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CHAPTER I
BACKGROUND AND NATURE OF THE STUDY

No educator should deny the importance of student reading ability. Student progress in all academic areas of education has largely depended upon effective reading skills. The issue of student reading ability and the consequent need for reading research were evidenced by the great interest in the field of reading within the last ten years. In regard to the issue and the need, research pointed to the number of studies made and the various aspects of reading being investigated by researchers.

In an unpublished dissertation, Panchyshyn identified several important factors concerning reading research. His study measured the importance placed on reading research by the increased number of studies made—"more than 700 in 1960 (reported by Gray) to over 1,400 in 1969 (reported by Ebel) and by the amount of money expended by public agencies for reading research." Panchyshyn further reported that "the apparent willingness of the public to spend huge amounts of money on reading-related materials" was reflected by two factors: the innovation of "countless hardware and software items" and by the "entrance of large corporations into educational supply fields."¹

¹Robert Panchyshyn, "An Investigation of the Knowledge of Iowa Elementary School Principals about the Teaching of Reading in the Primary Grades" (Ph.D. dissertation, the University of Iowa, 1971), p. 2.
In the current issue of the Annual Summary of Investigations Relating to Reading (July 1978-July 1979), more than 1,100 published reports of reading research were given. Weintraub, Smith, Roser, and Rowls commented on the 1,100 figure by stating,

That number is about double the entries appearing in last year's summary and is by far the greatest number ever to have been identified within a single summary.2 Weintraub et al.'s comments were construed as two measures for the marked increase in reading research: an increase for one year and a precedent for one summary. "Psychology, child development, linguistics, optometry and ophthalmology, journalism, sociology"--the specialty areas--were cited by Weintraub et al. as being "but a few of the areas in which researchers are investigating aspects of reading."3

The inundation of reading research focused not only on the need for reading skills but also on the need for viable reading programs. Even though our modern electronic systems of communication may seem to have made the printed word obsolescent, our society has, nevertheless, continued to depend upon the permanence and accessibility of the printed word. And nowhere has the printed word become more important to the student than on the secondary level of education. Because of the demands made on our students for critical and

---


3 Ibid.
efficient reading skills, our secondary schools have needed and have been confronted with the problem of providing quality reading programs, programs that accomplish maximum student achievement within the secondary curriculum.

The research also focused on the impressions of parents that schools teach reading poorly. These parental impressions were reinforced by numerous book, periodical, and newspaper articles that disparaged the increasing number of students with less than adequate ability to read. The research further disclosed that administrators were asked and, in some cases, were told to implement reading programs in their schools. McHugh summed up the literature by citing the reasons for the demands made of administrators to develop programs of reading instruction:

Mounting pressures from many directions are forcing principals to examine carefully their reading programs. Recent research, new programs, technologies, systems, and strategies for implementing improved programs combined with massive federal and state windfalls have placed a difficult burden on the school principal.4

The literature placed such an emphasis on the need for student reading skills that it did not examine either the methods for establishing viable reading programs or the roles of the personnel involved. Therefore, it seemed evident that there was a need to examine the role of the principal as the

primary, responsible person for establishing instructional programs at the building level.

In examining the functions of the principalship Carlson was concerned about how much a principal is expected to know in his role as instructional leader. In answer to his question—"Can the principal be expected to be an expert in all curriculum areas?"—Carlson commented:

Practically speaking, the criterion of cruciality will need to be applied. Certainly the more knowledge a principal has in all curriculum areas the greater his effectiveness and the more complete his security. To survive, however, a principal needs to know the area of reading instruction in some depth.

A review of the literature indicated that the principal should not only support the reading program but that he should also play a key role in designing and developing the program. Henry Brickell emphasized the influence of the administrator upon an effective reading program; he stated that

The administrator may promote—or prevent—innovation. He cannot stand aside or be ignored. He is powerful not because he has a monopoly on imagination, creativity, or interest in change—the opposite is common—but simply he has the authority to precipitate a decision. Authority is a critical element in innovation because proposed changes generate mixed reactions which can prevent consensus among peers and result in stagnation.

---

5 Thorsten B. Carlson, "What the Principal Needs to Know about Reading," in Revitalizing Today's Reading Instruction, ed. R. Maloney (Beverly Hills: California Reading Association, 1969), p. 28.

John Simmons conducted a survey of the administrative practices in three midwestern states. In his survey findings Simmons disclosed what may be interpreted as the lack of knowledge and, hence a lack of influence, by the administrator. He reported that

A large number of the administrators can be classified as having no formal training in the teaching of reading. Some had fragmentary training, gained as part of a methods course, but there were few reading specialists and only one secondary reading teacher employed in the schools responding to this survey. In most cases, I would speculate, the reading specialist was responsible for the entire school system and was probably spending most of his time with problems in the elementary schools of the community. The study points up further the utter lack of reading instructors whose chief concern is instruction at the high school level.7

Bernard and Hetzel emphasized what may be termed as the inherent responsibility of the principal for improving the school reading program. Further, their research pointed to the competencies pertinent to the principal in his duty to effect a successful reading program.

By the very nature of the position, the principal is responsible for providing the impetus to improve the school reading program. The literature supports the concept but fails to delineate the competencies of the effective principal that result in a successful school reading program.8

A survey of the reading journals of the 1960s and 1970s revealed how much is written on methods, materials, and the

kinds of reading programs but disclosed that less is written on the role and responsibilities of the principal. Sidney Trubowitz deduced that "Study after study indicates the principal sets the tone for the reading program in the school."

But before the principal can set the tone, he must know his job role requirements; in this regard the suggestions of Rauch were helpful. For over twenty years, Sidney Rauch has written about the importance of administrators to a successful reading program. Rauch cited the following six characteristics of the successful administrator:

1. The administrator should be knowledgeable about the reading process.
2. He takes advantage of the training and expertise of reading specialists.
3. He consults with supervisory and teaching personnel before new programs are instituted or changes are made.
4. He realizes that teachers are severely handicapped if materials are lacking.
5. He encourages and supports experimentation and innovation.
6. He has the support and respect of the community as a person and as an educational leader.

Here, Rauch has given an image of the functional administrator. In essence, Rauch has begun to delineate some of the "competencies of the effective principal that result in a successful school reading program."

---

9Sidney Trubowitz, "The Principal Helps Improve Reading Instruction," Reading Horizons 18, no. 3 (Spring 1978): 186.


11Barnard and Hetzel, "The Principal's Role in Reading Instruction," Reading Teacher 29, no. 4 (January 1976):386.
The guidelines for this study concerning the role of the principal in secondary reading were constructed from two sources: research reports of the International Reading Association combined with a role description of the secondary principal by Stephen Knezevich. The following were the guidelines constructed as the role functions of the principal in the operation of the secondary reading program.

1. He participates in planning and developing the reading program.

2. He ensures proper funding for the program.

3. He makes provision for adequate facilities.

4. He provides competent personnel to guide and implement the program.

5. He plans and participates in inservice programs to bring about quality reading instruction.

6. He provides adequate lines of communication among administrators, reading, and other content area personnel about the status/operation of the program.

7. He provides channels for monitoring and properly evaluating the success of the program.

8. He establishes staff and community support through the best possible public relations efforts.

In addition to serving as the criteria for this study in surveying the administrative practices in secondary reading programs, the foregoing guidelines were constructed toward the view of answering Barnard and Hetzel's complaint that the literature failed to delineate the competencies of the principal in a reading program.
Statement of the Problem

The problem investigated was the administrator's role relative to reading programs of the public secondary (9-12) high schools in DuPage County, Illinois. The administrative procedures to implement a plan, fund a plan, staff a plan, and evaluate a plan, as well as the academic and experiential backgrounds of the secondary principals, were surveyed.

Purpose of the Study

The main consideration in this study was a survey of the current administrative practices of the principal in secondary (9-12) reading programs. The consideration of the study came within the purview of four questions as follows:

1. To what degree does the role of the principal in secondary reading programs involve preparing the program budget and providing for adequacy of funding?

2. To what degree does the role of the principal in secondary reading programs involve planning for program facilities, program implementation, and program evaluation?

3. To what degree does the role of the principal in secondary reading programs involve staff selection and staff development?

4. To what degree does the role of the principal in secondary reading programs involve promotion through public relations of staff and community support of the reading program?

In addition, data collected from the survey was used to analyze the current academic and experiential background of
the administrators in the public secondary (9-12) schools of DuPage County, Illinois. This data further helped to identify the target population. The collected data included the following:

1. educational degree(s) held
2. type(s) of Illinois certificate(s) held
3. number of credit hours earned in reading courses
4. years of experience as a teacher or administrator
5. acquired educational experience relating to the improvement of reading instruction

**Importance of the Study**

The analysis of the data collected and of the conclusions drawn from this study assisted principals, supervisors, consultants, specialists, department chairpersons, and other staff members in determining the status of reading programs in the public secondary (9-12) high schools of DuPage County, Illinois. Also, the identified administrative practices provided guidelines to assist educators in improving and/or extending secondary reading programs.

**Delimitations of the Study**

The following were the delimitations of the study:

1. The study was limited to the public secondary (9-12) high schools in DuPage County, State of Illinois.
2. The study was limited to the current administrative practices identified by the target principals.
3. The study did not measure the effectiveness of any administrator or of any reading program in actual practice, nor did it evaluate any instructional method for teaching reading.

4. The representativeness and completeness of the mailed questionnaire results were dependent upon the willingness of the sample principals for completing and returning the research forms.

5. The representativeness and completeness of the interview findings were dependent upon candid and valid responses by the principals to the items included in the structured interview questionnaire.

**Research Method**

The instruments used for collecting data were a mailed questionnaire and an instrument with a structured interview format. The instruments were developed for securing descriptive data consistent with the purpose of the study. The purpose of the study was to survey the administrative practices of principals in the reading programs of selected public secondary (9-12) schools in DuPage County, Illinois.

The questionnaire was also used to collect objective data relative to the status of secondary reading programs and the role of the principal in the programs. The structured interview format was selected because of the flexibility in use of the instrument for gathering subjective data. The interview technique was planned to provide both the interviewer and the individuals interviewed with a non-threatening situation in which open and candid discussion could take place concerning secondary reading programs.
Organization of the Study

The study was organized into five chapters. Chapter I outlines the overall design of the study. The general organization of Chapter I includes sections written for providing background information into the nature and purpose of the study.

Chapter II presents a review of the research and literature relating to the role of the principal in secondary reading programs. The methodology used in the study is presented in Chapter III. Analyses and summaries of all collected data are presented in Chapter IV. The findings of the study are presented in Chapter V along with the conclusions and recommendations concerning this study.

Definition of Terms

The following terms were used in the study. The source for defining the terms was the Dictionary of Education, edited by Carter V. Good, 3rd edition, New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1973.

high school, comprehensive: a secondary school that includes both general education courses and specialized fields of study in its program and thus offers academic, commercial, trade, and technical subjects

inservice program: a school or community teacher training plan that may include such activities as seminars, workshops, bulletins, television or film [presentations] for individuals who are already teaching

principal: the administrative head and professional leader of a school division or unit, such as a high school, junior high school, or elementary school
program development/planning: a process by which the nature and sequence of future educational programs are determined

program evaluation: the testing, measuring, and appraising of the growth, adjustment, and achievement of the learner by means of tests and non-test instruments and techniques

program, reading: a planned instructional program in reading, as contrasted with the incidental teaching of reading or with unskilled and unplanned reading instruction

reading, content: reading of books that contain needed information, such as textbooks or reference books on geography, history, or science, as contrasted with the reading of books for recreation or fun only

reading, critical: reading in which the reader evaluates content in terms of its authenticity, beauty, usefulness, or some other criterion

reading expert: a person well-versed in all aspects of reading instruction

role: behavior patterns of functions expected of or carried out by an individual in a given societal context

secondary school organization: any plan followed in assigning school grades to the secondary school administrative unit, such as the 8-4 plan or the 6-3-3 plan
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE AND RELATED RESEARCH

Introduction

The review of literature and related research relative to the administrative practices of the principal furnished an understanding of the role expected of the principal in providing a successful, effective reading program. Pertinent areas under review were those areas of responsibilities specifically involving the principal in developing and maintaining the reading program.

Organization of the Chapter

The review of literature and related research was organized to illustrate the following areas:

1. Historic development of the secondary school and its principalship

2. The general role of the principal in the administration of the secondary school

3. The leadership role of the secondary principal in the reading program

Historic Development

In order to place in perspective the present-day role of the secondary principal, it was important to trace the origin of the secondary school in the American educational system.
During the colonization of America, the early settlers from England brought with them the concept and structure of the Latin grammar school. In the new colonies the first such school, established in 1635, was the Boston Latin Grammar School. The Latin grammar schools were "known as secondary schools" and "were parallel to existing elementary (common or dame) schools rather than upward extension of such schools." The schools were open to boys; girls were not eligible to attend. The boys who attended the schools were usually from families of the higher social and economic scale.

Requirements for graduation from the schools varied from colony to colony. Essentially, attendance was required of a boy "until he reached the age and attained the necessary proficiency in the classics to enter the college of his choice." Because of the proficiency requirement, the Latin grammar schools were, "in this sense, college preparatory schools."\(^1\)

Except for the New England colonies, where it met with some measure of success, the Latin grammar school did not prosper greatly in America; however, it did mark a period in educational history during which a school offered education beyond the common school level.

In the latter half of the 1700s, when social, economic, and political conditions were changing in the colonies, there

---

was a growing desire by the colonists for independence from the mother country. The schools reflected these changes. The Latin grammar school faded from the scene, and there arose a new institution, the academy. Transition to the new institution was accounted for by the shortcomings of the Latin grammar school itself. "Because of unwillingness or of inability, or perhaps a combination of the two, the Latin grammar school did not make any major changes to satisfy the new demands" made by the colonists for societal changes. Another factor contributing to the transition was the factor of "popular sentiment for secondary education in America," and this popular sentiment "was reflected by the fact that the academy experienced such rapid growth during the 1700s and the early 1800s."²

Probably the best known of the academies was that founded by Benjamin Franklin in Philadelphia in 1751. Franklin, cognizant of the mounting unrest among the colonists for societal changes, wanted the classics of the Latin grammar school abandoned in favor of English grammar and literature. In his foresight for academic improvements, Franklin's view was toward that of a practical school, for he believed that such a school would better serve the needs of the colonists. Interestingly, the colonists took a practical step forward by developing the academies for girls. The early developments of secondary education for both sexes represented the

²Ibid, pp. 21-22.
growing social and economic needs of the colonists for schools beyond the common elementary level.

The early development of the high school was the result of an envisioned goal by a young American society to make secondary education available to all American children. In addition, the growth of the high school reflected the "need for a school that would follow rather than compete with the elementary or common school." In his work, Public Education in the United States, Cubberly pointed out the need for "a more complete education than the common schools afforded." These factors led to the major educational development of free public high schools in the early 1800s, and the first free one was opened in Boston in 1821. Known first as the Boston English Classical School, the first free public high school later, in 1824, became known as the Boston English High School. The early schools were the direct fore-runners of today's high schools, and although their success was immediate, it took nearly two decades for their influence to permeate the educational system. In the twenty-year span 1890-1910 the number of high schools multiplied approximately four times--"from a little over 2,500 by 1890 to well over 10,000 by 1910"--while total enrollment increased approximately four and one-half times--"from about 200,000 pupils by 1890

3Ibid., p. 23.

to more than 900,000 by 1910."\(^5\) Knezevich called the development of the comprehensive high school primarily a twentieth century event, and on a global scale the United States has been one of the few countries of the world adhering to the cause of supporting and maintaining a compulsory secondary educational program.

One of the oldest educational positions—-but one that "has no history"—was that of the secondary school principalship. Actually, the headmasters of the Latin grammar schools were the forerunners of the modern-day principal. The term "headmaster" referred to the "title assigned to a building-level administrator who was granted a considerable degree of responsibility for the control of the ... school."\(^6\)

As for the evolution of the public high school principal, Knezevich suggested there is evidence that this position existed prior to the establishment of both the elementary school principalship and the superintendency of schools. Early in the development of the public schools, the secondary schools were totally autonomous from the elementary schools and, as discovered by Moehlman,\(^7\) the early superintendents were given no authority over the secondary schools. The early principals (head teachers) were usually responsible for the tasks of disciplining in the school and for con-

\(^6\)Ibid., p. 390  
\(^7\)Ibid., p. 391.
ducting visitors on tours through the school. Later, as secondary schools became larger, the principal then became responsible for the scheduling of students and teachers and for making reports on courses of study. At this point in time, there was "little need" for the principal "to develop a high degree of skill in the administrative process" since he was the best teacher in the building and the best informed in most, if not all, subjects of the curriculum."\(^8\) But by the late 1900s the qualification requirements for the principal surpassed his capability to perform his duties as headmaster and as the head teacher who taught all courses and classes. The principalship had grown into the province of a professional administrator and with the expanded status, more administrative responsibilities; chief of which was that of coordinating the curriculum plan. With the specialization of subjects at the high school level, the principal found it very difficult to maintain an in-depth knowledge of each academic area. As a remedy to the insurmountable task confronting the principal, his role became that of an instructional leader. In this capacity he worked with his staff to obtain the best possible curriculum, but despite this remedial innovation, the task of instructional leader has been difficult for the secondary principal because

In far too many situations the principal is poorly trained for the emerging school curriculum that is rapidly developing. He has the title of "instruc-

\(^8\) Ibid.
tional leader" but neither the skills nor . . . depth of background in each curriculum area to prepare himself for the problem he faces.\(^9\)

Because of the burgeoning complexities associated with the role of the chief administrator of a secondary school, experts in the field of educational administration have taken a more realistic appraisal of this position.

**Role of the Principal in Secondary Schools**

In 1923, in an address to the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, Milo Stuart, a very successful high school principal, presented an eloquent exposition on the role characteristics of the secondary principal. In his interpretation of the principal's role, Stuart bespoke characteristics that obviously were from experience --how, otherwise, could he have depicted so typically all the attributes, foibles, and propensities of that role?

The relation of the principal to his teachers should be the most intimate of any. If a teacher fails, the principal fails; if the teacher succeeds, the principal succeeds. To sum up what the principal's job is, I should call him a referee--the captain of a ship--the boss of the firm--a juvenile court judge before whose tribunal come not only the culprits but the adults who frequently contribute to the pupil's shortcoming. He is a promoter who must project the future of his institution and convert the public to his plan. He is social physician to every parent who has a wayward son who needs attention. He is a friend-in-need to pupils and to all the homes in which misfortune comes. His power,

---

his activities, even the good he does cannot be measured by a material yardstick.\textsuperscript{10}

In Stuart's perspective of the secondary principal there was present one predominant human attribute—personality. Other characteristics were implied: the importance of personal relationships (personal rapport) and staff loyalty; the importance of the influential power inherent in the principal's characteristic role as social liaison; the importance of patience and consideration; and the importance of being free from all elements of bias. Throughout his exposition Stuart depicted the principal's underlying buttress of perseverance and an image of his succinct skill in human relationships. More than fifty years have passed since Stuart's address, but his role characteristics are as applicable to the 1980 secondary principal as they were to the 1923 principal, simply because human characteristics are universal in application.

In the \textit{NASSP Bulletin} (November 1951), a national committee on experience standards for principals of secondary schools reported on the responsibilities of the principal. The committee indicated that "the principal of the American secondary school has in some measure all the responsibilities" of every worker on the school staff. In addition to the responsibilities of all the school employees, the national

committee enumerated as follows three functional responsibilities of the secondary principal:

First, the principal has the responsibility for leading the entire staff of the secondary school in developing as guiding principles the objectives of the school...

Second, the principal has the responsibility for coordinating all those activities which grow out of a dynamic program of secondary education...

Third, the principal has the responsibility for making decisions...

In broad but definitive terms, the committee elucidated three responsibilities that may be identified as administrative role functions of the secondary principal. In item one, the committee identified the principal as the developer of objectives; in item two, as the coordinator of the activities; and in item three, as the decision maker. There is no doubt that the secondary principal becomes involved with the responsibilities of staff members at all staff levels. These three NASSP role functions were more easily summed up in what Austin and Collins called the leadership roles of the secondary principal.

In 1956, Austin and Collins made a study of attitudes toward the high school principal and reported their findings under eleven areas of job performance. Whereas the national committee on experience standards identified three broad but definitive role functions of the secondary principal, Austin and Collins, in their eleven areas of job performance, branched out to give specific details of the principal's administrative functions as follows:

11Ibid., p. 135.
1. organizing, managing, and coordinating components of the school
2. improving curriculum and teaching
3. gaining confidence and support
4. winning respect and approval of students
5. enlisting the support and cooperation of the community
6. delegating authority and responsibility
7. increasing his professional competence
8. participating in community affairs
9. making policies and decisions
10. working with higher administration
11. executing policies and decisions

These areas of job performance were more in line with the normal areas of concern facing any principal, but in citing these eleven areas, Austin and Collins were citing the diverse range of responsibilities and administrative practices that fall within the province of the principal.

Corbally, Jensen, and Staub viewed the functional responsibilities of the secondary administrator under the major headings of "instructional leadership" or "management." Under the major headings they then cited the following six areas of conflicts and concerns:

1. Purposes: . . . Purpose underlies curriculum and questions of purpose must be resolved before curriculum can be developed. . . .
2. Instructional leadership: . . . New approaches are needed in the development of the secondary school curriculum. Leadership in discovering these approaches is expected of the secondary school.
3. Staff personnel: . . . If the demands made upon secondary education are to be met, administrators will need to find new ways to utilize the talent available to them. . . .
4. Student body: . . . The secondary school principal will . . . administer an organization with a complex and heterogeneous clientele . . . . And

---

12Ibid., p. 136.
he will have problems. Nevertheless, it seems clear that the comprehensive high school with a comprehensive student body will be the order of the day.

5. Management: ... The educational administrator must view his proposed actions in terms of financial resources and must be aware that educational conflicts and concerns need ultimately to be viewed in relation to financial ones. Education, not dollars, is the primary focus for decisions and for planning, ... 13

Corbally et al. acknowledged that these areas of concern have been prevalent areas of concern facing any principal since the inception of secondary schools.

Other writers in the field of educational administration referred to the role of the secondary principal in terms of professional competencies. Jones, Salisbury, and Spencer listed the following nine competencies relevant to the middle group of administrators--secondary principals:

1. The secondary principal should possess adequate personal qualities.
2. The secondary principal should be of good moral character and have basic integrity.
3. A leader of the secondary school should have a wide background of undergraduate or graduate work which gives an understanding about the nature of learning and specific learnings to his own teaching field.
4. The principal of a secondary school should have a deep understanding of the technical aspects of educational administration.
5. In addition to possessing competencies in these areas, the principal should be able to relate his knowledge and skills in a meaningful way.
6. A leader of a secondary school should possess an adequate background of experience.
7. The secondary principal should have a good understanding of related disciplines.

13 Corbally et al., pp. 34-36.
8. The principal of a secondary school should be able to work effectively with both individuals and groups.

9. The principal of a secondary school should be able to adjust his knowledge and thinking to situational patterns.14

In summary, the competencies of Jones et al. were analyzed in terms of the role requirements and expectations of the principal as a leader and as an administrator. In items one and two, Jones et al. were depicting a principal-administrator with personality and good moral attributes; in items three and six, a principal-administrator with good educational and experiential background requirements; in items four and seven, a principal-administrator with a keen perception of the magnitude and scope of the educational administrative role; and in items five, eight, and nine, a principal-administrator with flexibility and succinct skill in human relationships.

In a U. S. Office of Education Bulletin, Stuart Dean added still another term by which to identify the role functions of the principal. He called the competencies of the principal "services." These competencies were thought of as services rendered by the office of the principal for the school service center. The ten most important services cited by Dean connoted professional services comparable to the services of a sophisticated, centralized business enterprise.

The principal's office services were concisely stated as

1. a communications center of the school
2. a clearing house for the transaction of school business
3. a counseling center for teachers and students
4. a counseling center for school patrons
5. a research division of the school for the collection, analysis, and evaluation of information regarding activities and results
6. a repository of school records
7. the planning center for solving school problems and initiating school improvements
8. a resource center for encouraging creative work
9. a coordinating agency cultivating wholesome school and community relations
10. the coordinating center of the school enterprise

Even though the ten services were broadly stated, they astutely present a good overview of the school enterprise and of the pertinent administrative matters that fall to the discretion and jurisdiction of the principal.

The authorities of the 1960s and 1970s placed the secondary principalship on a positional level comparable to that of an executive or central administrator; more and more the administrative role of the principal has become likened to the role of the corporate executive managing resources, both human and material, for the ultimate good of the business. The position of the secondary principal was viewed as being extremely important to the American educational enterprise. "No greater challenge to leadership ability exists than to work toward the continued growth of the American high school." With the continued growth of the high school, the

---

15 Knezevich, p. 395. 16 Corbally et al., p. 38.
role of the principal has evolved from the headmaster concept of the best teacher in most subject areas to the manager of the secondary school. Knezevich called the principalship a constellation of positions. Indeed, it does embody a complex role. Knezevich stated that the principal is

A counselor of students, the school disciplinarian, the organizer of the schedule, the supervisor of the instructional program, the pupil-relations representative for the attendance area, the liaison between teachers and the superintendent, the director and evaluator of teaching efforts, the manager of the school facilities, the supervisor of custodial and food-service employees within the building, and a professional leader.17

"Professional leader" was the final term of summation given to the administrative role of the principal by both Knezevich and Corbally et al. In essence, the role descriptions of all the authorities were narrowed to the single category of leadership, and all the leadership qualities of the secondary principal were classified under one or more of the headings of functions, competencies, job performances, or services, depending upon the source of authority consulted. In summarizing the educational administrative field, Briner visualized the role of the secondary principal in three major dimensions: technical, managerial, and conceptual.18 The functions of testing, interviewing, and maintenance were placed under the technical dimension; effectiveness of staff, rules, economic use of space and funds were placed under the managerial dimension; and instructional program director, com-

17Knezevich, p. 395. 18Ibid.
munity ideas for learning, pupil and teacher welfare were all placed under the conceptual dimension. Thus, Briner has added still another term--dimension, in tripartite—to the role descriptions of the secondary principal.

Regardless of how the authorities perceived the role of the secondary principal, the needs of each principal's field of operation dictated the actual practices promulgated by the respective administrator. It was helpful to juxtapose theory and practice in order to determine if the state of the art reflected the state of the literature.

Leadership Role of the Secondary Principal in Reading

Experts in the field of educational administration cited leadership as one of the most important functions of the secondary principal. Of the curricular areas requiring the principal's instructional leadership, the area of reading is one of the most vital to the student. Reading instruction does not cease just because a student has entered the secondary level of schooling. The literature and related research identified problem areas that directly and adversely affect the development of student reading skills. The experts carefully delineated the broad competencies of the secondary principal but failed to focus on the principal's specific duties in the area of reading. Perhaps the lack of literature concerning those responsibilities of the secondary principal in the area of reading reflected the lack of
concern and support for the reading program or the state of
the reading field at the secondary level.

Reading at the secondary level has not been successful.
Reasons for its lack of success can be traced to an inade-
quate understanding of the need for reading on the secondary
level and the lack of training for both administrators and
content teachers that would otherwise enable both to cope
more successfully with secondary reading problems. Thus, be-
cause reading permeates the secondary curriculum and recent
studies indicated that reading difficulties plague the second-
ary schools, authorities were in agreement that it is incum-
bent on the principal to take the initiative in resolving sec-
ondary reading problems. McHugh stated that

... The most important factor in improving the
reading program in the classroom is to train princi-
pals to be instructional leaders in reading. Someone
must assume the role of instructional leader, change
agent, and evaluator. This challenge falls squarely
on the school principal. No other person can assume
this role.19

The principal's knowledge and expertise must of neces-
sity operate over a wider range than that of the teacher. To
the experts, the principal's input into the educational enter-
prise was (1) his ability to precipitate a decision and (2)
his ability to effect the behavior of teachers. In the
opinion of Rauch

19 Walter J. McHugh, "Current Administrative Problems
in Reading," TRA Highlights of the Pre-Convention Institutes
Little is said about the roles and responsibilities of the person who has primary responsibility for the school reading program—the principal.

It must be emphasized that the principal sets the tone for the reading program. His interest and concern for better reading permeates the entire program. His sensitivity to the needs of his staff and realistic appraisal of the total school community environment can lead to the enthusiastic cooperation of all concerned. Above all, he provides the leadership necessary for the total involvement of the faculty.20

The principal's support of the secondary reading program may have a profound effect upon its success or failure. The current literature viewed the principal as the necessary component to the reading program; not only must the principal assume the role of chief instructional leader, but he must also have a high commitment to the instruction of reading in the school. In a study conducted in New Mexico, Bowren identified administrative commitment and proper attitudes as prerequisites to the success of a reading program.

... The paramount problem appears not to be one of funding, but rather of attitudes and commitment. Content teachers will generally follow the lead of their administrators. ... [and] will develop a commitment to a program when it is initiated by the local administration. If reading programs are to be successful, proper attitudes must be developed.21

Numerous surveys and studies made of the reading problems in our nation's schools disclosed alarming facts that should be of concern to every educator. Avery's wisdom was timely spoken when he said that


Administrators of all levels of school organization must, in the current milieu, be informed on the teaching of reading. This is important even when the details of the administration and supervision of the programs are delegated to specialists.22

The need for principals to understand the magnitude of reading problems associated with the nation's schools was emphasized by Kottmeyer who made a study of 7,380 eighth grade students and found that when the students entered the ninth grade, almost 81 percent read below the seventh-grade level. Kottmeyer further reported that the reading scores of the students ranged from above college freshman level to below fourth-grade level. In his study Traxler reported that of all students entering high school, 2 percent were two or more years retarded in reading. In Teaching Secondary English DeBoer, Kaulfers, and Miller stated that 80 percent of the high school freshmen read below their grade norms. Stewart indicated that, on the national average, the number of secondary pupils seriously handicapped in reading ranged from 20 to 30 percent. In her pioneer study concerning the scope of reading problems in secondary schools, Pentz reported that of the poor readers, 49.9 percent dropped out of school because they lacked reading ability. Teachers simply failed to help those students who lacked adequate reading skills. In 1962, Grissom made a follow-up study which indicated that from

one-fourth to one-third of the students in virtually any given high school tended to be academically handicapped in the important skill of reading. The studies of Kottmeyer, Traxler, DeBoer et al., Stewart, Pentz, and Grissom, to name but a few, were all studies relevant to student reading levels.

The findings of the individual studies just cited suggested "serious shortcomings within the high school curriculum" over the past years. A study conducted by Austin and Morrison disclosed that our educators are inadequately trained or prepared for their respective administrative or teaching functions. "To the question of who is responsible for the leadership or organized reading instruction in the high school" often the response is "every teacher is a teacher of reading. . . ." But Austin and Morrison's findings were converse to such a response; they reported


Prospective teachers are now receiving little more than minimal training in the teaching of reading during their undergraduate years, and they should receive further training and effective guidance as beginning teachers. The people to whom they must look for this support and assistance are school principals and curriculum supervisors. However, the field study appears to show that some principals and supervisors have no genuine understanding of reading concepts and thus are unable to participate in the inservice training of the novice.\textsuperscript{25}

On the basis of the data collected in their study, Austin and Morrison recommended that college-sponsored courses or inservice training, specifically designed for principals, supervisors, and curriculum specialists, be offered in reading instruction.

In addition to the findings of Austin and Morrison, Strang, who surveyed the effectiveness of secondary reading programs, found that of 7,417 high school English teachers surveyed, 90 percent indicated that they were poorly prepared to teach reading. The ninety-percent group--identified by Strang from her collected survey data as those with the least amount of preparation for teaching reading--were teachers in junior and small high schools.\textsuperscript{26}

A study by Bosworth supported Austin and Morrison's idea that there is a correlation between active administrative leadership and positive gain in the reading ability of


secondary students. The purpose of Bosworth's study was to determine the relationship between the introduction and use of certain administrative practices relative to the secondary reading program. Bosworth found that there was a positive correlation in all of the selected schools where the administrative staff showed genuine flexibility in using new procedures and patterns.27

From the general role descriptions of the secondary principal given earlier in this chapter, it was apparent that the authorities in the field of educational administration were in accord that the principal must assume the role function of instructional leader, but as Barnard and Hetzel stated,

The literature supports the concept [of instructional leader] but fails to delineate the competencies of the effective principal.28

The authorities suggested the broad competencies of the secondary principal but failed to focus on his responsibilities in the area of reading. Generally, the literature and related research viewed the following areas as the primary areas of concern of the principal as he guides all curricular programs of the school:

1. facilities and programs
2. staff selection and development

27Bowren, p. 518.

3. budgeting and funding
4. staff and community relations

Rauch, a leading advocate of administrative leadership in reading, suggested the following guidelines for the principal as he guides the reading program:

1. The administrator should be knowledgeable about the reading process.
2. He takes advantage of the training and expertise of reading specialists.
3. He consults with supervisory and teaching personnel before new programs are instituted or changes are made.
4. He realizes that teachers are severely handicapped if materials are lacking.
5. He encourages and supports experimentation and innovation.
6. He has the support and respect of the community as a person and as an educational leader.29

Barnard and Hetzel generalized the principal's leadership role in reading in broader terms than did Rauch. They viewed the principal's functions as required managerial competencies to improve reading. These competencies were goal focusing, resource allocation, and program monitoring.30

Joseph Sanacore presented the principal's role responsibilities as functional capacities. These capacities were the principal's duty to obtain qualified personnel, to provide inservice education, to provide guidance in program evaluation, to provide classroom supervision, and to inform and involve the community.31

---

29Rauch, pp. 398-9
30Barnard and Hetzel, p. 386.
The role descriptions provided by Rauch, Barnard and Hetzel, and Sanacore were somewhat similar to the current general roles delineated by the authorities in the field of educational administration. What these writers advocated for reading—concerning what the principal should already be doing as an instructional leader—was not new or different from that stated by the authorities in educational administration. The reading authorities were more concerned that there be an awareness by the principal of remedial reading needs and that there be a structuring of the principal's time to effect a successful secondary reading program. The reading authorities contended that the key to a successful reading program was a combination of the principal's understanding of the reading process and of his leadership ability to promote the program.

Guidelines for this study concerning the role of the principal in secondary reading were constructed from two sources: research reports of the International Reading Association combined with a role description of the secondary principal by Knezevich. In his leadership role the principal

1. actively involves himself in the planning, implementation, and operation of the secondary reading program

2. establishes sound financial and budgetary practices to ensure adequate funding of the reading program

3. allocates the best facilities and materials available to meet the needs of a secondary reading program
4. establishes guidelines for the selection of specialized reading personnel to staff, operate, and teach the reading program

5. provides guidance in establishing quality in-service programs for the development of staff expertise in coping with reading problems

6. provides methods based upon sound theory and research for evaluating the reading program, the students in the program, and the staff of the program

7. promotes staff involvement in secondary reading by generating proper attitudes toward the importance of reading in the content areas on the secondary level

8. provides guidelines for establishing staff lines of communication with the community

Because the literature and related research identified problem areas that directly and adversely affect the development of student reading skills, the experts in the field of educational administration and in the area of reading instruction were correct in citing leadership instruction as one of the most important functions of the secondary principal. The problem areas that were isolated by the literature were serious enough in nature to prompt any principal to take the most efficient remedial action. Thus, the authorities were also correct in assuming that the principal, as chief instructional leader, should have the ability to precipitate a decision—to institute the most immediate remedial action—and the ability to effect the behavior of teachers—to influence their attitudes toward and, hence, their commitment to, a more effective program of higher quality reading instruction.
Summary of the Literature and Related Research

The historic development of the secondary school was investigated. The review of literature and related research indicated that the American high school was a grass roots movement that stemmed from the desires of a young nation's society for free public coeducation beyond the common school level. Because of the growth of the secondary schools, a new kind of administrator—the principal—came to the American educational system. The position of the secondary principalship, which has been studied extensively since the early 1900s, was recognized for its unique growth. Likely in existence before either the elementary principalship or the superintendent, the secondary principalship was developed from the concept of headmaster and, since the 1950s, has evolved into a complex managerial concept likened to a middle-management businessman controlling personnel and materials.

The review of literature suggested that the leadership qualities of the secondary principal are his most important assets. Further, the literature indicated that the secondary principal has a wide range of responsibilities concerning the secondary school curriculum; chief among these is the responsibility for instructional leadership. The experts in the area of reading agreed that the secondary principal must accept specific areas of responsibility in managing and extending the secondary program.
Based upon the research reports of the International Reading Association and a role description of the secondary principal by Stephen Knezevich, there was developed, for the purpose of this study, a guideline list of the principal's administrative responsibilities for the secondary reading program. These guidelines became the survey criteria for testing actual field practices against theory.
CHAPTER III
PROCEDURES OF THE STUDY

The procedures which were used for the research study are presented in Chapter III and are divided into the following areas:

1. restatement of the purpose
2. description of the population
3. pilot results
4. description of the data-gathering instruments and their development
5. design of the mailed questionnaires and the structured interviews
6. procedures for administering the data-gathering instruments
7. methods of analysis and of reporting the findings

Restatement of the Purpose

The main consideration in this study was a survey of the current administrative practices of the principal in secondary (9-12) reading programs. The consideration of the study came within the purview of four questions as follows:

1. To what degree does the role of the principal in secondary reading programs involve preparing the program budget and providing for adequacy of funding?
2. To what degree does the role of the principal in secondary reading programs involve planning for program facilities, program implementation, and program evaluation?
3. To what degree does the role of the principal in secondary reading programs involve staff selection and staff development?

4. To what degree does the role of the principal in secondary reading programs involve promotion through public relations of staff and community support of the reading program?

In addition, data collected from the survey was used to analyze the current academic and experiential background of the administrators in the public secondary (9-12) schools of DuPage County, Illinois. This data further helped to identify the target population. The collected data included the following:

1. educational degree(s) held
2. type(s) of Illinois certificate(s) held
3. number of credit hours earned in reading courses
4. years of experience as a teacher or administrator
5. acquired educational experience relating to the improvement of reading instruction

Description of the Population

Initially, the Illinois State Board of Education, Department of Research and Statistics, Springfield, Illinois, was contacted concerning the exact number of Illinois public secondary (9-12) schools with an established reading program. Except in the case of Title I, which is tied to direct state and federal funding, it was learned from personnel of the Department of Research and Statistics that the Illinois state school code and guidelines do not require a reading program. Thus, not every public high school in the State of Illinois has a reading program.
During subsequent telephone conversations with the educational service regions of Illinois, it was then determined which public secondary (9-12) schools had existing reading programs. From this sample of secondary schools, those counties with 95 percent of their secondary schools containing established reading programs provided the target population. From the records of the Educational Service Region located in Wheaton, Illinois, it was learned that every public secondary (9-12) school in only one county, DuPage County, Illinois, had an established reading program. Therefore, the principals of all twenty-three public secondary schools in the school districts of DuPage County, Illinois, provided the target population for this research study.

An invitation to participate in the survey study was extended by letter (Appendix A) to each of the twenty-three principals. The criteria and format of the research study were outlined in the invitational letter.

Personal telephone calls, further clarifying the nature and scope of the study, were made to each of the principals. The telephone conversations allowed flexibility for questions and answers and facilitated the scheduling of mutually convenient visits to the schools for the purpose of conducting a structured interview with each of the principals.

The collected data was the result of 100 percent participation by the principals of the twenty-three public high schools in DuPage County, Illinois. Full participation by
each principal gave reliability and validity to the collected data. However, a pilot study was conducted before undertaking an investigation of the target population.

**Pilot Results**

An important underlying assumption was made for this study. Because of the nature of the research problem, this investigation operated within the concept of "construct validity."¹

We must face up to the fact that we are trying to measure something that is beneath the surface, and we are trying to give this "something" a more precise formulation by saying what subvariables it pulls together and how it must be related to other attitudinal or preceptual variables and to some aspect of behavior. If we happen to find pragmatic validity in respect to a particular criterion, we still need to know why it works, in terms of constructs. Such constructs, once obtained, would be expected to enter into relationships with other variables in predictable ways. Validity is inferred from such a predicted network of relationships; this validates both the measure and the theory behind it.²

Further, Selltiz, Jahoda, Deutsch and Cook pointed out that there are good reasons for engaging in the construct validation.

In content validation, one assumes that all of one's test measures the target concept but perhaps not all of the concept. In pragmatic validation, one assumes


that what one wants it to measure is the right thing to measure for one's purpose (criterion), and that the test can be expected to correlate with the criterion. Construct validation investigates what the other two assume, and thus underlies them both.³

Therefore, a pilot study was conducted to determine the constructs for an investigation of the target population. Careful pilot work ensured that the instruments developed for this study reflected terms and ideas like those that were to be used by the target population and that these terms and ideas had approximate similar meanings.

If an instrument is valid, it is reflecting primarily the characteristic which it is supposed to measure, with a minimum of distortion by other factors, either constant or transitory; thus we could assume that it also possesses an acceptable reliability.⁴

The pilot study field-tested the two data-gathering instruments designed for this study, that of the mailed survey (Appendix B) and the structured interview (Appendix C). Five secondary (9-12) schools with established reading programs were chosen in southwest suburban Cook County, Illinois. The principals of the five schools were willing to participate in the pilot study.

The survey questionnaire was mailed to each pilot principal. As a follow-up, one week later, each principal was contacted by telephone in order to arrange a mutually

⁴Ibid.
convenient time for the structured interview. If the principal had not returned the survey questionnaire, he was asked to do so during the telephone call or at the time of the interview.

Part 1 of the mailed questionnaire yielded the following descriptive data about the pilot principals. The principals were asked the number of years of experience they had as a high school principal. Their responses indicated two categories.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Number of Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The pilot principals reported that they did have other grade area administrative experience before becoming a high school principal. The other areas were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Number of Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Junior High (7-8)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary (K-6)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The teaching experience of each pilot principal differed from that of each of the other pilot principals as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Number of Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 or more</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Each pilot principal believed that the major teaching area was an important question on the questionnaire. That question was added to the actual mailed questionnaire.

Four of the principals held a doctorate, and one had a masters degree. Each principal believed that the type of degree held was a necessary question on the questionnaire.

The following types of Illinois certificates were held by the pilot principals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Number of Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>General Administrative</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>6-12 Teaching</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>K-9 Teaching</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Guidance and Counseling</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Special Language Arts</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With regard to the type of Illinois certificates held by the pilot principals, four of the principals indicated that the question should read, "list type and title of Illinois certificates held." This response became question 5 on the actual mailed questionnaire.

The number of hours earned by the pilot principals in reading-related courses varied as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester Hours</th>
<th>Number of Principals</th>
<th>Quarter Hours</th>
<th>Number of Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 or more</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15 or more</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Three of the pilot principals had difficulty understanding CEU credits. They stated that the question of CEU credits was not necessary for the survey questionnaire, but two of the principals suggested that by stating what the initials "CEU" stood for and, thus, leaving it in the questionnaire, the question would gather informative data in case any principal may have had extension credit hours in reading. This latter suggestion was taken for the actual mailed questionnaire.

Question 7, Part 1, of the mailed questionnaire yielded the following responses from the pilot principals for the best experience(s) related to instructional leadership in reading:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Number of Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inservice Workshops</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College/University Course Work</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Exposure to Existing Program</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with Others Knowledgeable in Reading</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, all the pilot principals had advanced degrees and had been high school principals for a relatively short number of years (0-9 years). All had extensive teaching backgrounds with a wide range of experience (from 0 to 20 or more years). They all had administrative experience in other grade areas before becoming a high school principal (primarily, junior high (7-8)).
All five pilot principals had university or college credits in the area of reading or reading-related courses and ranked these courses as being helpful to them for improving their leadership role in reading. Four of the principals stated that inservice workshops provided the best experience for improving their leadership expertise in reading.

Part 2, containing Sections I and II, of the mailed survey questionnaire (Appendix B) was an attitude-rating scale concerning various roles that the principal may perform in relationship to the reading program. Part 2, Section I, of the questionnaire elicited, with one of three possible responses, the attitude of each pilot principal toward the role functions. The three possible responses—not important, fairly important, and very important—were made by the pilot principals to the following eleven items:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The principal:</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>Fairly Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Plans/implements reading program</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Establishes budgetary practices</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Operates daily reading program</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Selects equipment and instructional materials</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Evaluates reading program</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Establishes guidelines for hiring</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Hires reading personnel</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Evaluates reading staff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Promotes staff involvement in content area reading</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Provides guidelines for public relations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Plans inservice programs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In summary, the pilot principals indicated that the following areas were of greater importance to them:

Item 1 - Planning and implementing the reading program
Item 2 - Establishing financial and budgetary practices to ensure funding
Item 5 - Evaluating the program
Item 6 - Establishing guidelines for hiring specialized reading personnel
Item 7 - Hiring specialized reading personnel
Item 9 - Promoting staff involvement in reading for the content areas
Item 11 - Planning inservice programs
Item 8 - Evaluating the reading staff
Item 10 - Providing guidelines for staff lines of communication with the community

The pilot principals indicated that the following area was fairly important to them:

Item 4 - Selecting equipment and instructional materials

The pilot principals indicated that the following area was of least importance to them:

Item 3 - Operating the daily reading program

Part 2, Section II, of the mailed survey questionnaire (Appendix B) elicited, with one of two possible responses which functions were actually a part of the administrative roles of the five pilot principals. The two possible responses—part of my role and not part of my role—were made by the pilot principals to the following eleven items:
The Principal:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Planning and implementing the reading program</th>
<th>Establishing financial and budgetary practices to ensure funding</th>
<th>Evaluating the program</th>
<th>Establishing guidelines for hiring</th>
<th>Hiring specialized reading personnel</th>
<th>Evaluating the reading staff</th>
<th>Promoting staff involvement in content area reading</th>
<th>Providing guidelines for public relations</th>
<th>Planning inservice programs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Planning and implementing the reading program</td>
<td>Establishing financial and budgetary practices to ensure funding</td>
<td>Evaluating the program</td>
<td>Establishing guidelines for hiring</td>
<td>Hiring specialized reading personnel</td>
<td>Evaluating the reading staff</td>
<td>Promoting staff involvement in content area reading</td>
<td>Providing guidelines for public relations</td>
<td>Planning inservice programs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In summary, all five pilot principals indicated that the following items were a part of their administrative roles:

Item 1 - Planning and implementing the reading program

Item 2 - Establishing financial and budgetary practices to ensure funding

Item 5 - Evaluating the program

Item 6 - Establishing guidelines for hiring

Item 7 - Hiring specialized reading personnel

Item 8 - Evaluating the reading staff

Item 9 - Promoting staff involvement in reading for the content areas

Four of the five pilot principals indicated that the following items were a part of their administrative roles:

Item 10 - Providing guidelines for staff lines of communication with the community

Item 11 - Planning inservice programs
The following items were a part of the administrative roles of only two or three of the five pilot principals:

Item 3  - Operating the daily reading program

Item 4  - Selecting equipment and instructional materials

To what extent were the pilot principals actually performing these stated administrative roles? This question was answered by using the second data-gathering instrument, the structured interview questionnaire (Appendix C), which was designed specifically to elicit responses from the pilot principals concerning the extent of their roles in the operation of the reading program. Thus, the structured (focused) interview was conducted with each principal, and their responses were coded by using a "multiple-mention" response method. This coding technique was used because the wide range of information covered by the principals during their interviews required the interviewer to interpret and cross-check responses through the techniques of probing, clarifying, classifying, and redirecting of questions.

All five pilot principals viewed their role as instructional supervisor of the reading program. They delegated the following areas to their assistant principals:
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### Area Delegated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Delegated</th>
<th>Number of Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Daily Operation of Reading Program</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of Equipment/Instructional Materials</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Reading Staff</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of Reading Program</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning of Inservice Programs</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing of Financial/Budgetary Practices</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All five pilot principals stated that their assistant principals left the daily operation of the reading program and the selection of equipment and materials to the individual teachers. Because the requests for materials and equipment fall under the category of "budgetary" matters, the five pilot principals stated that they only approve or disapprove of such requests.

The pilot principals responded to the question of hiring specialized reading personnel as follows:

#### a. Job Description

1. **Academic Qualifications Necessary**
   - Masters Degree in Reading: 4
   - Minimum Illinois State Guidelines Required to Teach Reading: 4
   - 12 Semester Hours in Reading: 2
   - 18 Semester Hours in Reading: 2
2. Experiential Background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Desired</th>
<th>Number of Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-3 Years of Teaching Experience (Grades 7-12)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 Years of Experience in Teaching Reading (Grades 7-12)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-3 Years of Teaching Experience, English/Language Arts (Grades 7-12)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Preferred Area of Expertise

- Individualized Instruction | 4
- Diagnosis/Remediation | 3
- Testing | 2
- Curriculum Development | 1
- Staffing | 1
- Learning Disabilities | 1
- Reading/Content Areas | 1
- Study Skills Development | 1
- Speed Reading | 1

b. Personal Characteristics Desired

- Intelligence | 5
- Articulation | 5
- Appearance | 5
- Honesty | 4
- Intensity | 2
- Friendliness | 2
- Openness | 1
- Demeanor | 1

c. Other Factors

- Past Experience | 3
- Extra-Curricular Activities | 2
- Likes Kids | 2
- Publications | 1
- Other Related Subjects Taught | 1
- Enjoys Teaching | 1
The pilot principals indicated that the following techniques or methods were used for program and/or staff evaluation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods/Techniques</th>
<th>Number of Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferences</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal Contract</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Forms</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checklists</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports (i.e. Teacher's/Assistant Principals')</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Comments</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Comments</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Discussions</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal Assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventories</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summative Evaluation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reports</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTA Reports</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Advisory Council Reports</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All five pilot principals stated that the funding and budgetary guidelines were the responsibility of the district central offices. The district superintendent's office allocated the necessary funds, and the purchasing of materials and equipment was processed by means of department or district funds with authorized account numbers.

With regard to inservice programs and staff development, all five principals stated that the central office was responsible for inservice program development and that it was the role of the assistant superintendent or curriculum direc-
tor to implement the inservice programs. However, the principals stated that they were members of the committees or administrative councils that plan the inservice programs, although this is a role that they might delegate to their assistant principals, division chairpersons, or department chairmen. In addition to themselves or their delegates, the pilot principals further reported that the faculties in their schools have teacher representatives also as members of the committees or administrative councils.

As to the types of inservice programs that best meet the needs of the staff, the following areas were mentioned by the pilot principals:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas</th>
<th>Number of Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject-Related Workshops</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drugs and Their Abuse</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing Problems</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Relations</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speakers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identifying Problem Learners</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnosing Problem Readers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The five pilot principals mentioned areas of inservice programs broader than reading because they believed that reading inservice programs were not high in priority in their schools.
Staff involvement in reading for the content areas was a rather broad category in terms of the pilot principal responses. Generally, their responses indicated a rather disorganized approach.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Number of Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Involve Reading Teacher with Staff</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have Reading Teacher Meet with Department Chairmen</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have Reading Teacher Help Staff with Problem Readers</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Teacher Sends List of Students with Problems in Reading to All Interested Faculty</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title I Teacher Pulls Out Students with Most Problems</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Teacher Gives Materials to Interested Teachers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Teacher Works with Counselors to Schedule Students with Reading Problems</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The pilot principals did not have an organized approach or program for reading in the content areas or for involvement of the entire staff with content area reading. In most cases, it was left up to the reading teacher.

The pilot principals focused on the types of staff lines of communication with the community, but there were no organized programs for developing staff skills in public relations other than to encourage the staff to be positive in their communications with the community. There was no organized broad dissemination of information about the read-
ing programs except for that offered by the guidance and counseling departments in the curriculum handbooks. The pilot principals gave the following responses for establishing staff lines of communication with the community:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Number of Principals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Newsletters to Parents</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press Releases</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental Visits</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Calls</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notes to Parents</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters to Parents</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments on Report Cards</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTA, Parent Conferences</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sporting Events</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All five pilot principals answered a question concerning student enrollment and students serviced by reading programs; however, they all stated that such a question was not related to the role of the administrator in reading. Also, all these principals stated that giving total student population may identify the school, thereby destroying confidentiality. Thus, this question was dropped from the actual structured interview.

Pilot Interview Question 8:

Student Enrollment Not Related to Principal's Role in Reading 5

In response to a final pilot interview question three principals listed some additional concerns for reading:
Responses | Number of Principals
--- | ---
Difficult to Hire "Good" Qualified Personnel | 3
Principal Has Total Responsibility but Has to Delegate Much to Others | 3
Inadequate Federal and State Funding - Title I | 2
Enrollment Is Dropping; Funding Is Difficult for Reading | 2
Reading Is an Elective Course and May Be Dropped | 1
Reading Is Popular with Parents but Not with Students | 1
Reading Should Be Tied to English Department and Not Made Separate Course | 1

The pilot study gave structure for the responses of the target population and provided this research study with the related "constructs" necessary to conduct the actual investigation. In tabulating and coding the responses to the two instruments, three areas of role functioning took prominence: administrative practices (i.e., staff selection and evaluation), operational practices (i.e., budget, materials, and program planning), and public relations (i.e., community involvement in the school). A fourth area, that of professional preparation, was revealed from Part 1 of the mailed questionnaire. All of the principals participating in the pilot study had some special training for reading instructional leadership, either from course work or from some inservice types of experiences with special emphasis on reading.
These broad areas from the pilot study then became the framework for the actual investigation of the target population, and the concept of "construct validity" was the underlying assumption of the study. However, further steps were taken to ensure reliability of the instruments themselves.

**Development of the Survey Instruments**

The survey data was collected by two types of instruments, the mailed questionnaire containing Part 1 and Part 2 and the structured (focused) interview questionnaire. The advantages in utilizing both types of instruments for the survey study were cited by Selltiz et al. in their study of research methods. The main advantage to these instruments was "on observation primarily directed toward describing and understanding behavior as it occurs," specifically, the ongoing role of the secondary principal in reading. Also, data gathered with these instruments provided some uniformity in the measurement of one situation to that of another.

The mailed questionnaire was designed to obtain preliminary information concerning the principals and their respective roles. It was the first step in the data-gathering process, and it offered a standarized document with which

---


2 Ibid., p. 292.
to introduce the purpose of the research study. This question- 
naire was used as a cross-check to delineate further 
questions for the primary data-gathering instrument, the 
structured (focused) interview.

The structured interview offered advantages when 
used in conjunction with the survey questionnaire.

Surveys conducted by personal interview... usually 
yield a much better sample of the population. Many 
people are willing and able to cooperate in a study 
when all they have to do is talk... In an inter-
view, since the interviewer and the person inter-
viewed are both present as the questions are asked 
and answered, there is opportunity for greater care 
in communicating questions and eliciting information. 
In addition, the interviewer has the opportunity to 
observe both the subject and the total situation to 
which he or she is responding.8

The structured interview, as a follow-up to the mailed 
questionnaire, offered this study flexibility in checking the 
reliability and validity of responses "through the cross-
checks of rewording questions, probing further in follow-up 
to an answer, seeking clarification of a response, classify-
ing (field coding) answers on the spot, and building a rap-
port"9 with the principal interviewed. Further, as Oppenheim 
pointed out,

There remains the undisputed advantage that the rich-
ness and spontaneity of information collected by 
interviewers is higher than that which a mailed ques-
tionnaire can hope to obtain.10

---

8Ibid., pp. 294-96.
9A. N. Oppenheim, Questionnaire Design and Attitude 
Ibid., p. 32.
More than any other reason, however, was the importance of the questionnaire and interview to the respondent, for this determined the frequency and validity of response.

As Selltiz et al. recommended, "much can thus be gained by restricting the use of such instruments to such topics, or given the topic, restricting the target population." For the purposes of this study the topic was restricted to the current administrative practices of the principal in secondary (9-12) reading programs. Further, the target population was restricted to those principals in DuPage County, Illinois, where every 9-12 building had a reading program.

**Design of the Mailed Questionnaires and Structured Interview**

The items of the mailed questionnaire (Appendix B) were based on the objectives outlined in the purpose of the study. The general organization of the questionnaire was in two parts. Part 1 was designed to elicit the professional background of the school principals, which helped to clarify the population used. Further, this data was used to analyze the professional preparation of the principals as it relates to instructional leadership in reading. Each principal was asked to answer questions concerning his academic and experiential background relating to reading and to specify the Illinois certificate(s) currently held by him. Part 2 was

---
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designed to determine the current practices used by each principal as he performs his role in connection with the reading program of his respective school. Specifically, this section of the instrument focused on program implementation and program evaluation; staff selection, staff development, and staff evaluation; financial practices; and public relations.

All of the data was preliminary to the primary research method, that of the structured (focused) interview (Appendix C). By using the mailed questionnaire to focus question content, a structured interview questionnaire was designed to gather in-depth information concerning the extent of the role of the secondary principal in reading. The structured interview offered the interviewer the opportunity to explore those areas outlined in the mailed questionnaire and, in addition, offered the principal interviewed the opportunity to clarify responses given in the mailed questionnaire. When utilized together, these data-gathering instruments complemented one another in securing the information that was used to report the perceived practices of the target population in their respective schools.

Procedures for Administering the Data-Gathering Instruments

As a result of the pilot study, a four-part procedure was used to gather the data for this study. In step one, the mailed questionnaire containing Part 1 and Part 2 (Appen-
(Appendix B) was forwarded with the letter of explanation (Appendix A) to each principal for completion. In step two, return of the mailed questionnaire was expedited by a follow-up telephone call to each of the principals. During the telephone conversations, appointments were made with each principal for conducting the structured interview. In step three, the interview questionnaire was forwarded to each principal prior to the time of his interview, and in step four, the actual structured interview was conducted with each of the principals of the twenty-three public secondary (9-12) schools in DuPage County, Illinois.

The structured interview was very important to the research study, and great care was taken to devise techniques that would ensure reliability. The interview consisted of three interacting variables: the respondent, the interviewer, and the questionnaire. The questionnaire was the same for all twenty-three principals, and by taking the following steps the interviewer endeavored to conduct the interview in a standardized manner:

1. ensuring that the principal understood each question and its purpose
2. probing further in clarifying responses to questions
3. asking principals to classify answers where appropriate
4. endeavoring to establish and maintain rapport in order to keep the principal interested until the end of the interview

---
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5. making every effort to eliminate bias by the interviewer so that the opinions and judgments of the interviewer would not influence the responses made by the principals.

However, there were differences in the way each respondent reacted, and these differences became the results of the study.

**Methods of Analysis and of Reporting the Findings**

The data from the mailed questionnaire was categorically analyzed and tabulated into tables of percentages and order of rank.

The data collected from the structured interview was coded by multiple-mention. Comparisons were made between the variables and cross-checks were made from the mailed questionnaire to the structured interview. Since the data from this study was qualitative, nonparametric and multivariate techniques\(^{13}\) were used to analyze the data.

Tables were designed to organize the data based on percentages and rank correlation.

The rank correlation shows "concordance" or "agreement," the tendency of two rank orders to be similar.\(^{14}\) These indices reflect the tendency toward monotonicity, and the direction of relationship that appears to exist.\(^{14}\)

The mailed questionnaire and interview results were organized into the following categories (constructs dis-

---


covered in the pilot study), since these gave an indication of the commonality of relationship between the principals:

1. Operational aspects of the secondary reading program that were investigated: planning for facilities, implementing the program, evaluating the program, and financing the program

2. Administrative practices involving personnel that were investigated: staff selection, staff evaluation, and staff development

3. Public relations practices that were investigated: programs for establishing staff lines of communication with the community, especially for educating the staff to this process and for making the community aware of the reading program

4. Areas of principal expertise that were investigated: professional and experiential preparation of the principals with special emphasis placed on training for instructional leadership in reading
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS OF THE STUDY

The problem investigated in this study was the administrator's role relative to reading programs of the secondary (9-12) public high schools in DuPage County, Illinois. The administrative procedures to implement a plan, fund a plan, staff a plan, and evaluate a plan, as well as the academic and experiential background of the secondary principals, were surveyed.

The data presented in this chapter was collected by the methods and procedures outlined in Chapter III. Thirteen public school districts were included in this study, and a total of twenty-three secondary (9-12) principals were used as the target population. In the pilot study it was discovered that the various roles of the principals fell into four general categories: professional and experiential background, program operation functions, personnel practices, and public relations practices. Therefore, based upon the pilot study, this chapter is organized into the following related areas in order to explain the collected data of the target population:

1. A profile of the secondary (9-12) principal of DuPage County
2. The operational functions of the principal in the secondary reading program: planning for the facilities, implementing the program, evaluating the program, and financing the program
3. The administrative practices involving personnel: staff selection, staff evaluation, and staff development

4. The public relations practices for establishing staff lines of communication with the community

Profile of Secondary Principal of DuPage County

DuPage County is located west of Chicago in northern Illinois and has thirty-two elementary (K-8) public school districts, seven secondary (9-12) public school districts, and six unit (K-12) public school districts. This study focused on those seven secondary and six unit districts within DuPage County where the twenty-three public secondary schools existed. The target population was the twenty-three chief principals of these secondary schools. Although there were a greater number of secondary principals under the title of assistant principal, the study was limited to only the twenty-three chief principals.

The experience of these twenty-three principals numbered into a wide range of years and fell into four categories (see Table 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable/Years</th>
<th>Number of Principals Responding</th>
<th>Percentage of Principals Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>47.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Seven of the twenty-three principals reported that they had acquired a broad range of experience in other administrative areas before becoming a high school principal (see Table 2).

**TABLE 2**

**ADMINISTRATIVE EXPERIENCES IN OTHER GRADE AREAS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level Experience</th>
<th>aNumber of Principals Responding</th>
<th>Percentage of Principals Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9-12 Experience Only</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>69.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-8 Experience</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-6 Experience</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Experience:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent (K-12)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Administrator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Multiple responses were given by seven principals indicating experiences that cross all three grade-level categories.*

The teaching experience of the principals, also covering a wide range, fell into four categories (see Table 3). In addition, the major teaching areas reported by the principals revealed that there was quite a diversity in their academic backgrounds (see Table 4).
### TABLE 3
YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE BEFORE BECOMING A PRINCIPAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable/Years</th>
<th>Number of Principals Responding</th>
<th>Percentage of Principals Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 4
MAJOR TEACHING AREA(S)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Number of Principals Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English/Reading</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education/Health</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[^a\] Three principals indicated that they were certified in two areas.
The responses of the principals indicated that the doctorate was the primary degree held by more than half of them, while the masters or certificate of advanced studies (CAS) was held by the remainder of them (see Table 5). All the principals had earned advanced degrees (see Table 6).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Number of Principals Responding</th>
<th>Percentage of Principals Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>52.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAS/Specialist</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As was expected, when answering the survey question on the types and kinds of certificates held, the responses of the principals indicated that type 75 (Administrative
and Supervisory K-12) was the most commonly held certificate, followed by type 09 (High School 6-12 Teaching) (see Table 7).

**TABLE 7**

**TYPES AND TITLES OF CERTIFICATES HELD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type(s)</th>
<th>Title(s)</th>
<th>Number of Principals Responding</th>
<th>Percentage of Principals Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Administrative and Supervisory K-12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>86.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>6-12 Teaching</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>69.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>K-14 (limited all grade teaching)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Special K-12 Teaching</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>All Grade Supervisory</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Multiple responses were given in this area. In addition, eight principals indicated that they held the superintendent's endorsement (K-12) on their type 75 certificates.*

In the area of instructional leadership in reading, the variety of responses by the principals indicated that they did have some background in the area of reading. In fact, fifteen (65.22 percent) of the principals had the equivalent of one to three reading-related courses. Table 8 gives the number of semester or quarter hours the principals had in reading-related courses, while Table 9 lists in rank order, by frequency of response, those types of instructional leadership experiences considered by the principals to be among the most helpful to them for improving their leadership role in reading.
Fifteen (65.22 percent) of the principals responded to the question concerning experiences received for improving their leadership role in reading. Eight (34.78 percent) of the principals indicated inservice workshops as being among the most helpful to them in their leadership roles, while six (26.09 percent) of the principals indicated that two areas—college/university classes and working directly with the reading teachers and their respective programs—were helpful to them in their leadership role. Eight (34.78 percent) of the principals did not respond to this question on the survey questionnaire (Appendix B), but when questioned during their interviews, they responded by stating that they had received no experiences for improving their leadership expertise in reading.

**TABLE 8**

**NUMBER OF HOURS IN READING-RELATED COURSES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester Hours</th>
<th>Principals Responding</th>
<th>Percentage of Principals Responding</th>
<th>Quarter Hours</th>
<th>Principals Responding</th>
<th>Percentage of Principals Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 0-4            | 9                     | 39.13                               | 0-4           | 0                     | -----
| 5-9            | 6                     | 26.09                               | 5-9           | 0                     | -----
| 10-14          | 4                     | 17.39                               | 10-14         | 0                     | -----
| 15 or More     | 3                     | 13.04                               | 15 or More    | 1                     | 4.35 |
| No Response    | 1                     | 4.35                                |               |                       |                                     |
TABLE 9
EXPERIENCES IN INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP FOR READING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experiences</th>
<th>Number of Principals Responding</th>
<th>Percentage of Principals Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inservice Workshops/Reading</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College/University Course Work</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with Teachers and Building Program</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convention/Conferences for Reading</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Response to Question</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a.* Multiple responses were given by the principals.

DuPage County Principal Profile Summary

All the principals had advanced degrees; more than half (52.17 percent) held doctorates. Seventeen (73.92 percent) of the principals had been high school principals for a relatively short number of years (0-9 years of experience). The teaching backgrounds of the principals ranged from 0-19 years of experience. Seven (30.43 percent) of the principals indicated that they had acquired a broad range of experience in non-high school administrative areas before becoming a secondary (9-12) principal. However, sixteen (69.56 percent) of the principals indicated that their only experience was at the secondary (9-12) area.

All of the principals had earned university or college credits in the area of reading or in reading-related courses,
and six (26.09 percent) of the principals identified these courses in their interviews as being among the most helpful for improving instructional leadership in reading. Eight (34.78 percent) of the principals ranked inservice workshops as their most helpful experiences for instructional leadership in reading.

In order to gather background information, the principals were given an attitude-rating scale (Appendix B, Part 2, Sections I and II) concerning various roles that they may have performed with respect to their secondary reading programs. Section I of Part 2 asked, with one of three possible responses, the attitude of each principal toward these role functions. The three possible responses --not important, fairly important, and very important--were made by the principals to each of eleven items as reported in Table 10. Part 2, Section II, of the mailed survey questionnaire requested one of two possible responses--part of my role or not part of my role--from the principals to the eleven listed items. These responses are reported in Table 11. This became an important area to the study because the responses to this survey questionnaire (Appendix B, Part 2, Sections I and II) were used to compare the attitudes of the principals toward their role in the reading program with their actual performed roles. In addition, their responses served as reference guides for questioning the principals during their structured interviews.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Important (a)</th>
<th>Important (b)</th>
<th>Fairly Important (a)</th>
<th>Important (b)</th>
<th>Not Important (a)</th>
<th>Important (b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Plans and implements reading program</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39.13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>56.52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Establishes financial and budgetary practices to ensure funding</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>73.91</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26.09</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Participates in daily operation of reading program</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17.39</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.04</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>69.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Participates in selection of equipment and materials</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.04</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>52.17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Evaluates reading program</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>69.57</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30.43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Establishes guidelines for hiring specialized reading personnel</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>82.61</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17.39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Hires specialized reading personnel</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>86.96</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.04</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Evaluates reading staff</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>69.57</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30.43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Promotes staff involvement in reading in content areas</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>60.87</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39.13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Provides guidelines for staff lines of communication with community</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30.43</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>65.22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Participates in planning inservice programs for staff development, especially in reading</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>47.83</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>52.17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Number of principals responding  
(b) Percentage of principals responding
### TABLE 11
**ROLE OF THE PRINCIPAL IN THE SECONDARY READING PROGRAM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Part of My Role</th>
<th>Not Part of My Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Plans and implements reading program</td>
<td>(a) 18 (b) 78.26</td>
<td>(a) 5 (b) 21.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Establishes financial and budgetary practices to ensure funding</td>
<td>(a) 22 (b) 95.65</td>
<td>(a) 1 (b) 4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Participates in daily operation of reading program</td>
<td>(a) 6 (b) 26.09</td>
<td>(a) 17 (b) 73.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Participates in selection of equipment and materials</td>
<td>(a) 8 (b) 34.78</td>
<td>(a) 15 (b) 65.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Evaluates reading program</td>
<td>(a) 20 (b) 86.96</td>
<td>(a) 3 (b) 13.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Establishes guidelines for hiring specialized reading personnel</td>
<td>(a) 20 (b) 86.96</td>
<td>(a) 3 (b) 13.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Hires specialized reading personnel</td>
<td>(a) 22 (b) 95.65</td>
<td>(a) 1 (b) 4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Evaluates reading staff</td>
<td>(a) 23 (b) 100.00</td>
<td>(a) 0 (b) ----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Promotes staff involvement in reading in content areas</td>
<td>(a) 17 (b) 73.91</td>
<td>(a) 6 (b) 26.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Provides guidelines for staff lines of communication with community</td>
<td>(a) 17 (b) 73.91</td>
<td>(a) 6 (b) 26.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Participates in planning inservice programs for staff development, especially in reading</td>
<td>(a) 19 (b) 82.61</td>
<td>(a) 4 (b) 17.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Number of principals responding

(b) Percentage of principals responding
It was interesting to compare the principals' attitudes toward their roles in the reading program (Table 10) with their actual performed roles in that program (Table 11). In general, when combining the two attitude responses of the principals in Table 10—very important and fairly important—it seemed that their attitudes toward their roles nearly matched the percentages of those who stated that they actually performed those roles (Table 11). Their responses are listed in rank order by percentages which are based upon frequency of response. The following summarizes this comparison:

100.00 percent (Item 8) - evaluates the reading staff
   69.57 percent believed this role was very important and 30.43 percent believed it fairly important

95.65 percent (Item 2) - establishes financial and budgetary practices to ensure funding
   73.91 percent of the principals believed this role was very important and 26.09 percent believed it fairly important

95.65 percent (Item 7) - hires specialized reading personnel
   86.96 percent of the principals believed this role was very important and 13.04 percent believed it fairly important

86.96 percent (Item 5) - evaluates the reading program
   69.57 percent of the principals believed this role was very important and 30.43 percent believed it fairly important

86.95 percent (Item 6) - establishes guidelines for hiring specialized reading personnel
   82.61 percent of the principals believed this role was very important and 17.39 percent believed it fairly important
82.61 percent (Item 11) - plans inservice programs

47.83 percent of the principals believed this role was very important and 52.17 percent believed it fairly important.

78.26 percent (Item 1) - plans and implements the reading program

56.52 percent of the principals believed this role was fairly important and 39.13 percent believed it very important.

73.91 percent (Item 9) - promotes staff involvement in reading for the content areas

60.87 percent of the principals believed this role was very important and 39.13 percent believed it fairly important.

73.91 percent (Item 10) - provides guidelines for staff lines of communication with the community

65.22 percent of the principals believed this role was fairly important and 30.43 percent believed it very important.

It was also noteworthy to compare the attitude responses of the principals who stated that the listed items were not a part of their role in the reading program. Their responses are listed in rank order by percentages which are based upon frequency of response. The following summarizes this comparison:

73.91 percent responded not a part of my role (Item 3) - participates in the daily operation of the reading program

69.57 percent of the principals believed this role was not important, 17.39 percent believed it very important, and 13.04 percent believed it fairly important.

65.22 percent responded not a part of my role (Item 4) - participates in the selection of equipment and instructional materials
52.17 percent of the principals believed this role was fairly important, 34.79 percent believed it was not important, and 13.04 percent believed it was very important.

The extent to which the principals actually performed these eleven roles was explored through the structured interview process (Appendix C). The interviews with the twenty-three principals averaged in duration from one to two hours. Every principal was cooperative; in fact, six of the twenty-three principals even invited their assistant principals for instruction to sit in during the interviews. As suggested by Oppenheim,\(^1\) the actual interviews provided a rich collection of data and clearly became the best data-gathering technique in the study. The remainder of this chapter is focused on those role functions that were discovered and discussed through the structured interviews. Those role functions are discussed here, as outlined in Chapter III, under the general headings of operational functions, personnel practices, and public relations practices.

Operational Functions in the Secondary Reading Program

For the purposes of this study the operational functions of the principal in a secondary reading program included the planning and implementation of the program, the financing (budget) of the program, and the evaluation of the program.

In the structured interviews all of the secondary DuPage County principals viewed their role in the reading program to be a tripartite role—that of planner, developer, and policymaker. Table 12 lists those labels or terms used by the principals themselves to describe their general role within the reading program. In addition, the principals commented that these descriptive terms could be interpreted as being a part of their role in planning and implementing any curricular program within their buildings.

TABLE 12
GENERAL ROLE IN THE SECONDARY READING PROGRAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Number of Principals Responding</th>
<th>Percentage of Principals Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Leader</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>52.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idea Man (generator of policy)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Manager/Supervisor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director of Team</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Part 2, Section I, question 1, of the mailed survey (Appendix B) the principals indicated that planning and implementing the reading program was important to them. Twenty-two (95.65 percent) of the principals believed that
this process was important or fairly important (see Table 10). Eighteen (78.26 percent) of the principals made this a part of their role (see Table 11). However, in the interviews, the principals indicated that they received assistance in the planning and implementing process from two other personnel areas, that of the assistant principals and the department chairpersons/instructional team leaders. The principals stated that they delegated part of the implementation process to the assistant principals and part of the daily operation and instructional process to the department chairpersons. The following table lists by rank order those tasks which are partly delegated by the principals to their assistant principals and department chairpersons.

TABLE 13
AREAS DELEGATED TO ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS/DEPARTMENT CHAIRPERSONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role/Area</th>
<th>aNumber of Principals Responding</th>
<th>Percentage of Principals Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Staff</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Program</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision of Daily Operations</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>91.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities/Equipment/Materials Planning</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>91.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budgetary Matters</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>91.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiring of Personnel</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>86.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Inservice</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>86.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling for Program</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>43.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aMultiple responses were given by all principals.
Table 13 shows that all (100 percent) of the principals delegated staff and program evaluation to their assistant principals or department chairpersons. Twenty-one (91.30 percent) of the principals also delegated supervision of the daily operations of the reading program and budgetary planning to their department chairpersons or assistant principals. In addition, twenty-one (91.30 percent) of the principals delegated the planning for facilities and the ordering of equipment and related materials to their assistant principals, department chairpersons, or reading teachers. In fact, fifteen (65.22 percent) of the principals stated that this was not a part of their role (see Table 11), while eight (34.79 percent) of the principals stated that it was not important to their role (see Table 10). Therefore, a majority of the principals saw this area--planning for facilities and purchasing of equipment and instructional materials--as one that was best left to the assistant principals, the department chairpersons, or the reading teachers, and by this delegation, they maintained a low profile in the actual functioning of this area.

Twenty (86.96 percent) of the principals shared the hiring of personnel with their subordinates. These twenty principals indicated that hiring became a team approach with shared responsibilities for each member--the assistant principal or department chairperson.

Sixteen principals (69.57 percent) indicated that various areas such as scheduling, instructional materials
selection, and paperwork were delegated to their subordinates. During the interview each principal made it very clear that he could not perform his role without the support services of the assistant principals or department chairpersons.

Financial and Budgetary Practices

One important area over which all of the twenty-three principals exercised tight control was the area of building budget. Each principal required strict accounting and allocation procedures for the department budgets within their buildings. In Part 2, Section II, question 2, of the mailed survey (Appendix B) all twenty-three (100 percent) principals stated that the establishment of financial practices was important to them (see Table 10). Twenty-two (95.65 percent) of the principals stated that this was part of their role (see Table 11). However, the reading budget was a delegated responsibility to department chairpersons or assistant principals by twenty-one (91.30 percent) of the principals (see Table 13). All twenty-three principals indicated in their interviews that they assumed accountability for the total building budget.

In general the central office (superintendent) of each school district allocated a set amount of monies to the twenty-three principals for their buildings. Each department chairperson (i.e., English or reading chairman) developed and sub-
mitted the yearly budget request to the principal who, upon approval of the requests, then allocated the monies for the programs. In actual practice in twenty (86.96 percent) of the buildings, the principals indicated that the reading program budget was a part of the English Department yearly budget, while three buildings had separate reading department budgets. In a majority of the buildings the English Department chairperson delegated the budget development in reading to the reading teachers who, in turn, submitted their yearly requests to the chairpersons. The ultimate responsibility for all reading program financing was the responsibility of the principals, and without exception all twenty-three principals viewed their attentiveness to this fiscal role as being very critical to the proper functioning of the program of every department. During their interviews, each principal indicated that he expected carefully planned budget requests to come to him for approval, and each made it clear that reading was important in his building and that he allocated the necessary money requested which would properly fund that reading program.

Program Evaluation

In the operation of any program one very important factor is the evaluation of that program. In Part 2, Section II, question 8, of the mailed survey (Appendix B) the twenty-three (100 percent) principals viewed program evaluation as being important to them (see Table 10). Twenty (86.96 percent) of
the principals stated that it was part of their role (see Table 11); yet, all of the principals indicated in their interviews that they were dissatisfied with their program evaluation procedures and that they wanted improvement made in this critical area. Only seven (30.43 percent) of the principals indicated that they were following an organized program evaluation model (see Table 14). Four (17.39 percent) of the principals were using an in-district-developed, five-year curriculum model which stressed program/student evaluations through formal testing and informal teacher assessment. Two principals were following an alternative North Central evaluation model because they were preparing for a North Central evaluation of their districts in school year 1981-1982. One principal stated that he used a Phi Delta Kappa model for program evaluation. He did not elaborate on the specific details of the model, but he stated that it is a kind of generic model that involves assessing programs and program outcomes on a continuous basis throughout the school year.

All twenty-three principals relied upon the evaluations of the reading program by their department chairpersons or their own conferences with the reading teachers about program outcomes/objectives (see Table 14). Twenty (86.96) percent of the principals stated that much of their program evaluation was tied to staff evaluation procedures. In evaluating the reading personnel, these twenty principals believed
they could determine whether the reading program was succeeding in its objectives.

It is important to note that all twenty-three principals viewed reading as one area that was under more careful review by each of the instructors involved than any other area of programming in their buildings. The principals believed that since the reading teachers assessed student performance rather carefully, this kind of student assessment was a form of program evaluation. During their structured interviews the principals listed several kinds of methods or techniques they utilized for program evaluation. Table 14 lists by rank order those methods/techniques mentioned by the principals for program evaluation in reading. However, a majority of the principals indicated that these methods/techniques could carry over to other curricular areas also.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods/Techniques</th>
<th>aNumber of Principals Responding</th>
<th>Percentage of Principals Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department Chairperson Reports</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferences with Teachers</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Evaluations/Observations</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>86.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre/Post Test Score Results</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Course Evaluation Forms</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs Assessment/Review of Goals</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five-Year Curriculum Plan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative North Central Model</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No External Evaluation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phi Delta Kappa Model</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aMultiple responses were given by the principals.
Summary of Program Operational Functions

It seemed evident from the interviews that in the operation of the secondary reading program, a majority of the principals took an active role in the planning and development of the reading program but received assistance from their assistant principals and department chairpersons. These support personnel were delegated part of the daily operation and implementation of the reading program, as well as budget and facilities planning. A majority of the principals viewed their role as being very pertinent to the proper funding of the reading program. Each principal held final approval over the reading program financing, including the purchase of equipment and instructional materials, but expected the details of that budget to be clearly planned and prepared by the department chairpersons or reading teachers.

In the evaluation of the reading program, the principals again received assistance from their assistant principals and department chairpersons. A majority of the DuPage County principals believed program evaluation was very important; however, they all agreed that further work was needed for developing stronger evaluation procedures in their respective buildings.

Administrative Practices Involving Personnel

The second general area that was investigated in this study was the principal's role involvement in the personnel practices of the reading program. In the area of personnel
practices this study investigated staff selection procedures, staff evaluation procedures, and staff development/inservice programs with special focus on content area reading.

**Staff Selection**

Besides the budget, one of the important areas for the secondary principals was the area of personnel selection. All of the principals agreed that establishing guidelines to hire specialized reading personnel and the hiring of this personnel was important. In their interviews twenty (86.96 percent) of the principals indicated that they established their own guidelines for hiring reading personnel, and twenty-two (95.65 percent) of them hired the specialized reading personnel for their respective schools. Under the area of guidelines used for hiring specialized reading personnel, the following areas were presented for discussion in the interviews (see Appendix C):

a. Job Description
   1. academic qualifications necessary
   2. experiential background desired
   3. preferred area of expertise

b. Personal Characteristics Desired

c. Other Factors

The following tables provide summaries of the interview responses that were made by the twenty-three principals. These tables are presented in the same order as outlined in the structured interview format (see Appendix C), and their responses are placed in rank order by frequency of mention.
### TABLE 15

**JOB DESCRIPTION**  
**ACADEMIC QUALIFICATIONS NECESSARY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualifications</th>
<th>Number of Principals Responding</th>
<th>Percentage of Principals Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Minimum State Guidelines (18 hours in reading plus teaching certificate)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Masters Degree in Reading Preferred</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>86.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 16

**JOB DESCRIPTION**  
**EXPERIENTIAL BACKGROUND DESIRED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Background</th>
<th>Number of Principals Responding</th>
<th>Percentage of Principals Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 1-3 Years Specifically in Senior or Junior High School</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>86.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 3-5 Years General Teaching Experience</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>52.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE 17**

**JOB DESCRIPTION**

**PREFERRED AREA OF EXPERTISE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Number of Principals Responding</th>
<th>Percentage of Principals Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Areas of Reading Stressed</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>86.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individualization</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>34.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnosis/Remediation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Areas of Expertise Unknown</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Multiple responses were given by the principals.

**TABLE 18**

**PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS DESIRED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Number of Principals Responding</th>
<th>Percentage of Principals Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rapport/Friendliness</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>65.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relates to/Understands Students</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>60.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligence</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>56.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Articulation/Good Use of Language</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>52.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appearance</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>43.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Ideals/Commitment</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivator</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honesty</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stable Role Model</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team Person</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent Thinker</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 18 - Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>aNumber of Principals Responding</th>
<th>Percentage of Principals Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task Oriented</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiastic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confident</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aMultiple responses were given by the principals.

TABLE 19
OTHER FACTORS USED IN HIRING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>aNumber of Principals Responding</th>
<th>Percentage of Principals Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extra-Curricular Activities:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach/Coach/Supervise</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>95.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past Experiences</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>91.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendations/References</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>82.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fits into Faculty Structure</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>69.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current/Will Work in Field</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>65.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Related Subjects Taught</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>65.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal Setting</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>52.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionalism</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aMultiple responses were given by the principals.

From the interview data it was evident that the principals looked carefully at the candidates for the positions in their respective schools. In staff selection practices in
twenty-three principals stated that they would follow the Illinois state guidelines required for reading teachers (eighteen hours in reading); however, twenty (86.96 percent) of the principals would prefer an individual with a masters degree in reading. Twenty (86.96 percent) of the principals preferred previous senior high or junior high experience (1-3 years), but twelve (52.17 percent) of the principals would look for an individual with three to five years of experience at any grade level. Twenty (86.96 percent) of the principals would prefer an individual who could handle all the areas of reading instruction.

The personal characteristics desired by the principals varied considerably (see Table 18). A majority of the principals mentioned four areas of desired characteristics:

- rapport/friendliness 65.22 percent
- relates to/understands students 60.87 percent
- intelligence 56.52 percent
- articulation/good use of language 52.17 percent

Other personal characteristics were mentioned by less than a majority of the principals, and these are found in Table 18, listed in rank order by frequency of response. Table 19 lists other factors used by the principals for the selection of staff personnel. Extra curricular activities and past experiences were mentioned by more than 90 percent of the principals. Recommendations and references were checked by 82.61 percent
of the principals. All of the principals commented that the personal characteristics listed in Table 18 and other related factors listed in Table 19 could apply to other curricular areas as well as reading.

As further guidelines for selecting new faculty, sixteen (69.57 percent) of the principals would also use the factor of ability to fit into the existing faculty structure; fifteen (65.22 percent) of the principals would use the ability to stay current in the reading field; and fifteen (65.22 percent) of the principals would use the ability to teach any other related subjects within the building (see Table 19).

From the interviews it was clear that each principal had his own established methods for selecting staff personnel. A majority of the principals stated that they used their own structured questioning format and past experiences in judging a candidate for their building. In addition, twenty (86.96 percent) of the principals indicated that the department chairpersons and assistant principals were also involved in the interview process (see Table 13). These twenty principals used their support personnel to help in the screening process and viewed staff selection as a team process, ultimately with the principal giving final approval on the team choice. Every principal stated that he placed high priority on finding the most qualified person with whom to entrust the reading program.
Staff Evaluation

Once the prospective candidates were chosen and hired, clearly defined evaluation procedures were used by the twenty-three principals of DuPage County. The target principals followed their respective district procedures for staff evaluation, and they cited no specific evaluation technique that was used specifically for reading personnel. In every building the reading personnel were evaluated just like any other faculty member.

The area of evaluation was the only area on the mailed questionnaire (Appendix B, Part 2, question 8) where 100 percent of the principals indicated that it was part of their role (see Table 11). Even though staff evaluation procedures varied from district to district, one factor was constant. Every teacher received a formalized evaluation some time during the school year. There were marked differences in the number of evaluations for tenure and non-tenure personnel --two to ten evaluations per year for non-tenure faculty and one to five evaluations per year for tenure faculty.

The department chairpersons in all the twenty-three schools were always involved in the staff evaluation process, whereas the assistant principals were involved in the evaluation process in only eighteen of the twenty-three schools (see Table 20). Although the methods used for staff evaluation varied, three methods--that of classroom visits, conferences and department chairperson evaluations--were used by 100 percent of the principals (see Table 20). Several other methods
were mentioned by the principals. These are also listed in Table 20 in rank order by frequency of response.

### TABLE 20
**STAFF EVALUATION PROCEDURES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Number of Principals Responding</th>
<th>Percentage of Principals Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observations/Classroom Visits</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferences</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Chairperson Evaluation</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Principal Evaluation</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>78.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Supervision Model</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>52.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narrative Evaluation</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>47.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checklist Evaluation Form</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Rating Forms</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical Instructional Model</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Evaluation Forms</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(\text{a} \)Multiple responses were given by the principals.

**Staff Development**

In Part 1, Section I, question 2, of the mailed questionnaire (Appendix B), twenty-two (95.67 percent) of the principals indicated that staff development/inservice programs were important to them, but only seventeen (73.91 percent) stated that it was part of their role (see Tables 10 and 11). One reason for this difference in agreement may be because staff development was a delegated responsibility. All twenty-three target schools had curriculum inservice committees that were made up of either appointed or voluntary members who served to plan and organize the staff development/
inservice program days. The administrators served as liaisons or chairpersons to the committees; in twenty-one of the schools, the assistant principal served in this capacity, while in the other two schools, the central office had a curriculum director who served in this capacity.

All twenty-three principals stated that the areas of inservice programs/staff development were open-ended in that they were receptive to suggestions and, in fact, encouraged the faculty to provide suggestions or guidelines for inservice programs. Generally, their responses indicated that this was an area in which they played a low profile. Reading was not a high priority inservice item in their schools, and none of the principals gave any specific suggestions for inservice programs or staff development in the area of reading. Yet, all of the principals agreed that staff involvement in reading for the content areas could be important for inservice programs or staff development. Seventeen (73.91 percent) of the principals stated that this area was part of their role (see Table 11). In terms of their responses to question 9, Part 2, of the mailed questionnaire (Appendix B), their support for inservice programs/staff development was more verbal than through specifically organized staff development procedures. While each principal was committed in theory to the concept of content area reading, it was discovered through the interviews that only six (26.09 percent) of the twenty-three schools had a formalized program of content area
reading instruction. The principals of these six schools wanted their reading teachers to work with the faculty; therefore, they had developed organized programs for the inservicing of subject (content) teachers for those reading skills necessary to their content areas. Three of the six principals were certified as English or reading teachers. The other three had assistant principals or English Department chairpersons committed to content area reading.

While all twenty-three principals gave tacit approval to content reading instruction, fourteen (60.87 percent) of the principals reported during their interviews that they left content reading instruction to the reading teacher to accomplish what he could. Obviously, this was one of the weak areas in the study and serves to illustrate the view of the literature concerning the problem in reading at the secondary level. The literature of the field suggested that successful programs on the secondary level must include content area teachers; yet, only six (26.09 percent) of the DuPage County principals were involved in a formalized approach to this important staff development/inservice area.

Summary of Personnel Practices

In the second major area investigated, the DuPage County principals indicated that they took a very active role in the staff selection procedures. As was discussed earlier within the other functional areas of the target principals,
the principals received the support of their assistant principals and department chairpersons in the area of staff evaluation. Department chairpersons were delegated the task of evaluating the faculty within their own departments, but all the principals took an active role in evaluating the non-tenure faculty.

Staff development/inservice programs were delegated tasks by the DuPage County principals. They relied upon district planning committees for direction in developing inservice/institute time. Unfortunately, the principals indicated that reading was not a high priority inservice item in their schools. Even more unfortunate was the fact that only six (26.09 percent) of the principals had programs of content area reading instruction. Experts in reading have stated that a correlation exists between successful readers and content reading instruction. Each of the twenty-three buildings had a reading program; yet, seventeen (73.91 percent) of the principals did not extend their reading programs to involve the other academic areas, even though, in their interviews, those seventeen principals agreed in theory that content area reading was important to secondary reading instruction.

---

Public Relations Practices

The last role function that was investigated in this study was the practices that were used by the principals to establish staff lines of communication with the community. The literature of the reading field and the field of school administration suggested that communication with the community is one of the key areas in public education. In the structured interviews, the question concerning public relations practices was intended to seek out those programs used by the principals to communicate information about the reading program to the general community, as suggested by the literature, and those methods used by the principals to educate the staff to this process.

In Part 2, question 10, of the mailed survey questionnaire (Appendix B), nineteen (82.61 percent) of the principals stated that communications with the community was a part of their role (see Table 11), but in their structured interviews these principals only focused on types of staff lines of communication with the community. These nineteen principals stated that there was no organized broad dissemination of information about the reading programs, except for that which was communicated by the reading instructors themselves or their department chairpersons.

Since the literature suggested that successful reading programs should have community understanding and support, it is incumbent upon the chief building administrator, the prin-
cipal, to assume the responsibility for this community communication. However, the findings of the study revealed an inconsistency between the literature and the actual field practice concerning this role function. It seemed evident that public relations was important to the twenty-three principals. Their techniques, listed in Table 21, indicated positive ways for reaching out to their respective attendance areas. However, no principal mentioned a program approach by which their staffs could develop important skills in community communications. In general, the techniques mentioned by the principals were used when the need arose for faculty-community communications.

In Table 21 are reported the interview responses that were given by the principals for establishing staff lines of communication with the community. These techniques were what the twenty-three principals considered to be their public relations practices. The principals made it clear that these techniques could apply to reading or any other curricular area.

**TABLE 21**

TECHNIQUES FOR STAFF LINES OF COMMUNICATION WITH THE COMMUNITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods/Techniques</th>
<th>Number of Principals Responding</th>
<th>Percentage of Principals Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct Parent Contact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Calls</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Classroom Visits or Orientations/Open House</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>82.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance Meeting/Conferences with Parents</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>78.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sporting/Activity Events</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38.46</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 21 - Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods/Techniques</th>
<th>(^{a})Number of Principals Responding</th>
<th>Percentage of Principals Responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group Contact</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizens Advisory; PTA/PTO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent Conferences</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>95.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booster Clubs</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>91.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Club Presentations</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speakers Bureau</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Media Contact</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press Releases</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Handbooks</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Newsletter</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>91.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Warnings/Achievements</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>86.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flyers to Parents</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{a}\)Multiple responses were given by the principals.

**Principal Concerns**

During their interviews, the last question that the principals were given was an open-ended one concerning areas they wished to address in secondary (9-12) reading. This question seemed difficult for the principals. They did not respond readily as in the other areas. Generally, they thought they had no important concerns to voice. After redirecting the question and offering some time for thought, the principals did mention two general areas upon which they agreed. All twenty-three (100 percent) of the principals saw a need for reading instruction on the secondary level. Twenty-one (91.30 percent) of the principals stated that they believed every content area teacher should be aware of read-
ing skills. In addition, four principals mentioned that they wanted no new state-mandated reading programs for secondary schools. Thereafter, the writer used this statement in all the other nineteen interviews as an example of a concern for secondary reading. The concern of four principals then became the concern of all twenty-three because the other nineteen also agreed that they wanted no new state-mandated reading programs. The discovery of this concern during the interview process illustrates how valuable the interview technique was for data collection in this study. Table 22 lists in rank order, by frequency of response, all of the concerns mentioned by the principals.

**TABLE 22**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRINCIPAL CONCERNS FOR SECONDARY READING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concerns</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for Reading Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Every Content Teacher Aware of Reading Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No New State-Mandated Reading Programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortage of Available Qualified Reading Personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budgetary Restraints Restrict Reading Needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal Serves as Example for Commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for Program Evaluation Tools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Programs Must Serve More Students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Multiple responses were given by the principals.*
In summary, all twenty-three principals saw the need for reading instruction, and twenty-one believed every content teacher should be aware of reading skills. All the other concerns were mentioned by only one principal (see Table 22). After the official interview was completed, the writer mentioned each of the concerns voiced by the one principal to all the other principals. Generally, a majority of the principals supported these concerns also.

**Summary of the Study Results**

This study investigated the role of the secondary principal relative to the building reading program. Specifically, the areas under study came within the purview of four questions, which were:

1. To what degree does the role of the principal in secondary reading programs involve preparing the program budget and providing for adequacy of funding?

2. To what degree does the role of the principal in secondary reading programs involve planning for program facilities, program implementation, and program evaluation?

3. To what degree does the role of the principal in secondary reading programs involve staff selection and staff development?

4. To what degree does the role of the principal in secondary reading programs involve promotion through public relations of staff and community support of the reading program?

All of the principals of DuPage County indicated that budgetary concerns/financial planning was one of their most important roles, and twenty-two (95.65 percent) of these
educators listed this area as part of their role (see Table 11). The DuPage County principals were not very specific as to the dollar amounts for the funding of the reading programs. They all dealt with general policy, and when questioned for further information about dollar amounts for their reading programs, they generalized about their building budgets. They all stated that they were committed to reading and that the department chairpersons were very important to the financial planning because all budget requests and financial concerns were channeled to the principals through the department chairpersons. The total budget for each of the twenty-three schools was of primary concern to each principal, and they were unanimous in their agreement that they would not delegate this task to anyone else.

Equally important to the principals was their role in staff selection and staff evaluation. Twenty (86.96 percent) of the principals established their own guidelines for hiring reading personnel, and twenty-two (95.65 percent) did the hiring of the reading personnel. Even though the guidelines mentioned by the principals in Tables 15-19 only applied to the hiring of reading personnel, a majority of the principals indicated in their interviews that these guidelines could be generalized to include the hiring of all personnel. Twenty (86.96 percent) of the principals shared staff selection with their assistant principals and department chairpersons. Therefore, a majority of the principals
depended upon their subordinates in seeking the best qualified teacher to run the building program even though the chief principal had the final authority for approval.

All of the principals stated that it was their responsibility to evaluate the staff. In the capacity as instructional leader/supervisor of curriculum, the principals delegated most of the staff evaluation to their support personnel, such as assistant principal of instruction, assistant principal for operations, assistant principal for personnel, and department chairperson or division/instructional chairpersons. In fact, in every building, each department chairperson was responsible for evaluating every member of his department. However, every principal evaluated the non-tenure teachers in his school.

In their interviews, all of the principals spoke highly of inservice programs and staff development in the area of reading as being beneficial to their staffs. In fact, nineteen (86.61 percent) of the principals stated that planning inservice programs was a part of their role (see Table 11); however, in the interviews every principal stated that he delegated the implementation of this area to either his assistant principals or department chairpersons (see Table 13) who received input and direction from the district inservice committees. These district-wide inservice committees did all of the planning for the inservice staff development workshops, and the input from these committees formed the
framework for the inservice programs of each school. Unfortunately, a majority of the principals indicated in their interviews that reading inservice was not a priority in their buildings.

Seventeen (73.91 percent) of the principals stated that promoting staff involvement for reading in the content areas was a part of their role (see Table 11). It might be a perceived part of the role of each principal but it was discovered in the interviews that only six (26.09 percent) of the principals had formalized programs for developing their staff in content area reading skills. The importance of this area was seen by the DuPage County principals; yet, in practice, no action was being taken in seventeen (73.93 percent) of the schools, except on an informal basis when, for example, a reading teacher took the time to chat with a colleague.

The programs for educating the faculty about public relations with the community were also non-existent in the twenty-three schools. Public dissemination of information about the reading program was done on an informal basis, usually by the reading teacher or by the English/Language Arts chairperson. The methods of dissemination varied from simple letters to parent group presentations. In response to the question about communication programs, the principals listed methods of staff lines of communication. Seventeen (73.91 percent) of the principals stated that this was a part of their role (see Table 11); however, during the inter-
views, they interpreted their role as being that of providing avenues of communication for their staffs. These avenues then became methods that were used throughout the school.

Eighteen (78.26 percent) of the principals indicated in their survey questionnaires that it was a part of their role to plan and implement the reading program, while in their structured interviews, all of the principals stated that they delegated much of the program implementation, including providing for the facilities, to their assistant principals and department chairpersons.

Twenty (86.96 percent) of the principals stated that they evaluated the reading program (see Table 11); however, in practice, the DuPage County principals received support from their assistant principals and department chairpersons to whom were delegated much of the daily supervisory duties of the secondary reading program (see Table 13). Seventeen (73.91 percent) of the principals stated that neither the daily operation of the reading program nor the selection of materials and equipment was a part of their role (see Table 11); they left these areas to the expertise of their subordinates. Sixteen (69.57 percent) of the principals agreed in their interviews that the program evaluation techniques used in their schools were in need of further development.

This study found the secondary principals of DuPage County committed to reading. They viewed their role in the reading program primarily as that of an instructional leader,
since the daily administrative and operational functions of
the secondary reading programs were delegated to their assis­
tant principals, department chairpersons, and teachers. The
areas of budget, staff selection, and staff evaluation were
of more concern to the principals.

The principals spoke highly of program evaluation, read­
ing in the content areas for staff development, and programs
of public relations, but their interview data indicated, as
a collective group, that their approaches to these functions
were rather disorganized.

In reviewing their concerns for secondary reading, one
can clearly see why these educators were and still are on
the cutting edge of the reading field. The DuPage County
secondary schools were accomplishing much in reading, and
despite the weaknesses identified in their schools, the prin­
cipals worked within their budget restraints to continue
leadership in the area of secondary reading. The twenty­
three principals wanted to improve program evaluation, in­
service programs (especially reading in the content areas),
and staff lines of communication with their communities.
Clearly, these were areas targeted by the principals them­
selves for improvement, but the principals thought that the
real plus for the public secondary schools of DuPage County
was the commitment to quality secondary reading instruction
by the boards of education, the central staff, the building
administrators, and the reading teachers.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The review of literature suggested that the leadership qualities of the secondary principal are his most important assets. Further, the literature indicated that the secondary principal has a wide range of responsibilities in the secondary school curriculum; chief among these is instructional leadership. The experts in the field of reading agreed that the secondary principal must accept specific areas of responsibility in managing and extending the secondary reading program. Based upon the recommendations of the International Reading Association and a role description of the secondary principal by Stephen Knezevich, there was developed, for the purpose of this study, a guideline list of the principal's administrative responsibilities for the secondary reading program.

In his leadership role the principal, as chief building administrator,

1. actively involves himself in the planning, implementation, and operation of the secondary reading program

2. establishes sound financial and budgetary practices to ensure adequate funding of the reading program

3. allocates the best facilities and materials available to meet the needs of a secondary reading program

4. establishes guidelines for the selection of specialized reading personnel to staff, operate, and teach the reading program
5. provides guidance in establishing quality inservice programs for developing staff expertise in coping with reading problems

6. provides methods based upon sound theory and research for evaluating the reading program, the students in the program, and the staff of the program

7. promotes staff involvement in secondary reading by generating proper attitudes toward the importance of reading in the content areas at the secondary level

8. provides guidelines for establishing staff lines of communication with the community

This study investigated the degree to which the public secondary school principals of DuPage County, Illinois, performed the administrative responsibilities mentioned in the role descriptions of the literature.

Findings of the Study

The need for instructional leadership by the secondary principal was supported by both the review of literature and the data collected in this study. Implications from the review of literature were that a need existed for greater administrative commitment and innovative leadership. No evidence was found in either the review of literature or this study to refute the idea that secondary school principals need to understand reading concepts and to accept responsibility for organized reading instruction on the secondary level of education.
Operational Responsibilities of the Secondary Principal

The specific areas that were investigated in the operational aspect of the secondary reading program were: planning for facilities, financing, implementing, and evaluating the program.

The data collected from the principals of DuPage County, Illinois, indicated that the twenty-three principals believed program financing to be one of the most important aspects of their role. Tight control was maintained over building budgets, and the principals expected their department chairpersons to exercise careful use of allocated funds. Without exception, each principal reviewed every purchase order in his building. This review was important to these chief building administrators because it gave them an overview of the fiscal needs for their buildings. The reading program budgets were either a separate fund or were incorporated into the annual budgets of the English departments.

A majority of the principals delegated the allocation of facilities for the reading program in his building to his assistant principals or department chairpersons. Each principal believed that his subordinates tried to give the reading program adequate space for growth and expansion in order to meet the needs of the student population. Capital outlay budgets were delegated by the principals to their subordinates also, and each principal believed that no request for
equipment would be denied if it could be shown to be directly beneficial to the student population.

The DuPage County principals were involved on a managerial level with the development and implementation of the reading programs. However, much support was received by the principals in this area. The data indicated that the principals delegated much of the implementation and daily operation of the secondary reading program to their assistant principals and department chairpersons.

Tied into program planning and program implementation was program evaluation. In the investigation of the DuPage County secondary schools, the area of program evaluation was determined to be a weak area. Even the principals themselves admitted that the area of program evaluation was in need of improvement. The principals were more concerned with adequate funding, proper facilities, and program development/planning and therefore left program implementation, daily operation, and program evaluation to their subordinates, the assistant principals and department chairpersons. In fact, each principal singled out the department chairperson as the most important link to the secondary reading program. The department chairpersons submitted reports on the status of the reading programs and kept the principals abreast of the program outcomes and student performances. The principals agreed that even the evaluations of their reading staff was indirectly an evaluation of the reading program.
The administrative practices for administering the secondary reading program were investigated specifically in the areas of staff selection, staff evaluation, and staff development.

The data collected from the principals of DuPage County indicated that staff selection and staff evaluation were the most important aspects of the administrative practices. Most of the principals established their own guidelines for hiring reading personnel, and most of them did all of the hiring for their buildings. In their staff selection process the principals used a variety of techniques to elicit responses about the educational and teaching background of candidates. They were in unanimous agreement that the Illinois state guidelines for hiring reading personnel should be followed. The Illinois guidelines require that reading personnel have a teaching certificate and eighteen hours in reading, but most of the principals preferred that reading teachers have a masters degree in reading.

To the requirement for experience, the responses of the principals indicated that candidates should have from one to five years of experience, and most of the principals preferred that one to three years of this experience be at either the senior high or junior high school level. Under other factors used by the chief building administrators for
hiring personnel, the two most highly cited factors were the factor of past experiences and the factor of extra-curricular activities for which the candidate could be responsible for supervising.

The principals gave a wide range of responses to the question on the personality factors/characteristics desired in candidates. They were never in unanimous agreement on any specific characteristic; however, a majority of the principals were in agreement on the following as being desirable characteristics: rapport/friendliness, relates to/understands students, intelligence, and articulation/good use of language.

In the investigation of administrative practices for this study, the area of staff evaluation was the only area on the mailed survey to which every principal responded that this was a part of his role and one of his primary concerns. The principals received assistance in the area of staff evaluation from their assistant principals and department chairpersons to whom they delegated part of the evaluation role. Three methods of evaluation--that of observations/classroom visits, conferences, and department chairperson evaluations--were used by all of the principals. In addition, a majority of the principals included the technique of clinical supervision as a method of staff evaluation.

The third area of administrative practices that was investigated in the secondary reading program was that of
staff development, particularly in the area of content reading instruction. Each principal delegated the area of staff development to his assistant principals and department chairpersons, and every school had an inservice committee that made recommendations from which the inservice/staff development workshop days were planned. The principals themselves gave no specific suggestions for inservice or staff development programs during their interviews. Their responses indicated that this was an area in which they all played a low profile in that they were open to ideas and, in fact, encouraged the faculty to provide suggestions or guidelines for the inservice programs.

All of the principals agreed that staff involvement in reading for the content areas was important to their schools; yet, in actual practice, reading was not a high priority inservice item in the buildings of the principals. Only six of the twenty-three schools had a formal program of content area reading instruction; therefore, while all twenty-three principals gave approval for content area reading, only six principals were really committed to a formalized approach to this important staff development/inservice area. This points up the view of the literature that reading instruction on the secondary level only works if the entire staff is involved in reading for the content areas.
The last area of administrative practices to be investigated in the secondary schools of DuPage County was that of programs used by the principals for establishing staff lines of communication with the community and for educating their staffs in the skill of faculty-community communications. The principals of DuPage County interpreted their role to be one of providing avenues of communication, focusing on techniques and not guidelines, for their staffs. There were no formalized public relations programs existing in any of the twenty-three schools for disseminating information about the school reading programs. However, a variety of positive public relations activities were mentioned by the DuPage County principals. All of the principals listed three areas—that of press releases, telephone calls, and curriculum handbooks—by which information about any program could be related to the community.

Conclusions

The conclusions of this study are based upon the responses of twenty-three secondary principals in thirteen public school districts of DuPage County, Illinois. These conclusions may represent other secondary school populations only to the extent that the target sample accurately reflects the general situation. The research methods of Chapter III
described the important underlying assumption of construct validity that was made for this investigation.

Validity is inferred from such a predicted network of relationships; this validates both the measure and the theory behind it.¹

The major conclusions of this study concerning the current administrative practices of the DuPage County secondary principals are as follows:

1. Each principal was committed in theory to program evaluation but realized that this area was in need of improvement in his building.

2. Each principal stated that reading in the content areas was an important program for staff development; yet, a majority of the schools did not have staff involvement in reading for the content areas.

3. Each principal assumed the final responsibility for establishing sound financial and budgetary practices for the secondary reading program, even though this was a delegated task by a majority of the principals.

4. Each principal established guidelines for selecting and hiring specialized reading personnel.

5. Each principal was committed to community public relations but considered his role to be one of providing avenues of communication rather than providing programs to educate his staff in public relations.

6. Each principal received much help from two support areas, that of department chairpersons and assistant principals. These subordinates were delegated much of the day to day operations of the reading programs, including program planning, development, and evaluation of the reading personnel.

It is also noteworthy to mention some generalizations of the DuPage County principals for secondary reading. These

¹A. N. Oppenheim, Questionnaire Design and Attitude Measurement (Basic Books, Inc., 1966), p. 76.
thoughts came under three categories:

1. A shared concern for budgetary restrictions on the local, state, and federal levels, while trying to maintain quality educational services.

2. A shared hope that the State of Illinois mandates no secondary reading programs but allows individual school districts to meet student needs.

3. A shared hope that the State of Illinois requires no mandatory competency testing programs but rather allows individual school districts to write their own student evaluation programs.

**Recommendations for Target Principals**

The recommendations given in the following section are based upon the collective responses of the target population, from information found in the review of the literature, and from observations made during the school visits and personal interviews.

1. A better method for program evaluation needs to be developed by each principal whereby specific program objectives may be evaluated against program outcomes on a thorough and regular basis.

2. A better system of communication, on a county-wide basis, needs to be developed so that each school may share in the positive aspects of secondary reading programs.

3. A program of county-wide inservice/staff development workshops needs to be implemented, especially in the area of secondary reading, so that both administrators and teachers may have the opportunity to grow professionally in the teaching of content area reading skills.

4. A formalized program needs to be developed in each school for educating the staff in public relations and for informing the community about the secondary reading program.
5. All principals need to keep abreast of the current developments in secondary reading by taking suitable workshops and by availing themselves of updated information in periodicals, current research reports, and other available sources, such as the "Administrator's Tips" from the International Reading Association.

**Recommendations for Further Study**

This study focused on administrative leadership in secondary reading. Additional study in the following areas may yield valuable information for secondary reading programs.

1. Further investigation is necessary to ascertain why some secondary teachers and administrators resist the teaching of reading in the content areas.

2. Additional research is needed to determine what role the chief district administrator—the superintendent—plays in secondary reading.

3. Rigorous research may yield necessary data about successful teaching techniques in secondary reading programs.

4. Further investigation should be undertaken to determine the role of the community in supporting the secondary reading program.
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APPENDIX A

May 27, 1981
10275 Oxford Street
Westchester, Illinois 60153

Dear ____________:

I am conducting a research study concerning the role of the secondary principal in reading. Specifically, this study seeks to identify those administrative practices used by the secondary principal in the operation of the reading program. The principals of the secondary public schools in DuPage County, Illinois, provide the target population for this study.

Every effort has been made to design the enclosed questionnaire in a manner that will enable you to complete it as efficiently as possible. In a week you will receive a telephone call as a follow-up measure that you have received the questionnaire. At the same time request will be made for a convenient time and date for an in-person interview with you.

You can be assured that no principal or school will be identified in the research findings. Your questionnaire and interview data will be analyzed and tabulated on the basis of a collective response. Should you choose not to participate in the research study, please return the blank questionnaire to me in the enclosed stamped, self-addressed envelope.

Your participation and cooperation in this research study will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Robert K. Wilhite
doctoral candidate
Loyola University of Chicago
Curriculum and Instruction

RKW/cmw
Enclosures
APPENDIX B
APPENDIX B
SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Part 1

1. Please indicate the number of years (including this one) that you have been a high school principal.
   a. __ 0-4           e. __ 20-24
   b. __ 5-9           f. __ 25-29
   c. __ 10-14         g. __ 30 or more
   d. __ 15-19

2. Please indicate whether you have had administrative experience in other grade areas before becoming a high school principal.
   a. __ secondary (9-12) experience only
   b. __ junior high (7-8) experience
   c. __ elementary (K-6) experience
   d. __ other experience (please indicate) _____________

3. Please indicate the number of years you taught before becoming a principal.
   a. __ 0-4           d. __ 15-19
   b. __ 5-9           e. __ 20 or more
   c. __ 10-14

   What was your major teaching area? ________________

4. Please indicate the current highest degree held by you:
   ___ bachelors       ___ masters
   ___ CAS or specialist ___ doctorate

   What is the title of that degree? ________________
5. Please list the type(s) and title(s) of Illinois certificate(s) presently held by you.

Type(s)               Title(s)
________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________

6. Please indicate the approximate number of hours you have completed in undergraduate or graduate reading and/or reading-related courses (i.e., reading methods, language arts, English, linguistics, diagnosis, reading in the content areas, etc.).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester Hours</th>
<th>Quarter Hours</th>
<th>College Extension Unit Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>0-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>5-9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14</td>
<td>10-14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 or more</td>
<td>15 or more</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. In your opinion, what is the best experience(s) you have had in relation to instructional leadership in reading (i.e., course work, conferences, inservice programs, workshops, etc.).

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

**DIRECTIONS:** Place a check mark in the appropriate box of Section I and Section II for each statement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The principal:</th>
<th>SECTION I</th>
<th>SECTION II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not Important</td>
<td>Fairly Important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. is involved in the planning and implementation of the reading program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. establishes financial and budgetary practices to ensure funding of the reading program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. is involved in the daily operation of the reading program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. is involved in the selection of equipment and instructional materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. evaluates the reading program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. establishes guidelines for hiring specialized reading personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. hires specialized reading personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. evaluates the reading staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. promotes staff involvement in reading for the content areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. provides guidelines for staff lines of communication with the community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. is involved in planning inservice programs for staff development, especially in reading</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C
APPENDIX C

PRINCIPAL'S INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. How do you view your role in the secondary reading program of your school and what areas do you delegate to the assistant principal?

2. Discuss the guidelines you use for hiring reading personnel. Relate your comments to the following three areas:
   a. Job description
      1. academic qualifications necessary
      2. experiential background desired
      3. preferred area of expertise
   b. Personal characteristics desired
   c. Other factors

3. Discuss your method(s) for program and staff evaluation in the reading program.

4. What guidelines do you use to establish adequate funding for the reading program?

5. Discuss your involvement in the planning of inservice programs for staff development, specifically in the area of reading, and those types of inservice programs that best meet the needs of your staff.

6. Discuss staff involvement in reading for the content areas.

7. What are your guidelines for establishing staff lines of communication with the community?

8. Do you have any concerns that you wish to address with respect to the administrative role of the secondary principal in reading?
APPENDIX D
Dear ____________:

I am conducting a pilot study for a dissertation project at Loyola University of Chicago. The purpose of my study is to investigate the role of the principal in the reading program.

Attached you will find a questionnaire in two parts. Part 1 is intended to elicit background information about the principal as it pertains to his professional preparation. Part 2 is intended to elicit information concerning the role of the principal in the area of reading. Your input concerning the questionnaire is important to my study. In addition, as a follow-up to the questionnaire, you will be contacted within one week in order to arrange a mutually convenient time for an in-person interview with you concerning this study.

At your earliest opportunity, please forward the questionnaire to me in the stamped, self-addressed envelope that has been provided for your convenience. Feel free to make any comments on the questionnaire where you think appropriate.

Thank you for your cooperation and assistance in this pilot study.

Sincerely,

Robert K. Wilhite
doctoral candidate
Curriculum and Instruction
Loyola University of Chicago
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A survey of the reading journals of the 1960s and 1970s revealed how much is written on methods, materials, and kinds of reading programs but disclosed that less is written on the role and responsibilities of the principal for the reading program. This study focused on the functional role and responsibilities of the secondary principal in the operation of a reading program. Guidelines for the study were constructed from two sources: research reports of the International Reading Association combined with a role description of the secondary principal by Stephen Knezevich. These guidelines were as follows:

1. He participates in planning and developing the reading program.

2. He ensures proper funding for the program.

3. He makes provision for adequate facilities.

4. He provides competent personnel to guide and implement the program.

5. He plans and participates in inservice programs to bring about quality reading instruction.

6. He provides adequate lines of communication among administrators, reading, and other content area personnel about the status/operation of the program.

The purpose of the study was to survey the administrative practices of principals in the reading programs of
selected public secondary (9-12) schools in DuPage County, Illinois. It was helpful to juxtapose theory and practice in order to determine if the state of the art reflected the state of the literature. The research method used for collecting data included a mailed questionnaire and an instrument with a structured interview format. The instruments were developed for securing descriptive data consistent with the purpose of the study.

The major conclusions of the study were as follows:

1. Each principal was committed in theory to program evaluation but realized that this area was in need of improvement in his building.

2. Each principal stated that reading in the content areas was an important program for staff development; yet, a majority of the schools did not have staff involvement in reading for the content areas.

3. Each principal assumed the final responsibility for establishing sound financial and budgetary practices for the secondary reading program even though this was a delegated task by a majority of the principals.

4. Each principal established guidelines for selecting and hiring specialized reading personnel.

5. Each principal was committed to community public relations but considered his role to be one of providing avenues of communication rather than providing programs to educate his staff in public relations.

6. Each principal received much help from two support areas, that of department chairpersons and assistant principals. These subordinates were delegated much of the day to day operations of the reading programs, including program planning, development, and evaluation of the reading personnel.