesn't take anything from you. You can do whatever you want as an instructional leader within the guidelines. The guidelines do not hamper you at all. The only thing possible is when we start talking about the inservices that are attached to the government funded programs.

Thus, the majority of respondents saw the presence of government funded programs in their school to be more beneficial than detrimental to their role as a leader. To many of the subjects, the opportunities offered by the government funds, in terms of program offerings and staff personnel, outweighed any other considerations. Such a finding was interesting in view of some published reports which seemed to fear that the leadership role of the principal might be endangered with increase in government funds for schools and the resultant controls attached to the

use of the funds.

Proposition 2: Do you agree that government funded programs tend to decrease a principal's time for supervising instruction?

The reactions to this proposition were particularly interesting. Although three-fourths of the respondents did not agree with the statement, the other 25% did and seemed to advance a good argument. Those who disagreed with Proposition 2 claimed that (a) government funded programs added more time for the supervision of instruction, since such programs brought more staff personnel to whom duties of the principal could be delegated; (b) the inservice training of teachers in the program does not have to be done by principals, since the central office and district office hire instructional coordinators for this purpose; (c) the programs took care of a number of needs of pupils, making it no longer necessary for the principal to personally deal on a one-to-one basis; and (d) some teachers were capable of assisting the principal with the inservice training of all teachers, capitalizing on the special skills developed through involvement with the innovative programs funded by the government.

One of those subjects who agreed with Proposition 2 had this to say: "Each one of these programs has a specific budget, specific requirements, and I have to go to specific meetings on each one, including night meetings. You can see that everything is a confusion. I would say that it cuts my time by two-thirds."

Another subject added the following point:

It [the presence of the programs] takes away; it eats into your time as far as supervision and that is the area that is going to suffer the most for the administrator. You have reports, you have deadlines and these take away from going into the classrooms to supervise teachers.

The reactions cited on Proposition 2 seem to suggest that the presence of government programs in a school is seen as part of the normal workload by many principals. The principals welcome the availability of the programs for they provide opportunities for the principal to serve pupils with special needs. Coordination of the programs is considered to be part of the supervision program. Other principals, however, and these may be in the minority, appear to regard the programs as an added-on burden for the principal. The additional responsibilities generated by the presence of government funded programs are regarded as an inconvenience and a distraction from the principal's main duties.

Proposition 3. Do you agree that government funded programs tend to increase the principal's involvement with administration and coordination of programs?

Proposition 3 was asked in an attempt to determine whether administrative duties and/or coordination of programs increased as the expense of activities related to the improvement of instruction, that is, instructional leadership. The result were as follows:

Fifty-two percent of all subjects did not perceive the presence of government funded programs to be a problem in as far as the time a principal has available is concerned. The prevailing attitude among the principals was that a principal has to be involved with administration and supervision of whatever programs happen to be in the school. The involvement would be there anyway, according to them. One subject made the point in a rather dramatic way when she said, "I wouldn't do my job any differently."

Of the subjects who did not believe the presence of the programs affected the amount of time for administrative duties, many seemed to employ the technique of assigning a good and experienced teacher to coordinate the programs. In this way, the principal would have the time to carry on with the normal routine. A few seemed to have developed the attitude that once good teachers were assigned to the programs, the activities would operate with little involvement from the principal. To this end, one principal stated: "I don't like taking much time to coordinate these programs. They can run without me." Then there were those who held the opinion that many of their day-to-day programs, in the area of student discipline, were taken care of by government funded programs, where students with special problems were cared for, thus giving the principal more time to attend to instructional leadership duties. This point was stated as follows: "I don't think they decrease the time I have available because their presence eliminates a lot of problems I would have to deal with that I couldn't. I find that I have more time now than ever before... you've got good teachers working in the programs and kids enjoying them, too."

On the other side of the argument, 48% of the respondents felt the programs took time away from their normal duties, particularly from the time traditionally allocated for supervision of the regular instructional program. One principal, who had strong reactions about the presence of these programs in a school stated:

I have to attend frequent meetings at the central office, at the district office, and I have evaluators coming out of my ears. Sometimes evaluators are here auditing the same programs from different departments at the same time and do not know the existence of other evaluators.

The other subjects in this group, however, did not appear to be as critical as this one respondent. Their reaction seemed to be that the benefits derived from the programs might very well be worth the time it takes for the principal to implement them successfully. The predominant response on the part of subjects in this latter group seemed to be that, although the government funded programs may tend to increase the principal's involvement in administrative duties, (a) the product is worth it, (b) the principal selects the programs designed to help him or her, (c) administration of the programs was part of being principal, (d) it is the principal to whom evaluators look, and rightfully so, and (e) "The programs generate a special kind of relationship with the central office and the district personnel that it really adds up to that kind of expertise and specialty that we wouldn't have access to."

The reactions expressed on Proposition 3 seem to reiterate the points made earlier--that the presence of government funded programs in a school is seen by a significant number of principals to be a distraction from the regular activities related to the supervision of the regular instructional program. This viewpoint, however, does not seem to be representative of the reactions of the majority. Many principals, faced with the need to implement government funded programs in their school, seem to resort to the simple technique of appointing a good, experienced teacher to undertake the duties of coordinating the programs. The result of this administrative ploy is that the principal is free to carry on whatever duties the principal deems to be more critical for the success of the school. A point that was not pursued during the interviews is why every principal doesn't appoint an assistant to take over the coordination of

the programs. All that can be surmised at this time is that probably many of those principals who did not delegate the responsibility felt such an act might either displease officials or render the principal ignorant of what was going on, thereby placing him or her in an embarrassing position with central office or state office evaluators and auditors. An additional factor might be that such principals like to have their fingers in everything and therefore would not entrust to a subordinate what, in their philosophical orientation, is considered to be a major responsibility.

### Summary

A summary of the statistics and the reactions of subjects to propositions 1, 2, and 3, on the subject of the effects of government programs on instructional leadership, presents the picture depicted in Table 8. The information presented in this table and a review of the reactions expressed indicate that the majority of subjects interviewed for the study responded that the presence of government funded programs in a school provides many opportunities for them to serve pupils with needs that were not being met before. In this way, the programs enhanced the role of the principal in instructional leadership. The time allocated for the administration of these programs does not, according to the subjects, affect the time a principal normally spends on activities related to the improvement of instruction.

A significant number of subjects, however, responded that the programs have a detrimental effect on the amount of time a principal devotes for instructional leadership. According to this latter group, the amount of time the principal spends with program monitors, auditors, and evaluators from agencies outside the local school, in addition to the

TABLE 8

PERCENT OF SUBJECTS EXPRESSING OPINIONS TO PROPOSITIONS 1, 2, AND 3

Proposition	Percent Expressing Opinion	Reaction Expressed
1	71% 21% 8%	Very positive impact Positive impact No impact at all
2	75% 25%	No decrease in time for supervision of instruction Time for instructional leadership adversely affected
3	52% 48%	No significant increase in time allocated for administrative duties Time for administration increased sharply



amount of time spent in administrative duties related to the programs, adversely affects the leadership role.

### RESEARCH QUESTION TWO

WHAT IS THE IMPACT OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS ON THE ROLE OF THE PRINCIPAL AS ONE CHARGED WITH THE RESPONSIBILITY TO CONDUCT A PROGRAM OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT AND INSERVICE FOR TEACHERS?

William Snead<sup>1</sup> made a study of thirteen school systems in the state of Ohio. One of the findings of that study was that federal programs had the effect of increasing the size of the central office staff. Very often, these additional central and/or district office administrators are given the role of designing federal funded programs to be implemented at the school level. The influence of the central office administrator often covers all aspects of funded programs including the inservice training of teachers. In view of such a systemwide administrative structure, the focus in the present study was to determine the extent to which the role of the principal, in the area of inservice training, is affected when multiple inservice training programs are provided for teachers of different programs by different categories of administrators and coordinators.

During the interviews, the discussion was based on one major proposition, followed by two minor propositions. The major proposition was worded as follows:

Proposition 4: Does the presence of government funded programs in a school interfere with or enhance the role of a principal to promote professional growth among staff?

---

<sup>1</sup>William R. Snead, "A Study of Central Office Administrative Staffing Patterns in Selected Urban School Districts in Ohio" (doctoral dissertation, University of Miami, 1971).

The minor propositions were stated in the following manner:

(a) The presence of government funded programs tends to increase the work of a principal in relation to program monitors and evaluation teams from central office, state or federal agencies; and (b) The presence of government funded programs tends to decrease the time the principal spends talking with teachers and students.

The reactions of subjects to the major proposition were as follows (see Table 9):

1. Seventy-six percent of all subjects responded that the presence of federal programs in a school had a positive impact on the role of the principal in the area of inservice training for teachers. This positive evaluation of the impact of the programs, according to the principals, was based on a number of reasons, such as: (a) "In my experiences as a principal, these programs have been leaders in showing me how to increase my involvement at inservice meetings." (b) These people teachers are getting inservice education above and beyond what they would ordinarily get." (c) "Without the federal programs, there would be no evaluation teams" of inservice programs; and (d) "We wouldn't have access to them [funds for providing the inservice education] otherwise."

The data cited here seem to indicate that the presence of government funded programs in a school has the effect of promoting and facilitating the leadership of the principal in providing for the inservice education of teachers. This promotion and facilitation of leadership is accomplished by giving the principal examples of how to organize and run inservice training programs, as well as by providing the school the necessary funds to enable teachers to attend inservice training sessions.

TABLE 9

PERCENT OF SUBJECTS EXPRESSING OPINIONS TO PROPOSITION 4  
AND MINOR PROPOSITIONS

Proposition	Percent Expressing Opinion	Reaction Expressed
4	76%	Positive impact
	12%	Negative impact
	12%	No impact
(Minor) 1	60%	Increase in relations with outside agencies
	40%	No increase in relations with outside agencies
(Minor) 2	50%	No decrease in time to relate with teachers
	29%	Decrease in time to relate with teachers
	21%	Unsure

Although the inservice education associated with government funded programs is not made available to all teachers in a school, presumably the principals feel there is a carry-over in benefits covering the entire faculty. To underscore this point, one subject stated: "The inservice teachers get through downtown makes my job easier." This viewpoint, however, was not held by all principals and a different viewpoint is expressed in point number 2 below.

2. Twelve percent of the subjects rejected the notion that government funded programs had a beneficial impact on the role of the principal in the area of inservice education. In fact, this group of principals expressed an outright negative criticism of the impact of the programs. For instance, one subject had this to say:

I do not know the nature of the inservice education program. This is one of the negative things. I do not know what is being presented to the teachers until afterwards. I do not know if teachers have a need of this material; I do not know if there had been assessment to find out if teachers had a need of such kind of inservice. In fact, I think that the lack of overall coordination with administration [of the local school] might be one of the handicaps.

This negative evaluation of the impact of the programs was supported by another subject who expressed the following point: "There has been an opportunity to enhance professional growth...one of our staff members here promotes the growth of the teachers. I don't think much about the inservices for some of these programs that are mandated."

An interesting point to note is that the principals who expressed a negative feeling toward the impact of the government funded programs seemed to be far removed from any administration, coordination or involvement in the inservice education associated with the government funded programs. This lack of involvement is made possible since, as noted

previously, the presence of government funded programs in a system generates a cadre of central office and district office administrators and coordinators responsible for the smooth operation of all aspects of the programs, including the inservice education for teachers in the projects. Therefore, there exists a likelihood that some principals at times might be tempted to abrogate their responsibility to the district office coordinators while they themselves remain passive observers or critics of the inservice training machinery. The proportion of principals falling in this category, however, seems to be significantly limited.

3. The remainder of all respondents, 12%, felt the government funded programs had no impact whatsoever on whether the principal's role was interfered with or enhanced. According to this group, much depended on the management style of the principal. In the words of one subject, "...it's determined by how you manage the whole operation."

As a summary of the data on the subject of the impact of federal funded programs on the role of the principal in the area of inservice training, 76% of the subjects interviewed for the study perceived a positive influence, 12% responded that the presence of the programs was detrimental, and 12% believed the impact of the programs was neutral.

The analysis of reactions of subjects to the two minor propositions on the subject of inservice education and the role of the principal is presented in the following sections.

Minor Proposition 1: Would you agree or disagree with the proposition that the presence of government funded programs tends to increase the work of a principal related to program monitors and evaluation teams from central office, state or federal agencies?

The reactions of subjects to this proposition were as follows:

Sixty percent of all respondents agreed that the work of the principal related to program monitors and evaluation teams from the systemwide and outside agencies increases with the presence of government funded programs in a school. The same subjects, however, rejected the argument that such an increase was a serious constraint on the principal's role insofar as inservice education is concerned. This point is substantiated by the following points, made by the subjects themselves, which represent the viewpoints of the group:

a. I would say that there is a slight increase, and if I were to put a percentage on my time, I would say it's less than 1%. I don't think that there are too many people who enjoy being monitored, but I know I monitor my teachers and I would imagine my district superintendent would not give up his right to monitor me; and I think for the money involved and for the benefits involved, I am willing to give up less than 1%.

b. I would agree [there is an increase], but I don't find fault with it.

c. There is an increase, but it seems to be the kind of increase that ought to be there. In any government programs, you are going to have auditors and evaluators. I see their role as one of aiding and not interfering. If we are doing something wrong, not doing it the way it ought to be done, somebody ought to tell us that, and I don't feel threatened by that at all.

Forty percent of the principals in the study disagreed with the proposition that the presence of the programs results in an increase in the work of the principal dealing with the outside agencies. This group, however, agreed with the former in that the presence of the programs does not affect in a negative way the duty of the principal to promote professional growth among teachers. The principals in this category seem to agree with the statement made by one of them to this effect: "I think if a program is run as it should be, you aren't too concerned as to who might

come in."

Thus, with respect to Minor Proposition 1, 60% of the subjects agreed with the statement and 40% disagreed.

Minor Proposition 2: Would you agree or disagree with the statement that the presence of government funded programs tends to decrease the time the principal spends talking informally with teachers and students?

This proposition was based on the assumption that the success of a principal to promote professional growth among teachers may depend on the principal being able to find the time to talk with subordinates on an informal basis. The responses to the proposition were as follows: 50% of the subjects did not agree with the proposition; 20% agreed with the statement, and 21% of the respondents gave neither positive nor negative opinions.

The subjects who disagreed with the argument that the presence of government funded programs deprived them of the time they would spend with teachers, believed that the programs somehow relieved them of the duty of dealing with problem pupils and they therefore had more time to spend with teachers. The contention of this group was as follows: "Since I have less problem kids to deal with, since more kids feel more secure in school, then more of my time is freed up for other things."

A total of 29% of the subjects disagreed with the argument advanced above. To this group, the programs seemed to keep them from doing anything else. The reason given by one member of the latter group was as follows: "I am expected to talk to each auditor when they [sic] come in, and see that they are given maps and directions to the rooms where they are going; answer their questions, and fill out their forms."

Surprisingly enough, some principals (12%) were not sure whether or not the amount of time a principal spends talking informally with teachers had been affected. It may be that this group of principals traditionally had placed a low priority on informal discussions with teachers and were therefore unable to notice any changes in regard to the implementation of programs.

### Summary

Table 9 depicts the pattern of responses to major Proposition 4 and minor propositions 1 and 2. As stated earlier and as indicated in the table, the majority of the principals see the impact of the federal programs as beneficial to the role of the principal in the area of inservice education. A small percentage of the subjects believe the programs to be either detrimental to that role, or to have no impact at all. Insofar as the principal's time is concerned, the majority see a slight increase in their relations with central office and outside agencies, but these relations were not believed to affect the amount of time a principal spends or should spend talking to teachers and students on an informal basis. Those who believed the programs took up much of the time they spent with teachers were in the minority.



RESEARCH QUESTION THREE

WHAT IS THE IMPACT OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS ON THE ROLE OF THE PRINCIPAL AS ONE CHARGED WITH THE RESPONSIBILITY TO CARRY OUT LONG-RANGE PLANNING?

On the subject of planning, Knezevich<sup>1</sup> believes that in an environment of continuous change, top-level administrators must devote more time to planning than to other administrative functions which can be delegated to lower-level personnel. The function of planning, according to Knezevich, enables the administrator to anticipate the impact of various forces and to influence and control, to some degree, the direction of change. Thus, in the present study, the investigation sought to determine the extent to which the ability of the principal to influence and control the direction of change in the school program was enhanced or interfered with by the presence of government programs. During the interviews, the subjects were asked one major proposition, followed by two minor propositions. The results of the analysis follows.

Proposition 5: Does the presence of government funded programs in a school enhance or interfere with the role of a principal in making plans for the educational program?

The reactions to this proposition were as follows. A total of 58% of the subjects reacted positively to the presence of the programs. A number of reasons was given by the subjects for believing the programs enhanced their role in planning. The following points were made:

- a. I would say the programs enhance the planning process because they enrich, bring the principal into new paths, and bring expertise into these new paths.

---

<sup>1</sup>Stephen J. Knezevich, Administration of Public Schools (New York: Harper and Row Publishers, Incorporated, 1969), p. 29.

b. If we didn't have the programs, we would not be getting academic assistance. Our programs are selected on the basis of input from staff and advisory councils.

c. The programs have me do something that wasn't in my style. Government funded programs forced me to include parents in my planning. While, as in the past, it was a good idea to include parents in my planning, but yet my planning was behind or something, and I waited to move ahead and that quickly fell by the wayside. Now, I know this is a base I must touch. I really think it's very good.

d. They [the programs] get me to be more communicative with parents in making sure that my plans and the plans they have are the kinds of things we should be doing.

It is interesting to note that this group of subjects seemed to judge the effects of the programs by the final product. Thus, if programs for the schools were in place, then, this was taken to mean the planning process was a success. The principals also seemed to point out the fact that the programs may force the principal to make plans for the implementation of the programs. This kind of pressure seems to be viewed as a positive influence on what the principal should be doing, anyway. This viewpoint, however, was not shared by all subjects in the study, as pointed out in the next paragraph.

A total of 42% of the subjects interviewed for the study believed government funded programs interfere with the role of the principal in planning. This belief was based on the following points, derived from statements made by subjects themselves.

a. I couldn't say these programs enhance a principal's role in planning. If I had no government programs, I would have a much easier job.

b. In some respects, a principal has to follow someone else's path.

c. The presence of the programs makes extra work; extra duties...

Thus, on the subject of planning, the subjects were divided with respect to their evaluation of the effects of government programs on the principal's job. It is interesting to note that although the majority (58%) believed the presence of the programs enhanced the role of a principal, a significant minority (42%) viewed the effects of the programs in a different light. The division in the ranks of the subjects, however, does not seem to be based on the philosophical orientation of the principals. Whether the principals were oriented toward leadership or leaned more in the direction of an administrator, both types of principals seemed to differ among themselves, with respect to the impact of the programs on the role of a principal as a planner.

Proposition 5 was followed by two minor propositions. The analysis of reactions of subjects to these minor propositions follows.

Minor Proposition 1: To what extent do you agree with the proposition that the presence of government programs in a school tends to create conflicts for the principal in the development of aims, objectives, and purposes for the educational program?

The results were interesting. All subjects interviewed for the study disagreed with the notion that the programs created conflicts for the principal in planning. This finding, at first glance, appears to be surprising because, as pointed out previously (Proposition 5), 42% of the principals had stated that the presence of the programs interfered with the role of the principal in planning. The latter finding would seem to contradict what the principals had said earlier. On closer analysis, however, it becomes clearer that the principals were reacting to different aspects of planning. In the former proposition, the principals were asked about the role of planning in general. In the latter, specific aspects of planning were singled out. Thus, when the question focuses on that aspect

of planning which is concerned with the development of aims, objectives, and purposes, a general consensus emerges among the subjects. Speaking for many, one subject expressed the following point:

I don't see any conflict at all. I would say one thing about the government funded programs--those that I had experience with are all good programs; and it all becomes a matter of giving a principal a choice of good things. A principal tries to tailor these to his own school--so there is no conflict.

The reactions of the subjects, with respect to Minor Proposition 1, will be compared and contrasted with the subjects' evaluations in response to the next proposition.

Minor Proposition 2: To what extent do you agree with the statement that the presence of government programs in a school tends to decrease the involvement of the principal in developing policy for the school program?

With respect to this proposition, there was, once again, a general consensus among the 24 subjects. None of them agreed with the statement. They all stated that the presence of the government programs did not pose difficulties of any kind or prevent them from fulfilling their roles as policymakers for their individual school. This proposition was, therefore, rejected.

This finding, as well as the results associated with the previous propositions, on the subject of planning, has an important implication. The findings seem to contradict the fears expressed by Gaylen Saylor to the effect that federal involvement in education presented a threat to the principal's role as a planner and determiner of education programs. Specifically, Gaylen Saylor advanced the following argument:

Yet there are...some threats evident in our present national efforts in support of education. Chief among these, I detect the following:

1. The stifling of the creativeness, incentiveness, and skill

of discovery of local educational leaders and officials.

2. Invidious control over the program of education itself.
3. Development of attitudes and modes of operations of dependency and indifference, of kowtowing to entrenched bureaucrats.<sup>1</sup>

### Summary

On the role of the principal in planning, the subjects selected for this study reject the notion that the presence of government funded programs in a school affects the following: (1) the principal's prerogative to make plans for the educational program of the school; (2) the principal's development of aims, objectives, and purposes for the educational program; (3) the principal's involvement in developing policy for the school program. The general pattern of response of the subjects' reactions to the propositions dealing with the function of planning is presented in Table 10.

### RESEARCH QUESTION FOUR

WHAT IS THE IMPACT OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS ON THE ROLE OF THE PRINCIPAL AS ONE CHARGED WITH THE RESPONSIBILITY TO CONDUCT SCHOOL-COMMUNITY RELATIONS?

On the subject of school-community relations, Neagley and Evans have this to say about the role of the principal:

The successful principal today most certainly is aware that lay individuals now must be considered as members of the team regardless of where he serves. He realizes that educational matters no longer are sacred. He is well aware that modern-day parents are unwilling to calmly sit by and permit decisions that affect children and youth

---

<sup>1</sup>Galen Saylor, "The Federal Colossus in Education: Threat or Promise," in School Administration: Selected Readings, eds., Sherman H. Frey and Keith R. Getschman (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1968), p. 42.

TABLE 10

PERCENT OF SUBJECTS EXPRESSING OPINIONS TO PROPOSITION 5  
AND MINOR PROPOSITIONS

Proposition	Percent Expressing Opinions	Reaction Expressed
5	58% 42%	Positive impact Negative impact
(Minor) 1	100%	Reject proposition
(Minor) 2	100%	Reject proposition

to remain exclusively the domain of the schools. Therefore, he will continuously involve parents in an advisory capacity in the solution of curriculum and instructional problems. Some parents also can make a contribution to the actual instructional program by serving as resource persons.<sup>1</sup> \_\_\_\_\_

In view of this theory, the investigation sought to determine the effects of government programs on the role of the principal in community relations as described. One major and one minor proposition were specified on this subject. The analysis of information collected, dealing with the two propositions, follows.

Proposition 6. Does the presence of government programs in a school enhance or interfere with the role of a principal in school-community relations?

The results show that 96% of the subjects believed that government programs promoted closer contact between the principal and parents in the community. They cited the following reasons for the increase in parental involvement with the school.

1. It is mandated that we have a board or school council. In going to meetings with the parents, they begin to see me [the principal] and teachers in the programs as people who are interested in their kids, and so I think it [the presence of the programs] helps.

2. In that several of the guidelines indicate that you should send out notices to the community about the programs, and I certainly use the PTA. For that it enhances community contact, which is good. So, I see nothing wrong with that.

3. Government funded programs bring more parents into the school than the PTA.

4. Simply because of the interest and enthusiasm government funded programs generate that you just spend more time with parents, and you get more parents involved.

---

<sup>1</sup>Ross L. Neagley and N. Dean Evans, Handbook for Effective Supervision of Instruction (New Jersey: Prentice Hall Incorporated, 1970), p. 116.

Thus, the majority of principals in this study evaluated the effect of the programs in a favorable manner. There was one subject, however, who rejected the proposition that the program enhanced a principal's role in relations with the community. The reason for rejecting the proposition was not made clear. Speculation suggests that this subject's involvement with the community had been already at the maximum level even before government programs were implemented in the school. If that was the case, then the presence of the programs could not make much difference.

Minor Proposition. To what extent do you agree with the proposition that the presence of government funded programs tends to increase the time a principal works with parents.?

This statement was posed as a corollary of the major proposition to determine the extent to which increased relations with the community resulted in a principal spending more time with parents. The results were as follows. A total of 65% of the subjects believed the time spent in contacts with parents increased with the presence of the government programs, as a logical consequence of increased relations with the community brought about by these programs.

About one-third of the subjects found no change in their contacts with parents, insofar as time is concerned. This finding should not be misconstrued to mean that some of the principals were unsure about the extent of their involvement with the community, since they seemed to react differently, almost in a contradicting manner, to the two propositions. The difference in the proportions of subjects agreeing or disagreeing with the two propositions probably should be expected. Although the two propositions, for the most part, seem to ask the same thing, yet the inquiry in each is directed slightly toward a different aspect of the same



function. The major proposition was concerned with whether the role of the principal was enhanced; the minor dealt with the question of whether more time was involved. Apparently, there is a difference between the two concepts--advancing or improving performance of a function and spending more time on it--and this would explain why some subjects reacted differently to the two propositions.

#### Summary

The majority of subjects involved in the study believed government funded programs had a positive impact on the role of a principal in relations with the community. Many of them found personal contacts with parents increased with implementation of government programs. This increase in contacts with parents was due to the fact that guidelines for implementation of the programs require that parent advisory councils and general communications with parents of participating children in the school be established. In addition, the principals believed the programs themselves generated enough interest to attract parents to come to the school.

The results of reactions of subjects to the major and minor propositions are presented in Table 11.

TABLE 11

PERCENT OF SUBJECTS EXPRESSING OPINIONS TO PROPOSITION 6  
AND MINOR PROPOSITION

Proposition	Percent Expressing Opinions	Reaction Expressed
6	96%	Programs enhance principal's role
	4%	Programs interfere with principal's role
Minor	65%	Accept proposition
	35%	Reject proposition

RESEARCH QUESTION FIVE

## WHAT IS THE EXTENT OF FEDERAL PROGRAMS ON THE ROLE OF THE PRINCIPAL AS THE CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICER OF THE SCHOOL?

In a statement of theory, Griffith<sup>1</sup> takes the position that the central function of administration is directing and controlling the decision-making process. According to him, decision making is central in the sense that all other functions of administration can best be interpreted in terms of the decision-making process. Griffith goes on to argue that decision making is the heart of organization and the process of administration. Thus, in this study, the investigation was focused on the extent to which the presence of government funded programs in a school either interfered with or enhanced the role of the principal in the administration of the school. Two major propositions and a series of minor propositions were formulated to aid the investigation. The analysis of these propositions follows.

Proposition 7. Do government funded programs have a positive or negative effect on the role of a principal as the administrator and the head of the local school?

Table 12 indicates that 66% of all subjects believed government funded programs have a positive effect on the role of a principal in the administration of the school, 17% believed the impact is negative, and 17% believed the programs do not affect the principal's role in any way. Since Proposition 7 was stated broadly, and the major purpose of the proposition was to determine the general direction of the impact of the

---

<sup>1</sup>Daniel E. Griffith, p. 220.

TABLE 12

PERCENT OF SUBJECTS EXPRESSING OPINIONS TO PROPOSITION 7, MINORS,  
AND PROPOSITION 8

Proposition	Percent Expressing Opinions	Reaction Expressed
7	66%	Positive impact
	17%	No impact
	17%	Negative impact
(Minor) 1	71%	Increase in paperwork
	29%	No increase in paperwork
(Minor) 2	85%	Reject proposition
	15%	Accept proposition
(Minor) 3	85%	Reject proposition
	15%	Accept proposition
8	100%	Reject proposition

programs, rather than focus on any specifics, the implications of the data cited here will become clear in the analysis of follow-up questions.

Minor Proposition 1: To what extent do you agree with the proposition that the presence of government funded programs in a school tends to increase the amount of paperwork for the principal?

Table 12 indicates that the reactions of subjects to the proposition was as follows: A total of 71% of all subjects agreed with the statement; 29% disagreed. Among those who agreed with the proposition, however, there were some who felt the increase in paperwork was minimal. Their arguments were expressed in the following manner:

(a) There is more paperwork. However, I don't look on it as being negative.

(b) I agree there is an increase, but not to a degree where it keeps one from doing something else.

With respect to those who disagreed with the proposition, it appears that these principals had employed the administrative ploy of delegating the coordination of the programs to a subordinate. Therefore, any paperwork associated with the programs did not accumulate directly on the desk of the principal, but became the responsibility of the coordinator. This point was underscored by one of the subjects who has this to say: "The paperwork is minimal--the coordinator takes care of it."

The finding resulting from the proposition analyzed here seems to support, as well as refute, some of the evidence discovered in a study by the Rand Corporation. One of the findings in that study was stated as follows:

Most principals mentioned increases in three activities--paperwork, consultation with parents, and coping with students' noninstructional needs.

Paperwork has increased. Principals' estimates of the time it requires varied, from over half-time to only four hours per week, averaging 25% or ten hours per week.<sup>1</sup>

Minor Proposition 2. To what extent do you agree with the proposition that the presence of government funded programs in a school tends to increase the work of the principal related with teacher union contracts?

The majority of subjects (85%), as indicated in Table 12, rejected the proposition; 15% accepted the statement that government funded programs tend to increase the principal's problems associated with teacher union contracts. These problems presumably arise since teachers in government funded programs may operate under conditions and are governed by requirements which may be contrary to regulations specified in the union contract. As indicated in the data, however, the frequency of problems related with the teacher union contracts appears to be minimal.

Minor Proposition 3. To what extent do you agree with the proposition that the presence of government funded programs in a school tends to increase the legal aspects of the job of the principal?

The reactions to this proposition were similar to those of the previous proposition. In both cases, 85% of the subjects rejected the proposition and 15% accepted the proposition. Thus, it appears that administrative duties related to the legal aspects of the principal's job, as well as those related to teacher union contracts, have not been significantly affected by the presence of government programs in schools. Table 12 presents the proportions of subjects expressing opposing viewpoints to Minor Proposition 3.

---

<sup>1</sup>Hill et al., (Rand, 1980), p. 5.

Proposition 8. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the proposition that the presence of government programs in a school has the effect of displacing the principal as a decision maker and leader of the school?

The reaction of subjects to this proposition was unanimous. As indicated in Table 12, all subjects disagreed with the statement. Some of the arguments advanced by them were as follows:

- a. I think there is a latitude in selection of programs. A principal has to consider which programs will fit in his school and which ones will not. It's a matter of finding the right programs that will give one the freedom to make decisions.
- b. I strongly disagree with that. There is no threat to my decision making.
- c. I disagree. I don't think that the decision maker has to make all decisions himself.
- d. There are other areas where principals can still made decisions.
- e. The principal has a chance to make decisions--and he has input on everything that is going on.
- f. I disagree with that. I think you could let it--you could say--oh well, the government is running the programs and they told us we've got to do this and the other thing.

The arguments thus advanced by the subjects would seem to contradict Galen Saylor's fear of an erosion of the decision-making prerogative of the principal as a result of federal involvement in education. His argument was put this way:

Here I point to direct federal control of education through the acts that provide support for these programs. I believe that the actual curriculum and other types of educational programs provided children in the classrooms and schools of this nation must be determined by the teachers and their fellow staff members who guide and direct the development of learning opportunities and plan the total program of education for the children of a particular school and school system. Lessening the responsibility for such decisions by the staff of the individual school system reduces the possibilities for adaptability, flexibility, experimentation, innovation, and...

administration to the educational needs of each child enrolled in school...

The real threat, I believe, comes from control by federal officers over the educational aspects of the plans developed for carrying out these acts, particularly the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. This act gives the United States Commissioner of Education authority to approve plans for carrying out the act and, hence, the conditions within provisions of the law under which grants will be made....<sup>1</sup>

Although the subjects of the study seemed to contradict Galen Saylor's argument, in some respects the threat might be real, as some of the remarks by the principals seem to indicate. Specifically, the remarks made by one subject to the effect that "There are other areas where principals can still make decisions," seem to suggest that there might be some areas where decision making by the principal is off limits.

#### Summary

On the subject of the role of the principal in the administration process of the school, the subjects of this study suggest that the presence of government programs in the school tends to have an impact. For the most part, the impact of these programs is considered to be positive, insofar as the principal's ability to carry out the purposes of the school is concerned. Although there has been an increase in the amount of paperwork related to the federal programs, most of the principals reject the notion that the increase is significant and many of them contend that the increase in the paperwork is a necessary evil they can live with.

The majority of the subjects reject the idea that government programs tend to increase the work related to the teacher union contract or that the legal aspect of a principal's job becomes complex. Above all,

---

<sup>1</sup>Galen Saylor, p. 42.



all subjects of the study rejected the argument that the principal's role in decision making tends to decrease with the increase in federal involvement in education. The principals contend that there are still areas where the principal is still free to direct the decision-making process. This argument, however, only goes to show that some of the fears expressed by Galen Saylor might be valid.

## CHAPTER V

### CONCLUSIONS, ANALYSES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The study was designed to examine the impact of state/federal funded programs on the assigned responsibilities of selected elementary school principals. A major impetus for embarking on this study was a concern that there was a great void in the research regarding how school principals were adjusting their assigned responsibilities to the massive changes which were impinging on the schools. The second and equally important reason to embark on this study was to examine the specific impact of federal/state funded programs on the principals.

The researcher's experiences as principal of an elementary school and a high school in a large urban center and also as superintendent in charge of government funded programs in that city were, in the final analysis, very beneficial. There was great concern at each step of the research process to make certain that personal biases were minimized and that the great respect and regard of the researcher for the principal, as the most important figure in the administrative structure, were kept in proper research focus.

A preliminary search of the literature and discussions with federal officials, university officials, and school administrators revealed a great deal of prescriptive literature and research on the principal, but a woeful lack of research on recent federal programs and their impact. There was, however, a great interest and concern regarding the subject of

responsibilities of principals and the impact of funded programs, and investigators were being encouraged by federal agencies (the National Institute of Education, for example) to embark on basic research.

Preliminary activities of literature search and conferences provided the materials for the development of some research questions. These questions were then expanded into major and minor propositions. After field test interviews and critiques with administrators and advisors, the following research questions were verified as major areas of concern.

1. What is the impact of federal programs on the role of the principal as one charged with the responsibility to supervise the program of instruction?
2. What is the impact of federal programs on the role of the principal as one charged with the responsibility to provide a program of staff development and inservice training for teachers?
3. What is the impact of federal programs on the role of the principal as one charged with the responsibility to carry out long-range educational planning?
4. What is the impact of federal programs on the role of the principal as one charged with the responsibility to conduct school-community relations?
5. What is the impact of federal programs on the role of the principal as the chief administrative officer of the school?

It was determined that the best results could be achieved with a sample of 20 to 25 subjects. This group of representative elementary school principals would be involved with an interviewer for one to three hours. Adequate time would be spent to facilitate a free-flowing

conversation and to describe the interview guide, which required minimal writing on the part of the interviewer and no writing on the part of the interviewee. The final data product was a taped recording of responses to the five basic research questions. Time, before and after the interview, was utilized to record additional impressions of the interview as well as other data related to the school and the principal.

The information collected on the tapes and the written report on each interview guide was considered as the primary data sources for the study. During the interview sessions, the principals reacted to each of the research questions and to a set of propositions. The total of the responses was analyzed to determine the direction of the response.

A brief summary of the results of the analysis is as follows:

- The majority of principals see the presence of government funded programs in their school to be more beneficial than detrimental to their role as a leader.
- The majority of principals see the impact of government funded programs as beneficial to the role of the principals in the area of inservice education.
- The majority of principals reject the notion that the presence of government funded programs in a school affects the principal's prerogatives to make plans for the education program in the school, to develop aims, objectives and purposes for the school, and to develop policy for the school program.
- The majority of the principals believed that the presence of government funded programs in a school had a positive impact on the role of the principal in relations with the community.

- The majority of principals reject the notion that the increase in paperwork related to government funded programs is significant.
- The majority of principals reject the notion that the presence of government funded programs tends to increase the work related to the teachers union contract or other legal aspects of the principal's job.
- All of the principals in the study reject the notion that the presence of government funded programs tends to decrease the principal's role in decision making.

#### CONCLUSIONS

Based on the analysis of the data, a number of conclusions have been reached. Care must be taken, however, to interpret the results in light of the limitations of the study. Since the sample used for the study was selected from a limited population of principals, confined to one school system, inferences regarding the sample should be made only to the population from which the sample was obtained.

The conclusions are as follows:

1. The presence of government funded programs in a school makes it easier for the principal to exercise leadership.

If leadership is associated with goal setting and goal attainment, as the literature prescribes, then, certainly, the programs provide the principal the means and opportunities by which to attain those goals which are related to the instructional needs of pupils. Whether the leadership of the principal is exercised or not, however, depends on a number of factors.

First, the administrative burdens associated with federal programs may likely blur the principal's priorities of instructional leadership.

Second, the personal philosophical orientation of the principal may compel the principal to delegate much of the paperwork associated with the programs to a subordinate, thereby freeing the principal for activities related to the improvement of instruction. By the same token, the principal's philosophical orientation could also constrain the principal from exercising administrative ploys which can bring about a relief from some administrative duties of the programs.

Third, the organization structure of the school-wide system and its policies may create a climate which either stifles or promotes creativity and imagination on the part of the principal.

2. The presence of government programs in a school makes it easier for the principal to promote professional growth among teachers.

For the most part, government programs require that instructional services be carried out in a manner significantly different from conventional practices. Teachers, therefore, need to be retrained in order for them to operate effectively in the innovative programs. An imaginative and creative principal can seize the opportunity presented by the programs to base the inservice program, for the entire faculty, on alternative instructional modes similar to those exemplified by government programs.

The notion that government funded programs keep the principal so busy with program monitors and evaluators from outside agencies that he cannot keep in touch with his faculty is not supported by the evidence discovered in this study. Although there may be an increase in the

relations of the principal with outside agencies, this in itself does not seem to reduce the time available for the principal to make personal contacts with teachers and students.

The conclusion reached here, however, is subject to the same limitations of the study and some factors including those previously stated. These factors may be what the principal views as the most important responsibilities in his job, the organizational structure of the school system, and other factors.

3. The presence of government funded programs in a school may alter the role of the principal in planning, from one where the principal personally formulates all the major plans for his school, to one where the principal becomes primarily a monitor of the planning process or an implementer of plans made outside the local school.

Government funded programs require that the local school involve parents and teachers in needs assessment and the selection of programs to meet those needs. In addition, as stated in Chapter IV (page 113), government programs tend to create a cadre of central and district office administrators involved with the programs on a full-time basis. The effect of the total of these conditions is that major plans for a school program are either cooperatively formulated or are handed down to the local school from administrators occupying positions superordinate in nature to that of the principal. Thus, the presence of government funded programs does not seem to necessarily eliminate the principal from the planning process, as Gaylen Saylor feared (Chapter IV, page 120), but rather seems merely to allow more people to participate in the planning process. According to the evidence uncovered in this study, the role of the principal in planning and in the determination of the course of action for the school program seems to remain secure, although in an altered form.

4. The presence of government funded programs in a school probably enhances the role of the principal in school-community relations.

As pointed out previously, the professional literature expects the principal to be a leader, not just of his faculty, but of his school community as well. Government involvement in education seems to support that notion. The principal is required to seek community involvement in deciding which programs to implement in the school.

According to the evidence uncovered in this study, the majority of principals seem to have increased contacts with parents either in an attempt to get consensus about programs or as a result of parental interest to participate or observe the programs in action.

5. The presence of government funded programs in a school may create a condition where the principal of unitary control, expressed by Gulick,<sup>1</sup> may be violated. This in itself, however, does not seem to have a negative effect on the principal's performance of his or her job.

The fact that principals, associated with schools in which government programs have been implemented, have to deal with a variety of statutes, policies, and regulations emanating from multiple agencies, each exercising control of some programs, does not seem to have interfered, significantly, with the responsibility of principals to perform their administrative duties. On the contrary, according to the evidence of this study, the majority of principals rate the impact of the programs in a favorable manner. The principals reject the notion that they have been displaced as decision makers. Although there may have been an increase in

---

<sup>1</sup>Luther Gulick, 1937.



the amount of paperwork, as a result of the programs, the principals reject, also, the argument that the increase in paperwork has created for them situations with which they cannot live.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS

There is a real need for the legitimate developers of the concept of what a school principal is and what he does, e.g., the educational researchers, the universities, boards of education, state and federal lawmakers, to ensure that today's principal has both the opportunity and the necessary training to accomplish his assigned responsibilities. The principals in this study often stated that they could not devote a desired amount of attention to the important tasks, such as supervision, inservice, improvement of instruction, because of the many noninstructional requirements, including disciplinary problems, teacher contract restraints, student, teacher, and community noninstructional needs, and a myriad of other tasks. Although the principals had concerns regarding their inability to advance their schools in areas relating to instruction, the need to maintain a safe environment and to keep the organization operating remained of paramount importance. The practicing administrator deserves a continuous updating of theory as a guide to his day-to-day operating procedures. He also needs to know which practical applications have been most successful. These problems indicate that adequate means must be developed to retrain and inservice principals in order that they can respond favorably to changing and dynamic schools.

## SOME RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ADDITIONAL STUDY

1. A comparison study of principals with government-funded programs and those who do not have these programs.
2. A study to determine if different school district organizations change the impact of government funded programs on the local school principal. For instance, do decentralized or centralized school districts provide their local school principals the most favorable relationships with government funded programs?
3. A study to determine if certain leadership styles are more compatible with government funded programs.
4. A study of teacher views of the role of the principal in government funded programs.
5. A study of what resources are provided by the central office for principals within government funded programs.
6. A study of the type of inservice for coordinators of government funded programs provided by principals where the programs exist.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abramowitz, Susan and Tenenbaum, Ellen. High School '77: A Survey of Public Secondary School Principals. Washington, D.C.: The National Institute of Education, 1978.
- Ackerly, R.L. and Cluckman, I.B. The Reasonable Exercise of Authority, II. Reston, Virginia: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1976.
- Adams, Edward F. "A Multivariate Study of Subordinate Perceptions of and Attitudes Toward Minority and Majority Managers." Journal of Applied Psychology 63 (1978):277-88.
- Allen, J.E., Jr. "The Role of the Elementary School Principal in Achieving the Right to Read Goal." Address before the Convention of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, April 1970.
- American Association of School Administrators. Management Surveys for Schools: Their Uses and Abuses. Washington, D.C.: American Association of School Administrators, 1964.
- Averch, Harvey A.; Carroll, Stephen J.; Donaldson, Theodore S.; Kiesling, Herbert J.; and Pincus, John. How Effective Is Schooling? New Jersey: Educational Technology Publications, 1974.
- Banghart, Franklin and Trull, Albert, Jr. Educational Planning. New York: MacMillan Company, 1973.
- Barbarovi, D.R., et al. "The Handicapped Children Act--P.L. 94-142: Implications for Principals." Paper presented at the National Association of Secondary School Principals Annual Convention, New Orleans, Louisiana, January 1977.
- Barnard Chester I. The Functions of the Executive. Cambridge: Howard University Press, 1938.
- Barraclough, T. "The Role of the Elementary School Principal." Educational Management Review Series, Number 19. Eugene, Oregon: Oregon University, July 1973.
- Becker, Gerald. Issues and Problems in Elementary Administration. Corvallis, Oregon: Oregon State University, Center for Educational Research and Service, February 1970.
- Beegle, Charles W. and Edelfelt, Roy A., eds. Report of a Conference Jointly Sponsored by the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development and the Department of Administration and Supervision, Schools of Education, University of Virginia. Washington, D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1979.

- Berke, J.S. and Kirst, Michael W. Federal Aid to Education. Lexington, Massachusetts: Heath and Company, 1972.
- Berman, Paul and McLaughlin, Milbrey Wallin. Implementing and Sustaining Innovation: Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Vol. VII: The Findings in Review. R-1589/8-HEW. Santa Monica, California: The Rand Corporation, (April 1975, vol. 1-5; 1977, vol. 6-8).
- Berman, Paul and McLaughlin, Milbrey Wallin with the assistance of Bass, Gail Pauly; Edward Zellman, Gail. Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Vol. VII: Factors Affecting Implementation and Continuation. R-1589/7-HEW. Santa Monica, California: The Rand Corporation, April 1977.
- Boardman, A.E. Policy Models for the Management of Student Achievement and Other Educational Outputs, forthcoming.
- Bobbe, R.A. and Connolly, P.E. "Education Decision Making: Collaboration Among School Board, Administrators and the Community." Educational Technology 15:21-5.
- Boyer, Ernest. "Access to Excellence." An address given at the Annual Convention of the National Association of Secondary School Administrators, Anaheim, California, February 12, 1978.
- Braybrooke, David and Lindblom, Charles E. A Strategy of Decision. New York: The Free Press, 1963, as cited in Educational Evaluation and Decision Making, Phi Delta Kappa National Study Committee on Evaluation, Inc., 1971.
- Brodensky, B. "12 Major Events that Shaped American Schools." Phi Delta Kappan 58:68-77.
- Brown, B.W. and Saks, B.H. "The Production and Distribution of Cognitive Skills within Schools." Journal of Political Economy 83(1975):571-93.
- Burdin, Larry and Whitt, Robert L. The Community School Principal - New Horizon. Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Company, 1973.
- Burke, Arvid James. The Financing of Elementary and Secondary Schools: The Theory and Practice of School Finance. Chicago: Rand-McNally and Co., 1969.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Financing Public Schools in the United States. New York: Harper, 1957.
- Burke, Arvid J. and Mork, Paul R. Defensible Spending for Public Schools. New York: Columbia University Press, 1943.
- Butera, T.S. "Principal Know Thyself! Administrator Evaluation Form." National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin. 60 (September 1976):84-6.

- Caldwell, Bruce G. Differentiated Staffing - The Key to Effective School Organization. New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1973.
- Campbell, Roald F. "Application of Administrative Concepts to the Elementary Principalsip." in School Administration: Selected Readings, eds. Sherman H. Frey and Keith R. Getschman. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1968.
- Campbell, Roald F.; Corbally, John E.; Ramseyer, John A. Introduction to Educational Administration. 2nd ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1962.
- Campbell, Roald F.; Bridges, Edwin M.; Corbally, John E.; Nystrand, Raphael Ramseyer, John A. Introduction to Educational Administration. 4th ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1971.
- Campbell, Roald F.; Cunningham, Luvern L.; McPhee, Roderick F. The Organization and Control of American Schools. Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1962.
- Carver, Fred D. and Sergiovanni, Thomas J., eds. Organizations and Human Behavior: Focus on Schools. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1969.
- Chicago Board of Education. Rules of the Board of Education of the City of Chicago. published by authority of the Board of Education of the City of Chicago, revised to December 1, 1974.
- Calbaugh, Ralph E. School Superintendent's Guide: Principles and Practices for Effective Administration. New York: Parker Publishing Company, Inc., 1966.
- Coleman, James S. and Karweit, Nancy L. Information Systems and Performance Measures in Schools. New Jersey: Educational Technology Publications, 1972.
- Compensatory Education Services. "A Report from the National Institute of Education." Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, July 31, 1977.
- Comptroller General of the United States. Weaknesses in School Districts' Implementation of the Emergency School Assistance Program. Washington, D.C., September 1971.
- Cribbin, James J. "Fifty-Seven Varieties of Leaders" in Readings in Educational Management. ed. John W. Goode. New York: AMACOM - A Division of the American Management Association, 1973.
- Cronin, Joseph M. "The Federal Takeover: Should the Junior Partner Run the Firm." Phi Delta Kappan 57 (April 1976):499-501.

- Cuban, Larry. Urban School Chiefs Under Fire. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1976.
- Davis, H. Curtis. "Duties of High School Principals, Part I." 50th Yearbook, North Central Association, 1921:49-69.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Where Does the Time Go?" California Journal of Secondary Education. October 1953, pp. 349-60.
- Davis, O.A. and Sanday, P.R. "A Simultaneous Equations Model of the Educational Process." Journal of Public Economics 7(January 1978):23-49.
- Davis, O.A., et al. "Toward an Accountability Model of the Educational Process." A research proposal from the School of Urban and Public Affairs, Carnegie-Mellon University, 1972.
- Dillon-Peterson, Betty, ed. "Staff Development/Organization Development." Yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. Alexandria, Virginia, 1981.
- Dunn, Rita Stafford. Administrative Guide to New Programs for Faculty Management and Evaluation. West Nyack, New York: Baker Publishing Co., 1975.
- Ebel, Robert L., ed. "A Project of the American Educational Research Association." Encyclopedia of Educational Research. 4th ed. London: Collier-MacMillan Limited, 1969.
- Epstein, Benjamin. Principals: An Organized Force for Leadership. Reston, Virginia: The National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1974.
- ERIC ED 186-982. "Changing Role of the Principal in California."
- \_\_\_\_\_. 189-724. "Great Expectations: The Principal's Role and Inservice Needs in Supporting Change Projects."
- \_\_\_\_\_. 191-839. "Inservice Education: Priority for the '80s."
- \_\_\_\_\_. 191-651. "Local Success and Federal Failure: A Study of Community Development and Educational Change in the Rural South."
- Erickson, Donald A.; Hills, Jean R.; and Robinson, Norman. Educational Flexibility in an Urban School District. Vancouver: Educational Research Institute of British Columbia, 1970.
- Fantini, Mario and Gittel, Marilyn. Decentralization: Achieving Reform. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1973.
- Fayol, Henri. General and Industrial Management. London: Sir Issac Pitman and Sons, Ltd., 1949.

- Fillos, Rita M. and Bailey, William J. "Superintendents and Educational Research." Phi Delta Kappan, October 1978, pp. 135-6.
- Fischer, Lois and Thomas, Donald R. Social Foundations of Educational Decisions. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Co., Inc., 1965.
- Follett, Mary Parker. Creative Experience. New York: Longmans and Green, 1924.
- Frey, Sherman H. and Getschman, Keith R. eds. School Administration: Selected Readings. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, Co., 1968.
- Frost, Joe L. Compensatory Programming: The Acid Test of American Education. Dubuque, Iowa: W.C. Brown, 1971.
- Funkhauser, G. "Checklist for Principals." National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin 60(September 1976):87-8.
- Gallegos, Arnold M. "Politics and Realities of Staff Development." Journal of Teacher Education, January-February 1980, pp. 21-4.
- Garland, Parnell and O'Reilly, Robert R. "The Effect of Leader-Member Interaction on Organizational Effectiveness." Educational Administration Quarterly, fall 1976, pp. 9-30.
- Getzels, Jacob W. "Administration as a Social Process." in Administrative Theory in Education. ed. Andrew W. Halpin. Chicago: University of Chicago, Midwest Administration Center, 1958.
- Glasman, N.S. "The Effects of Governmental Evaluation Mandates." Administrator's Notebook 27 (1978-79):2.
- Glass, Thomas, "Change in Schools: Community Involvement and Shared Decision Making." National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin 61 (October 1977):5-9.
- Glazer, Nathan. "On Serving the People." in The Changing Politics of Education: Prospects for the 1980s. eds. Edith K. Mosher and Jennings L. Wagoner. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1978.
- Goldhammer, Keith and Becker, Gerald L. "What Makes a Good Elementary School Principal?" American Education, April 1970, pp. 11-13.
- Goode, John M., ed. Readings in Educational Management. New York: AMACOM A Division of the American Management Association, 1973.
- Gottesman, Alexander. "Applying a Model in Curriculum Planning." National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, October 1977, pp. 24-30.
- Gregg, Russell T. "The Administrative Process" in Administrative Behavior in Education. Roald F. Campbell and Russell T. Gregg, eds. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957.

- Grieder, Calvin; Pierce, Truman M.; and Forbes, Jordan K. Public School Administration, 3rd ed. New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1969.
- Griffith, Daniel E. "Administration as Decision Making." in Administrative Theory in Education. Andrew W. Halpin, ed. Chicago: University of Chicago, Midwest Administration Center, 1958.
- Gross, Neal and Herriott, Robert E. Staff Leadership in Public Schools. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1965.
- Gulick, Luther and Urwick, L., eds. Papers on the Science of Administration. New York: Institute of Public Administration, 1937.
- Halperin, Samuel. "ESEA: Decennial Views of the Revolution, I. The Positive Side." Phi Delta Kappan 57 (November 1975):147-51.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Federal Takeover, State Default, or a Family Problem." Phi Delta Kappan 57 (June 1975):696-7.
- Halpin, Andrew W., ed. Administrative Theory in Education. Chicago: University of Chicago, Midwest Administration Center, 1958.
- Halpin, Andrew W. "How Leaders Behave." in Organizations and Human Behavior: Focus on Schools. Fred D. Carver and Thomas J. Sergiovanni, eds. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1969.
- Halpin, Andrew W. and Croft, Donald B. "The Organizational Climate of Schools." Administrator's Notebook XI, no. 7, March 1963.
- Hanrahan, Robert P. "Influencing the Federal Legislative Process." National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin 60 (January 1976):62-7.
- Hansen, Carl F. Danger in Washington - The Story of My 20 Years in the Public Schools in the Nation's Capital. West Nyack, New York: Parker Publishing Company, Inc., 1968.
- Havighurst, Robert J. "A Comparison of Foundations and Government as Supporters of Experimentation." Phi Delta Kappan 59(June 1978):679-82.
- Haynes, A. Ford and Gardner, Arthur E. "Sharing Administrative Decision-Making." The Clearinghouse 51(October 1977):53-7.
- Hemphill, John K.; Griffith, Daniel E.; and Frederiksen, Norman. Administrative Performance and Personality. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1962.
- Herman, Jerry J. Developing an Effective School Staff Evaluation Program. New York: Parker Publishing Company, Inc., 1973.
- Herriott, Robert E. and Gross, Neal, eds. The Dynamics of Planned Educational Change. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1979.



- Hill, Paul T. Do Federal Education Programs Interfere with One Another? Report No. O-6416. Santa Monica, California: The Rand Corporation, September 1979.
- Hill, Paul T.; Wuchitech, Joanne; and Williams, Richard. The Effects of Federal Education Programs on School Principals. N-1467-HEW. Santa Monica, California: The Rand Corporation, February 1980.
- Holland, Thomas C.; Grobe, Robert P.; and Denton, William T. "Campus Level Planning: A Scheme for School-Based Change and Decision-Making." National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, October 1977, pp. 31-41.
- House of Representatives, Ninety-Fourth Congress, Second Session. Over-sight Hearings on the School Lunch Programs. Hearings before the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education of the Committee on Education and Labor. Washington, D.C., 1976.
- Howes, K.L. "Pathways and Pitfalls in Introducing Change." National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin 60 (April 1976): 1-70.
- Hughes, Larry W. and Ubben, Gerald C. The Elementary Principal's Handbook. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1978.
- Hutton, H.H. "Role of the Principal in Meeting the Needs of School Communities in a Changing Society." Education Canada 16:41-6.
- Jacobson, Paul B., et al. The Principalship: New Perspectives. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1973.
- Jago, Arthur G. "A Test of Spuriousness in Descriptive Models of Participative Leader Behavior." Journal of Applied Psychology 63(1978):388-9.
- Janke, Robert W. "A Lexicographic Combination Model of Decision Making by Superintendents Among Multiattribute Instructional Program Alternatives." Journal of School Psychology 12:318-25.
- Jenkins, K.D. "Community Participation and the Principal." National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin 60 (November 1976):70-2.
- Jones, Nina F. "A Study of the Effects of Individualized Instruction on the Attitudes and Behavior of Teachers and Pupils in the Middle Elementary Grades." doctoral dissertation, Loyola University, 1975.
- Keith, P.M. "Administrative and Faculty Turnover and Diffusion of an Educational Innovation." Urban Education 10 (October 1975):227-304.
- Keller, Ed. "NAESP Guidelines for Principals on P.L. 94-142." The National Elementary Principal 58 (October 1978):62.

- King, Richard A. "Litigation, Legislation and the Principal." A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. San Francisco, California, April 1979.
- Kirst, Michael W. "The Future Federal Role in Education: Parties, Candidates and the 1976 Elections." Phi Delta Kappan 58 (October 1976):155-8.
- Knezevich, Stephen J. Administration of Public Schools. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1969.
- Konnert, William and Graff, Orin B. "The Sine Qua Non of Organizational Effectiveness." Educational Administrative Quarterly 12 (fall 1976): 1-7.
- Krasnow, Bernard. "What Kind of Principal Do Teachers Want?" Phi Delta Kappan 70 (October 1978):137.
- Kunz, Daniel W. and Hoy, Wayne K. "Leadership Style of Principals and the Professional Zone of Acceptance of Teachers." Educational Administrative Quarterly 12 (fall 1976):49-64.
- Kurfman, Dana F., ed. "Developing Decision-Making Skills." 47th Yearbook. Arlington, Virginia: National Council for the Social Studies, 1977.
- Lieberman, Ann and Miller, Lynne, eds. Staff Development: New Demands, New Realities, New Perspectives. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1979.
- Lipham, James M. "Personal Variables of Effective Administrators." Administrator's Notebook 9 (September 1960).
- Lipham, James M. and Hoeh, James A., Jr. The Principalship: Foundations and Functions. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1974.
- Lortie, Dan C. Schoolteacher: A Sociological Study. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1975.
- Los Angeles Unified School District. ESEA Title I Components: Executive Abstracts. California, September 1970.
- Lynch, John Colbert. Implications and Applications of the Law for Teachers and Administrators. Chicago: DePaul University, 1972.
- Lyons, D.S. and Achilles, C.M. "Principal as a Professional Decision Maker." Educational Administrative Quarterly 12 (1976):43-53.
- Machado, Alayde G. "An Assessment of the Decision-Making Process in Selected Public Elementary Schools in Pennanbuso, Brazil: An Exploratory Study." doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1977.

- Malles, James Emery. "Perception of Teachers, Administrators and Community Council Members of Nine Select Elementary School Communities of the Chicago Public Schools as to the Role of the School-Community Council in Educational Decision-Making." doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana, 1974.
- Mann, D. Policy Decision-Making in Education: An Introduction to Calculation and Control. New York: Teachers College Press, 1975.
- Marks, James R.; Stoops, Emery; and Stoops, Joyce King. Handbook of Educational Supervision: A Guide for the Practitioner. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1971.
- Martin, W.J. "The Managerial Behavior of High School Principals." doctoral dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1980.
- Maslow, Abraham. Eupsychian Management. Homewood, Illinois: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1965.
- Mayo, Elton. The Human Problems of an Industrial Civilization. Boston: Graduate School of Business Administration, Harvard University, 1946.
- McCrosky, Cherie LeLevre and Duff, Grace. "Legal Aspects of Sex Discrimination in Education." Illinois Principal. May 1975.
- McDill, Edward Lamar. Strategies for Success in Compensatory Education. Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, 1967.
- McLaughlin, M.W. and Berman, P. "The Art of Retooling Educational Staff Development in a Period of Retrenchment." Educational Leadership December 1977, pp. 191-4.
- McPherson, R.B.; Salley, Columbus; and Baehr, Melany E. A National Occupational Analysis of the School Principalship. Chicago: Industrial Relations Center, The University of Chicago, 1975.
- Melby, Ernest. Administering Community Education. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1975.
- Melton, G.E., et al. The Principalship: Job Specifications and Salary Considerations for the 70s. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1970.
- Milstein, Mike M., ed. Schools, Conflict, and Change. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1980.
- Moore, Hollis A., Jr. Studies in School Administration: A Report on the CPEA. Washington, D.C.: American Association of School Administrators, 1957.
- Morphet, Edgar L. "Relationship of Education to Government." Forty-Fourth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1945.

- Morphet, Edgar L.; Johns, Roel; and Reller, Theodore L. Educational Administrative Concepts, Practices and Issues. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1959.
- Morris, Van Cleve, et al. "The Urban Principal: Discretionary Decision-Making in a Large Educational Organization." The report of a research project funded by the National Institute of Education to the College of Education, University of Illinois Chicago-Circle, March 1981.
- Mosher, Edith K. and Wagoner, Jennings L., Jr. The Changing Politics of Education. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1978.
- Murphy, J.T. and Cohen, D.K. "Accountability in Education - 'The Michigan Experience'." The Public Interest 36 (Summer 1974):53-81.
- National Association of Elementary School Principals. "The Busing Controversy." NAESP School Leadership Digest, Second Series, Number 6. ERIC/CEM Research Analysis Series, Number 21. Washington, D.C., 1976.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Survey Report. Arlington, Virginia, May 1980.
- National Association of Secondary School Principals. Concerning the Confidentiality of Pupil School Records. Reston, Virginia, September 1976.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Concerning Statutory Protection for Principals. Reston, Virginia, November 1976.
- \_\_\_\_\_. A Legal Memorandum. Reston, Virginia, April 1976.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Legal Status of the Principal. A Legal Memorandum. Washington, D.C., September 1973.
- National Center for Education Statistics. "NCES Fast Response Survey." Rockville, Maryland: Westat, Inc., 1980.
- National Conference of Professors of Educational Administration. Educational Futurism 1985: Challenges of Schools and Their Administrators. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1971.
- National Institute of Education. An Interim Report on the NIE Compensatory Education Study. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, 1977.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Compensatory Education Study: Executive Summary." Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, July 1978.
- National School Public Relations Association. "Managing Your School: What's Ahead." Arlington, Virginia, 1979.

- "National Survey of Secondary Education," Bulletin No. 17, Monograph 11 Washington, D.C.: U.S. Office of Education, 1932, p. 117, as cited in Glen F. Ovard, Administration of the Changing Secondary School. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1966.
- Neagley, Ross L. and Evans, N. Dean. Handbook for Effective Supervision of Instruction. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.
- Negan, L.P. "Principal's Performance Scale: An Informal Method of Evaluating Principals." Orbit 9:14-5.
- Newton, Robert R. "Educational Theories and Administrative Styles." National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin 64 (March 1980):76-86.
- Nolte, M. and Chester, E. School Communications: Duties and Dangers. A Legal Memorandum. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, April 1974.
- North Central Association of Colleges and Schools. Policies and Standards for the Approval of Elementary Schools, 1980-81. Commission on Schools, Boulder, Colorado.
- Odiorne, George S. Management Decisions by Objectives. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1969.
- Offner, Herman Leroy. Administrative Procedures for Changing Curriculum Patterns for Selected State Teachers Colleges with Special References to New Jersey, New York, and Pennsylvania.
- O'Reilly, Charles A. III. "Supervisors and Peers as Information Sources, Group Supportiveness and Individual Decision-Making Performance." Journal of Applied Psychology 62 (1977):632-50.
- Orienstein, Allen C. Accountability for Teachers and School Administrators. Belmont, California: Fearson Publishers, 1973.
- Ovard, Glen F. Administration of the Changing Secondary School. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1966.
- Owens, Robert G. Organizational Behavior in Schools. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1970.
- Parker, Mary Follett. Creative Experience. New York: Longmans and Green, 1924.
- Peterson, K.D. "The Principal's Tasks." Administrator's Notebook 26 (1977-78):1-4.
- Phi Delta Kappa National Study Committee on Evaluation. Educational Evaluation and Decision-Making. Itasca, Illinois: F.E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1971.

- The Practitioner: A Newsletter for the On-Line Administrator Providing Leadership for Teacher Motivation. National Association of Secondary School Principals. V, November 1978.
- Preble, Kenneth J., Jr. "Success in Administration: The Judges and the Judged." doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1962.
- Quinn, Timothy G. "Providing Leadership for...Teacher Motivation." The Practitioner 5 (November 1978):1-12.
- Reinhart, Diane L. "Life Cycles of Funded Projects and the Principal's Role; Principals' Behaviors that Facilitate or Retrain Project Accomplishment." A paper given at the American Educational Association Conference, Boston, April 1980.
- Reiller, Theodore Lee. Educational Administration in Metropolitan Areas. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundations, 1974.
- Roe, William H. and Drake, Thelbert L. The Principalship. New York: The MacMillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1980.
- Ryor, John. "One-Third Federal Funding." Today's Education 66(March-April 1977):6.
- Saif, P.S. A Handbook for the Evaluation of Teachers and Principals. Bloomfield, Connecticut: Capital Region Education Council.
- Sarason, S. The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1971.
- Saunders, Robert L. "Leadership Development of Administrators: Developing New Muscles to Meet New Challenges." Journal of Teacher Education 31 (January-February 1980):25-9.
- Saylor, Galen. "The Federal Colossus in Education - Threat or Promise?" in School Administration: Selected Readings. Sherman H. Frey and Keith R. Getschman, eds. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1968.
- Schoeny, Donna Hager and Ho, Robert. The Role of the Principal in Federal Programs. Report for the National Institute of Education, 1980.
- Scott, M.B. "What Is a High School Principal?" Clearinghouse (September 1957):30.
- Scribner, J.D., ed. "The Politics of Education." 76th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1977.
- Schultz, William C. Procedures for Identifying Persons with a Potential for Public School Positions. Berkeley: University of California, Cooperative Research Project No. 1076, 1966.
- Sergiovanni, Thomas J. and Starratt, Robert J. Supervision: Human Perspectives. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1979.

- Sergiovanni, Thomas J., et al. Educational Governance and Administration. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1980.
- Shane, Harold G. The Educational Significance of the Future. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa, Inc., 1973.
- Sharples, Brian. "Rational Decision-Making in Education: Some Concerns." Educational Administrative Quarterly (spring 1975):55-65.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Reaction: Response to a 'A Comment on Rational Decision-Making in Education': Some Concerns." Educational Administrative Quarterly (fall 1977):83-97.
- Shavelson, Richard J., et al. "Teachers Sensitivity to the Reliability of Information in Making Pedagogical Decisions." Educational Research Journal (spring 1977):83-97.
- Simon, Herbert Alexander. Administrative Behavior: A Study of Decision-Making Process in Administrative Organizations. New York: The Free Press, 1948.
- Snead, William R. "A Study of Central Office Administrative Staffing Patterns in Selected Urban School Districts in Ohio." doctoral dissertation, University of Miami, 1971.
- Snyder, Karolyn J. and Anderson, Robert H. "Leadership in Education: A System's Approach." Journal of Teacher Education XXXI (January-February 1980):11-20.
- Sproul, L. "Managing Education Programs: A Micro-Behavior Analysis," 1979.
- Stake, Robert F. Evaluating Educational Programs. Washington, D.C.: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development Publications Center, 1976.
- State Board of Education. The School Code of Illinois. St. Paul, Minnesota: West Publishing Co., 1977.
- Steig, Lester R. and Kemp, Frederick. School Personnel and Inservice Training Practices. West Nyack, New Jersey: Parker, 1970.
- Stevens, Joseph H. and King, Edith W. Administering Early Childhood Education. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1976.
- Stickney, B.D. "The Finding Out of Gains in 'Successful' Compensatory Education Programs." Urban Education 12 (1977):271-82.
- Stoller, Nathan. Supervision and the Improvement of Instruction. New Jersey: Educational Technology Publications, 1978.

- Stoops, Emery; Rafferty, Max; and Johnson, Russell E. Handbook of Educational Administration: A Guide for the Practitioner. Boston, Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1975.
- Stufflebeam, Daniel L., committee chairman, Phi Delta Kappa National Study Committee on Education. Educational Evaluation and Decision Making. Itasca, Illinois: F.E. Peacock Publishers, Inc., 1971.
- Summerfield, Harry L. The Neighborhood-Based Politics of Education. Columbus, Ohio: Merrill Series for Educational Administration, 1971.
- Swartz, Stanley. "A Recommendation for Competency Testing and the Handicapped." Illinois Principal, September 1979.
- Swick, K.J. and Driggess, R.K. "Principal and Curriculum Planning." Education 95:335-6.
- Talmadge, H.T. and Orenstein, A.C. "School Superintendents' Attitudes Toward Community Participation." Educational Research Quarterly I:37-45.
- Tannenbaum, Robert; Weschler, Irving R.; and Massarik, Fred. Leadership and Organization: A Behavioral Science Approach. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1969.
- Taylor, Frederick W. Scientific Management. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1947.
- Tiedt, Signey W. Role of the Federal Government in Education. New York: Oxford University Press, 1966.
- Tillman, Fred A., Jr. and Rencher, Alvin C. "Attitude Dimensions of Managerial Theories of School Superintendents." Journal of Experimental Education 45 (winter 1976):32-41.
- Turner, Winston. "Principals in the Pressure Cooker." National Elementary Principal 56 (March-April 1977):74-7.
- United States Division of Compensatory Education. Profiles in Quality Education - 150 Outstanding Title I Programs. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Superintendent of Documents, 1968.
- United States Department of Education News (for release 9:30 a.m. EDT, Wednesday, April 29, 1981) statement by T.H. Bell, Secretary of Education. "Elementary and Secondary Education Consolidation Act of 1981."
- Valentine, Jerry, "Preparing Your Assistant for the Principalship." National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin 64 (May 1980):40-3.



- Washington, Kenneth R. "Urban Principals and Job Stress." Phi Delta Kappan 61 (May 1980):646.
- Washington, Roosevelt, Jr. "Specific Role Expectations Held for the District Superintendent as Perceived by Teachers, Principals and District Superintendents in the Chicago Public Schools." doctoral dissertation, Northern Illinois University, 1971.
- Wayson, Williams. "ESEA: Decennial Views of the Revolution, II. The Negative Side." Phi Delta Kappan 57 (November 1975):151-6.
- Webster, Rufus Richmond. "The Development of a Conceptual Model to Increase Accountability in Personnel Management in a Selected School System." doctoral dissertation, University of Alabama, 1977.
- Weldy, Gilbert R. Principals What They Do and Who They Are. National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1979.
- Widmer, Henry N. "Critical Tasks for the Principal in Implementing the Least Restrictive Environment Mandate of P.L. 94-142." Illinois Principal (March 1979).
- Wiles, David K., et al. Practical Politics for School Administrators. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1981.
- Wise, Arthur. Legislated Learning: The Bureaucratization of the American Classroom. Berkeley, California: University of California Press, 1979.
- Wolcott, Harry F. The Man in the Principal's Office: An Ethnography. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1973.
- Wynn, Richard. "Intraorganizational Conflict in Schools." Oregon School Study Council Bulletin 21 (April 1978).
- Wynne, E. "Accountable to Whom" Society 13 (1976):30-7.
- Zeigler, L. Harmon; Tucker, Harvey J.; and Wilson, L.A. "How School Control Was Wrested from the People." Phi Delta Kappan 58 (March 1977):534-9.
- Zimmer, Basil G. and Hawley, Amos H. Metropolitan Area Schools: Resistance to District Reorganization. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, Inc., 1968.
- "Burnt-Out Principals." Newsweek (March 13, 1978):76.
- "One Way or Another Your Curriculum Flows from the Potomac." American School Board Journal 164 (February 1977):37-8.
- "Principal's Checklist for Streamlining Routine Program Maintenance." National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin 63:49-56.

"See Money." CPR. 61 (1971):26-8.

"Views on Federal Education Programs: Symposium." Journal of Teacher Education 26 (1975):155-71.

APPROVAL SHEET

The dissertation submitted by McNair Grant  
has been read and approved by the following committee:

Dr. M. P. Heller, Chairman  
Professor, Administration and Supervision  
Loyola

Dr. Max A. Bailey  
Associate Professor, Administration and Supervision  
Loyola

Dr. Philip M. Carlin  
Associate Professor, Administration and Supervision  
Loyola

The final copies have been examined by the chairman 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.

December 14, 1981  
Date

  
Chairman's Signature