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May 1989
This study was conducted to determine the perceptions of board presidents, superintendents, and elementary school principals regarding the role of the elementary school principal. To compare and contrast perceptions two school settings were chosen for the study: traditional schools, and outcome-based schools.

Data were collected by way of a survey questionnaire, and by on-site interviews. Statistical analyses were performed on data gathered from the survey questionnaire. One-way analyses of variances were used to answer null hypotheses one and two:

H0(1) Among the respondent groups there is no significant difference in how they perceive the role of the principal in traditional schools.

H0(2) Among the respondent groups there is no significant difference in how they perceive the role of the principal in outcome-based schools.

Two-way analysis of variances was used to answer null hypothesis three:

H0(3) The role of the elementary school principal as
perceived by the principal does not depend upon a) the size of the school, or b) years of experience of the principal.

The chi square was used to answer null hypothesis four: 

$H_0(4)$ There is no significant relationship between perceptions of the principalship role among traditional school respondent groups and outcome-based school respondent groups.

A qualitative analysis was performed on the data that were obtained from the in-depth interviews of the study. In general, sixty-five percent of the sixty role functions listed in the survey questionnaire were determined through analyses to be the primary responsibility of the elementary school principal. From the findings of the study, namely, agreement/disagreement regarding primary responsibility for role functions, a job description of the elementary school principal was created.

Hopefully the analyses provided will help associations of school administrators, boards of education, and legislators understand the role of the elementary school principal, in order to present these principals with a clear and realistic role description, and thereby strengthen this key position for effective schooling.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION, PURPOSE, PROCEDURE, AND LIMITATIONS

INTRODUCTION

Much has been said regarding the state of education in the United States of America, but what has been done about it?

The state of Illinois has made an attempt at bringing about needed change in education as evidenced by the school reform package of 1985. This package is a blueprint for the improvement of schools. The reality of it will come about only upon its implementation by the individual schools that do the work of education. One particular emphasis of this resourceful legislation focuses on the school principal. Senate Bill 730 requires school boards to specify in the formal job description for principals that improvement of instruction is the primary responsibility, and that the principal spend a majority of the time on curriculum and staff development. School boards are also to ensure that their principals be evaluated on instructional leadership ability and their ability to maintain a positive climate in their school. The education reform package went further to require the Illinois State Board of Education to cause the establishment of an Illinois Administrators' Academy for the provision of programs on effective communication skills,
instructional staff development, evaluation of personnel, and school relations.¹

In the past decade much research has been conducted in attempts to improve school leadership. Many causes are identified as contributing to ineffective school leadership, and among them is the alleged weakness of university programs designed to train these leaders.² Respondents in a recent survey claim in part that university professors who trained them did not have sufficient practical experience to be of real assistance in preparing them for administration, and that practitioners ought to teach in the preparation programs. Fifty-one percent of the respondents rated their preparation in management theory, curriculum and instruction, education research, school law, community relations, supervision, and school finance as fair or poor. Internship to prepare school administrators was favored by two thirds of the respondents in the same survey.

According to Unikel and Bailey the training of school administrators has remained traditional, even though the role of school administrators has become far more


²Robert W. Heller; James A. Conway; and Stephen L. Jacobsen; "Executive Educator Survey," The Executive Educator, September 1988, V. 10, No. 9, p. 18.
diversified, and complex. Because of demands on their time administrators hardly find time for professional growth outside of the universities. From the development of teacher centers, training centers for administrators have evolved to provide some professional development needed by them. Harvard began a center to train principals in 1981.

The Department of School Improvement, of the Illinois State Board of Education addressed the need for the training of administrators. Effective school research is replete with references to the importance of the school principal as instructional leader. The School Code of Illinois Section 2-3.53, called for the establishment of an academy for Illinois administrators in order to develop skills needed to evaluate personnel, to provide instructional staff development, to learn effective communication, and to develop techniques of public relations for improving school and community relationships.

Currently there are 18 Educational Service Centers in Illinois that provide the required training. Administrators who evaluate other certified personnel are obliged to take

---


4 Ibid., p. 36-39.
part in a workshop on the evaluation of personnel at least once every two years.\(^5\)

The role of the elementary school principal in this study will be compared and contrasted between traditional school settings and outcome-based school settings. Dr. Albert Mamary, superintendent of Johnson City Schools, New York, gave his views on outcome-based schools. The following is a summary of Dr. Mamary's thoughts on outcome-based schooling: an outcome-based school involves the entire school community in arriving at publicly stated and accepted outcomes; that is, the leadership of the school guides the staff and the residents of the school district in creating a mission statement, philosophy of education, exit outcomes (what you want the students to possess when they graduate), then the faculty writes the curricula appropriate to the particular locale. An outcome-based school places much emphasis on communication within the school community. The entire school staff is continually involved in the design of curriculum and instruction. The staff of the outcome-based school draws collectively on research to continually revise their model of instruction. Principals of outcome-based schools are required by their boards of education and superintendents to function as instructional leaders; that is, they must continually work with staff in

all phases of the instructional program, as well as continually observing and evaluating staff as they operate within the school. 

The Dictionary of Education (1973) defines a traditional school: "A term presently used to refer to the typical American school of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in which innovation and experimentation were minimal or to any school which is organized and operated in that style." 

Serem (1985) states that principals do not have much time allotted to instruction: "This is quite typical of the principalship role in the traditional school setting." 

Serem suggests what should be done: "It is therefore, a challenge to top level administrators, including the superintendent and the board, to help the principal in allocating himself more time for instructional leadership." 

---

6 Dr. Albert Mamary, Interview 1988.
9 Ibid., p.46.
Purpose

This study aims at discovering the perceptions of the elementary school principal held by board presidents, superintendents, and elementary school principals of traditional schools and outcome-based elementary schools. The data gathered from these three populations of respondents are compared and contrasted. By careful analysis of the data gathered via the survey questionnaire and the in-depth interviews, this researcher hopes to identify the essential qualities and functions of an elementary school principal that lead to the most effective instructional leadership possible. A component of this study is devoted to discovering the clearest description of an elementary school principal as instructional leader, using effective schools research as the criteria. Hopefully results of the study will also be used in:

1. Strengthening educational leadership by clearly defining the role of the elementary school principal according to the perceptions of the three groups of respondents. Knowledge of the groups' expectations would allow a principal to perform the desired functions most effectively.

2. Generating a job description for the Elementary School Principal.

3. Discovering and eliminating problems that inhibit the running of an effective school.
A survey questionnaire was used to determine the perceptions of board presidents, superintendents, and elementary school principals. The survey questionnaire was mailed to 30 board presidents, 30 superintendents, and 30 elementary school principals in traditional schools and likewise in outcome-based schools. In-depth interviews were conducted with thirteen consenting board of education presidents, superintendents, and elementary school principals who were randomly selected. The interviews focused particularly on the role of the principal who is viewed as a central character in the improvement of our schools.

School board members, superintendents, and principals should agree on the role the principal is expected to perform so that the principal can be free of stress that results from role ambiguity. Skills, performance criteria, and job description needed for a principal in a particular school setting should be identified to complement the mission of that school.

Discovering the perceptions that the respondents in this study have of the principalship role will help identify areas that are in need of change. Some of the perceptions discovered may be incongruent with desirable qualities listed in the effective school research.
Sweeney (1982) lists six leadership behaviors associated with school effectiveness which he synthesized from eight researchers.

1. Coordinate instructional programs.
2. Emphasizes achievement.
3. Frequently evaluates pupil progress.
4. Provides orderly atmosphere.
5. Sets instructional strategies.
6. Supports teachers. 10

If we are aiming to create more effective schools it follows that we need more effective leaders. This researcher hopes to help focus on how we may create more effective school principals. In his study Serem (1985) referred to congruency of perceptions held by board presidents, superintendents, and principals regarding the role of the principal. When there is congruence between role expectations and role performance then a principal seems to have a low level of frustration. Lack of agreement or congruence leads to a principal's ineffectiveness. 11

Serem found that: "This study also revealed that the size of school and principals' experience influenced the degree in which the principals perceived their role." 12 To realize the greatest support would seem to require that principals, superintendents, and boards of education concur


11 Ibid. Serem, p.6.

12 Ibid., p.108.
on what tasks ought to be performed by a principal. Serem suggested that we need to discover to what extent these three groups of people agree on the role of the principal.

"In order for the high school principal to provide his school with effective leadership and a complete learning atmosphere for students, it is important for the school board members, school superintendents and the principals to agree on the roles that the principal is expected to perform." 13

A major goal of this study is to analyze the perceptions of the three groups relevant to their agreement on the role of the elementary school principal. From the results of the analysis the role of the elementary school principal the role of the principal can be more clearly defined and strengthened.

The instructional program of any school can be enhanced immeasurably if its leader performs the task of instructional leadership. One basic requirement for leadership is simply to know one's role, and to know what is expected in that role. When a role is not defined clearly role ambiguity is the result, that is, the role incumbent does not know what is expected. Such a person's supervisory behaviors would not result in effective leadership. 14

13Ibid., p. 8.

Procedure

Appropriate data were gathered via a questionnaire used in conducting a survey research. The survey questionnaire consisted of sixty items designed to discover perceptions of the role of the elementary school principal held by board of education presidents, superintendents, and elementary school principals in outcome-based schools and traditional schools. The instrument was refined by members of the research committee and randomly selected school administrators for the purpose of precluding ambiguity as far as possible, to limit each item to a single frame of reference, and to ensure that each item was relevant to current school administration. Each item of the survey questionnaire asked for an opinion on the role of an elementary school principal; that is, each item was offered as a possible role function and respondents were asked to indicate how they perceived each function as a primary responsibility of an elementary school principal. Responses to each of the sixty items were categorized as follows: absolutely should; probably should; not sure; probably should not; absolutely should not.

This survey was done to determine the various perceptions of the role of the elementary school principal. The questionnaire was sent to a total population of 180; 30 board presidents, 30 superintendents, and 30 elementary
school principals in traditional school settings; in addition, 30 board presidents, 30 superintendents, and 30 elementary school principals in outcome-based school settings received the questionnaire. The two types of school settings were used so that correlations could be made from the analysis of the data. Of the one hundred and eighty member sample, ninety were from outcome-based schools and ninety were from traditional schools. Schools were determined to be outcome-based through their membership in The Network For Outcome-Based Schools, and traditional schools were identified from those schools that were not outcome-based schools. New York outcome-based schools received forty-five survey questionnaires, and Indiana outcome-based schools received forty-five survey questionnaires. Ninety traditional schools in Illinois received the survey questionnaire. One purpose of choosing these two types of schools was because outcome-based schools claim that they emphasize the role of the principal as instructional leader much more than traditional schools.

The sample was taken from Illinois, Indiana, and New York in an attempt to look at a more general picture of current educational thought than would be reflected by a study confined to a smaller geographic area. New York and Indiana were chosen because they had a sufficient number of outcome-based schools that had the outcome-based model well established. The instrument used in the interviews contained
ten items which were taken from the above mentioned questionnaire. The survey questionnaire was administered to a panel of ten experts whose experience in education ranged from fifteen to thirty four years. This panel selected ten role functions that they considered to be the most crucial to an effective elementary school principal. The ten items identified by the panel were used as the interview schedule. Of the 112 respondents to the sixty point questionnaire thirteen also consented to the in-depth interview. Respondents in each category: board presidents, superintendents, and elementary principals were given the opportunity to be interviewed, and the thirteen who accepted were representative of these three groups. The three states were represented as follows: in Illinois, two superintendent/principals, one elementary principal and three board presidents, in Indiana, one superintendent and two elementary principals and in New York, one superintendent and three elementary principals.

Data from the interviews were analyzed qualitatively according to The Constant Comparative Method of Qualitative Analysis described by Glaser. Information gathered using Glaser's method was compared and categorized noting similarities and differences among the responses. Direct quotes of the interviews were used to support the

---

qualitative analysis. The use of both questionnaire and interview formats was employed in comparing and contrasting data so that the researcher could do a more thorough study. The data thus gathered were used to compare and contrast the respondents' perceptions of the role of principal.

Both the survey questionnaire and the interview schedule were accompanied by cover letters. This study treated data from the survey questionnaire in Phase I of Chapter Three, and data from the in-depth interviews in Phase II of Chapter Three. Each set of data was treated separately to provide a balance between a statistical analysis and a qualitative analysis. Survey questionnaire responses ranging from positive to negative were tallied.

Responses were assigned points as follows: (Absolutely should) AS = 1 point, (Probably should) PS = 2 points, (Not sure) NS = 3 points, (Probably should not) PSN = 4 points, and (Absolutely should not) ASN = 5 points. Data were analyzed using one-way ANOVA, two-way ANOVA, and the chi square. Significant differences in perceptions were determined using these statistical methods on the data gathered from the survey questionnaire. If the .01 level of significance was exceeded in F values for research questions one and two, then the null hypothesis were rejected. A more stringent test was used for research questions three and four, so that the data for those questions were analyzed at the .001 level of significance.
Presentation and Analysis of Data

Survey instruments returned were hand scored by tallying the responses to the items. Responses to the survey questionnaire items were listed for frequency per item. Sixty two percent (one hundred twelve out of one hundred eighty) of the sample responded to the questionnaire. The survey questionnaire which was described above was used to collect data. All instruments were coded so that they were properly classified. A cover letter accompanied each survey questionnaire. Each potential respondent was provided with a return envelope with a postage stamp included. The instrument was mailed to 30 board presidents, 30 superintendents, and 30 elementary school principals in outcome-based schools and likewise in traditional schools. New York outcome-based schools received survey questionnaires as follows: 10 to board presidents 10 to superintendents, and 25 to elementary school principals. Indiana outcome-based schools received survey questionnaires as follows: 10 to board presidents, 10 to superintendents, and 25 to elementary school principals. The sample of 112 consisted of the following respondents: 9 board presidents, 12 superintendents, and 8 elementary principals from outcome-based schools in New York, 5 board presidents, 3 superintendents, and 14 elementary principals from outcome-based schools in Indiana;
13 board presidents, 22 superintendents, and 26 elementary school principals from traditional schools in Illinois. One way and two way ANOVA, and the chi square were used to analyze results from the questionnaire and to determine the significance of variance among the groups of respondents in their perceptions of the elementary school principal's role. One-way analysis of variance was used to answer research questions one and two, as well as null hypothesis one and two. Two way analysis of variance was used to answer research question three and null hypothesis three. The Chi Square was used to answer research question four and null hypothesis four. For the one-way ANOVA, statistical significance was noted at the .01 level. The two-way ANOVA and Chi Square were scrutinized at the .001 level of significance.

Data generated by interviewing were analyzed using the Constant Comparative Method of Qualitative Analysis.\textsuperscript{16} Interview information was analyzed to determine the meaning of the respondents' responses in each case.

**Hypotheses**

Null hypotheses one and two were rejected if the $f$ values for each item exceeded the .01 level of significance. Null hypotheses three and four were rejected if $f$ values for

\textsuperscript{16} Ibid., p.436-445.
each item exceeded the .001 level of significance. The null hypotheses were stated as follows:

**H₀(1)** Among the respondent groups there is no significant difference in how they perceive the role of the principal in traditional schools.

**H₀(2)** Among the respondent groups there is no significant difference in how they perceive the role of the principal in outcome-based schools.

**H₀(3)** The role of the elementary school principal as perceived by the principals themselves does not depend upon a) the size of the school or b) years of experience of the principal.

**H₀(4)** There is no significant relationship between perception of the principalship role among traditional school respondent groups and outcome-based school respondent groups.

**Definition of Terms**

The following is a list of terms defined as they are used contextually in this dissertation:

1. **Board of education** - a body which is appointed or elected and has legal power to govern a local schools district. The board is an agent of government created by the state legislature. The main functions of a board are policy-making,
appraising, legislating, financing, and authorizing.

2. Board president - the person elected within the local board to preside over all meetings of the board.

3. Elementary school principal - the administrative and supervisory officer who is responsible for an elementary school, usually a single school, or attendance area.

4. Outcome-Based (O.B.) Systems represent a workable alternative to prevalent instructional models. They are built on the premise that neither illiteracy failure are inevitable or acceptable consequences for schooling for anyone. OB Schools are expected to become "success-based" rather than "selection oriented" by establishing the instructional management procedures and delivery conditions which enable all students to learn and demonstrate those skills necessary for continued success. The data emerging from current programs in the U.S. suggest that this fundamental change is definitely attainable.\(^\text{17}\)

5. Principal - derived from principal teacher, the head administrator of a public school in the

\(^{17}\) William Spady, *Network for Outcome-Based Schools.* (Rev. ed.) San Carlos, California, p. 1.
6. Role - behaviors required of an individual in a specific organizational position, but not synonymous with job title. Role presupposes that the person has the prerequisites for the job.

7. Role ambiguity - this results when role is not clearly defined, and the person has not been oriented, or is unsure of what is expected.

8. Role conflict - the result of 1) a person required to perform two different roles which are incompatible; 2) one group or different group giving the individual incongruent or incompatible definitions/expectations of a role.

9. Role description - the observable and actual behaviors of an individual performing their job.

10. Role expectation - the duties expected of an office holder. What is expected of an individual in a given job. Board presidents, and superintendents, for example have expectations of principals.

11. Superintendent of schools - the chief administrative officer of a public school district, directly responsible to the school board for the school district operation. In some areas
the person is designated district superintendent or supervising principal.

12. Traditional school - A term presently used to refer to the typical American school of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in which innovation and experimentation were minimal or to any school which is organized and operated in that style.\(^{18}\)

**Limitations of the Study**

This study was limited to board presidents, principals, and school superintendents of outcome-based and traditional elementary schools in Illinois, Indiana, and New York, to obtain a general view of perceptions of the role of the elementary school principal. New York and Indiana outcome-based schools respectively received forty-five survey questionnaires while Illinois traditional schools received ninety survey questionnaires. One hundred and eighty questionnaires were mailed and 112 were returned which was sufficient for the purposes of this study. The sample of 112 consisted of the following respondents: 14 board presidents, 15 superintendents, and 22 elementary principals of outcome-based schools, and 13 board presidents, 22

superintendents, and 26 elementary principals of traditional schools. Of the one hundred and eighty potential respondents thirteen consented also to an in-depth interview. As in most studies the researcher depended upon the honesty of the respondents in answering the questionnaire, and likewise on responding to items within the interviews conducted. It is very possible that not every item matched every respondent's situation.

To identify role functions perceived by respondents to be the primary responsibility of the elementary school principal, a Likert like scale was used. Responses to the survey questionnaire were assigned values as follows.

1. A value of 1 indicated that the respondent perceived a particular role function to be absolutely the primary responsibility of an elementary school principal.

2. A value of 2 indicated that the respondent perceived a particular role function to probably be the primary responsibility of an elementary principal.

The next category of response indicated that the principal or some other administrator should take the primary responsibility for performing the particular role function.

3. A value of 3 indicated that the respondent was not sure who had primary responsibility for the role function.
4. A value 4 indicated that the respondent perceived that the role function probably should not be the primary responsibility of the elementary school principal.

5. A value of 5 indicated that the respondent perceived that the elementary school principal absolutely should not have primary responsibility for the role function.

For this study a value of 2.25 indicated a departure from the first two categories of responses described above and it was decided that responses above the 2.25 level indicated that the role function could be delegated or that it belonged to an authority higher than the principal.
CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

A review of the literature revealed that only one similar study has been conducted. That study was conducted by Serem at the University of Wyoming in 1985.¹

Serem confined his study to the high school principalship in North Central Association schools in the state of Wyoming, and this study is limited to the elementary school principalship in traditional schools and outcome based schools of Illinois, Indiana, and New York.

This chapter includes a review of the literature relevant to the role of the principal in outcome-based schools as well as traditional schools. The following topics are reviewed, because they were determined to be most relevant to the purpose of this study.

1. How teachers view a good principal.
2. Role conflict.
3. Utilizing effective school factors.
4. Instructional leader v. administrative leader.
5. Effectiveness of the principal.

How Teachers View a Good Principal

Goodlad states: "Principals of the more satisfying schools saw the amount of influence they had as congruent with the amount they thought principals should have..."² In the most satisfied schools Goodlad noticed that few teachers perceived administrators or staff relations to be negative, and the teachers felt supported. In his study Goodlad states: "A good principal, from the viewpoint of the teachers in this study, is himself or herself relatively autonomous as a person and leader, treats staff members as colleagues and professionals, and is consistent in dealing with teachers and students."³

Goodlad found that many principals lacked skills needed to bring about improvement in education.

"They did not know how to select problems likely to provide leverage for schoolwide improvement, how to build a long-term agenda, how to assure some continuity of business from faculty meeting to faculty meeting, how to secure and recognize a working consensus, and on and on. Most were insecure in their relations with faculty and

³Ibid., p.255
rarely or never visited classrooms."4

Austin (1979) reviewed selected reports which searched for indicators of effective education. A few of the findings follow. Austin referred to one of the findings of The Rand Corporation which conducted a careful review of educational effectiveness and gave a report to the President's Commission on School Finance; namely, that the principal in all types of schools seems to be essential to the effective operation of the school. This effectiveness depends partly on the degree of support from higher administration.

Austin also noted that New York, Pennsylvania, Delaware, and Maryland made longitudinal studies of exceptional schools and found that there was no single factor that accounts for a school being exceptional. He indicated that schools that were found to be exceptional fell into a group characterized by certain factors. The following is a list of the characteristics of exceptional schools as reported by Austin:

. Strong principal leadership (for example, schools 'being run' for a purpose rather than 'running' from force of habit);
. Strong principal participation in the classroom instructional program and in actual teaching;

4Ibid., p.306
Higher expectations on the part of the principal for student and teacher performance advancement;
principals felt that they had more control over the functioning of the school, the curriculum and program, and their staff;
greater experience and more pertinent education in the roles of principals, teachers, and teacher aides;
Teachers were rated as warmer, more responsive, and showing more emphasis on cognitive development in classes that did not involve direct reading instruction as well as in reading classes;
Teachers expected more children to graduate from high school, to go to college, to become good readers, and to become good citizens;
Teachers were more satisfied with opportunities to try new things; they were free to choose teaching techniques in response to individual pupil needs;
More satisfactory parent-teacher relationships;
Job responsibilities for the teacher aides included working across all grades with primarily small, low-ability groups; close involvement of teachers and paraprofessionals with pupils;
On several measures, differences seemed to be more pronounced in grades one to three than in
grades four to six;
. Schools had a longer instruction day;
. In evaluation, the teachers relied almost completely on teacher-developed tests and teacher judgments of student achievement;
. More positive self-concept and feeling of controlling their own destiny observable as early as grade three on part of children.5

Austin concluded: "These characteristics show that school characteristics are related to mean school achievement. Also, a school that performs in unusually successful ways has a principal or a leader who is an exceptional person."6

Austin also identified the principal as an efficient instructional leader rather than an administrative leader.

"In these studies, the principal is identified as an expert instructional leader, instead of an administrative leader, and the level of instructional expertise falls in the area of reading or arithmetic."7

Austin included pupils' perceptions stating: "The principals in these studies were viewed by the teachers and

6Ibid., p.12
7Ibid., p.12
the pupils as persons who are expert in a wide variety of areas concerning education."

Edmonds claims that the leadership of the principal is an essential element for effective schools:

"They have strong administrative leadership without which the disparate elements of good schooling can neither be brought together not kept together...""

Role Conflict

Serem (1985) stated:

"It was also revealed that some congruence regarding role perceptions must be present among the referent groups in order for the principal to perform his duties successfully. Additionally, it was indicated by researchers that the principal role must be defined clearly by his superordinates in order to reduced ambiguities, which often lead to stress and job dissatisfaction.""}

Is there more congruence among the superintendents, board presidents, and principals of outcome-based schools regarding expectations of the principals than there is among

---

8Ibid., p.12

9Ronald Edmonds, "Effective Schools for the Urban Poor," Educational Leadership, October 1979 p.22

10Ibid., p.73
similar groups of respondents from traditional schools? Serem (1985) found that there was a significantly higher correlation in data from the three respondent groups from the outcome-based schools that he surveyed than in data gathered from respondents in the traditional school environments:

The data in this study indicate that the referent groups' congruence regarding the principal's role was significantly lower in the traditional school environment than in the outcome-based school environment.\textsuperscript{11}

Serem also concluded that stress and frustration in principals may diminish if schools adopt the outcome-based model of operating:

"It has been concluded therefore, that if and when North Central Accredited High Schools of Wyoming move to a more outcome-based mode of operation, the principals' frustration and stress levels may subside and the principal turnover rate may decrease."\textsuperscript{12}

Eisenhower et al (1984) conducted a study on 61 elementary and 68 secondary school principals selected randomly. The authors found that:

\textsuperscript{11}\textit{Ibid.}, p.110
\textsuperscript{12}\textit{Ibid.}, p.110
"Job robustness was associated with low role ambiguity with low role conflict, and with support from those with whom principals work--staff, administrator colleagues, the superintendent, and the community. In general, principals saw their jobs as highly robust."\(^{13}\)

The findings of the study supported the foregoing proposition. The authors state that: "... perceived support from the superintendent appeared to play a key part in reducing ambiguity and controlling conflict."\(^{14}\) The authors end in an optimistic note: "The school principals in this study generally liked their jobs and saw them as quite robust.\(^{15}\)

Jordan (1985) states a truism in her article: "... role conflict is manifest in all situations where differing sets of expectations for individuals exist."\(^{16}\) In this article Jordan deals with some conclusions from a study which looked at problems associated with role conflict by administrators of the Solomon Schechter Day Schools in North


\(^{14}\)Ibid., p.89

\(^{15}\)Ibid., p.89

\(^{16}\)Cecile B. Jordan, "Written Job Descriptions, Role Conflict, and Day School Heads," *Jewish Education*, v.53, No.3 (Fall 1985) p.18
America. The author indicates that role conflict exists whether or not the head has a written job description, and that some subjects of the study who had written job descriptions experienced more role conflict than those without written job descriptions. Jordan claims that there is no clear answer to why this may be so. The author concludes: "Although written job descriptions and the perception of role conflict problems for the heads . . . have a statistically significant relationship, there is no way of affirming that a causal relationship exists."

In the search for educational excellence many state programs focus on the role of the principal, requiring them to restructure the school day to give optimal instructional time in core subjects. Instead of focusing on administrative tasks principals are being asked to spend more time evaluating, supporting, and assisting teachers. Blome and James (1985) suggest that policy nation wide is shifting to the monitoring of quality rather than quantity, and principals are particularly held accountable for it. Many of the state reform movements focus on principals and leadership teams at the local level. "The principal is central to the current education reform movement."
Utilizing Effective School Factors

According to Hall (1984) the role of the principal in improving schools must be viewed by considering a myriad of factors:

"The role of the principal in the school improvement process must be viewed in terms of the many factors that affect it rather than naively assuming that a quick cure can be made by changing one variable..."  

Duignan (1986) reviewed syntheses of effective schools' research. The author states: "Among the numerous factors examined in the effective schools literature the leadership of the school principal emerges as crucial in the success of the school." 

Duignan lists activities which indicate effective leadership:

"...setting an atmosphere of order, discipline and purpose, creating a climate of high expectations for staff and students, encouraging collegial and collaborative relationships and building commitment among staff and students to the

---


school's goals, facilitating teachers in spending maximum time on direct instruction, encouraging staff development and evaluation, and being a dynamic instructional leader."\(^{21}\)

Duignan cautions against applying findings from effective schools' research to high schools: "...with few exceptions the effectiveness research has been conducted in primary schools."\(^{22}\)

Duignan lists some factors of school effectiveness that have some support from research:

"The characteristics which seem to be common to most of the studies include (1) strong leadership by the principal or other staff, (2) high expectations by staff for students' academic achievement, (3) a clear set of goals and an emphasis for the school, (4) an effective staff development program, (5) an orderly atmosphere conducive to learning, (6) emphasis on basic-skill acquisition, (7) a system for the frequent monitoring of student progress, and (8) collegial and collaborative relationships among staff."\(^{23}\)

\(^{21}\)Ibid., p.67

\(^{22}\)Ibid., p.61

\(^{23}\)Ibid., p.63
Duignan concludes with a caveat: "Attempts to 'manipulate' individual factors and treat them as isolated and independent variables may lead to improvement initiatives that are less than successful." ²⁴

The implication for school improvement that Duignan gleaned from the research on effective schooling could be applied in schools that seek to be more effective. In order to evaluate successfulness principals could benefit from feedback obtained through such instruments as the "Audit of Principal Effectiveness". Valentine and Bowman (1988) indicated that to be an effective leader a principal needs to get continual feedback and must be able to interpret useful feedback, and more importantly translate data so that suggestions may be put into action. To facilitate the gathering of data for the use of principals in developing effectiveness, the authors developed the "Audit of Principal Effectiveness." ²⁵

**Instructional Leader vs. Administrative Leader**

Anderson and Lavid (1986), point out the existence of a conflict when principals decide between emphasizing

²⁴Ibid., p.71

leadership or management in their style of operating.

"The public expects not only leadership but also managerial skills from the school principal. The conflict, for the principal lies in determining which aspect to emphasize." 26

The following synthesizes three dimensions that Anderson and Lavid believe are part of this conflict:

1) Idiographic, that is, personal expectations that the principal has of the school district.

2) Nomothetic, that is, the school district's expectations of the principal. This indicates whether leadership or management should be emphasized. The principal should ascertain how the community perceives the principalship. How would the community describe their expectation of the principal. The same questions should be asked by the principal relevant to the staff that he supervises, for their perceptions influence how they act towards the principal.

3) How will the school tolerate the planned change? This will likely be affected by hopes and attitudes of the community. Will the community tolerate the change? Is the community ready for the change? Is the staff ready for the change?

26Robert E. Anderson and Jean S. Lavid, "The Effective Principal: Leader or Manager?", NASSP Bulletin, (April 1986), p.82
Anderson and Lavid summarize the three dimensions of the conflict challenge to be resolved by the principal:

"Three dimensions to resolving the conflict challenge the principal in choosing which of these behavioral traits-leader or manager-to emphasize. These dimensions are idiographic expectations (personal), nomothetic expectations (district), and expectations for change itself."\(^{27}\).

In conclusion Anderson and Lavid state: "If the principal chooses to be a manager, he or she needs to delegate ideas for change and improvement to those who can implement those ideas."\(^{28}\)

Anderson and Lavid explain Guba and Getzels terms "nomothetic" as what expectations a school district would have for a principal, and "idiographic" as what personal expectations a principal would have of a school district. Anderson and Lavid indicate that after the principal chooses the most desired style he or she should then act predominately as leader or manager. Guba and Getzels (1954) coined the words "nomothetic" and "idiographic" and addressed the issue of institutional and individual

\(^{27}\)Ibid., p. 82

\(^{28}\)Ibid., p. 84
Performing up to role expectations means that an individual is adjusted to the role, and if a person has fulfilled all of his needs that person is integrated. Guba and Getzels state:

"Ideally, the individual should be both adjusted and integrated, so that he may by one act fulfill both the nomothetic, or institutional, requirements and the idiographic, or personal, requirements." ²⁹

The authors explain that the ideal is seldom found in practice, and that normally we find conflict between expectations and needs. In their model Guba and Getzels include a "transactional" leadership-followership style along with the nomothetic and idiographic style mentioned above. The authors further explain that: "The three styles of leadership-followership are three modes of achieving the same goal; they are not different images of the goal" ³¹

The authors explain that the emphasis of the nomothetic style is "...on the requirements of the institution, the role, and the expectation rather than on the requirements of the individual, the personality and the need-


³⁰ Ibid., p.431

³¹ Ibid., p.435
disposition."32 In other words, the person is minimized and the role is maximized. The authors state: "...the most expeditious route to the goal is seen as residing in the nature of the institutional structure rather than in any particular persons."33 The authors state: "The standard of administrative excellence is institutional adjustment and effectiveness rather than individual integration and efficiency."34

The emphasis of the idiographic style is on the requirements of the individual, the need-disposition, and the personality and not on the requirement of institution, the role, and expectations, in other words the role is minimized and the person maximized. The "transactional style" of the Guba and Getzels model moves between the other two styles. Using this style a person would decide what to apply of the nomothetic/idiographic in a particular situation; that is, person and role are minimized or maximized according to the situation. "The standard of administrative excellence is individual integration and efficiency, satisfaction, and institutional adjustment and effectiveness."35

32 Ibid., p.436
33 Ibid., p.436
34 Ibid., p.436
35 Ibid., p.438
Guba and Getzels conclude by cautioning that improvement of administrative practice will not automatically come from understanding and using the variables and concepts of their model, but that application "... will help the administrator to sort out the problems confronting him ... and to understand something of their internal dynamics." \(^{36}\)

**EFFECTIVENESS OF THE PRINCIPAL**

Research on effective school leadership has found that successful principals are effective disciplinarians, and effective instructional leaders. As Sweeney (1982) stated:

"Leaders in the effective schools were more assertive, more effective disciplinarians, and more inclined to assume responsibility. "Emphasis on instruction and student achievement was pervasive in their schools." \(^{37}\)

Reavis (1986) found that if the principal holds high expectations for the students then the students will realize high achievement, and conversely, if low expectations are held, then low achievement will be realized. \(^{38}\)

---

\(^{36}\)Ibid., p. 440


In this study Reavis observed a principal who was successful in revitalizing his school. The following is a synthesis of five characteristics of effective principals listed by Reavis.

The principal: 1. Creates a wholesome climate.
2. Maintains high expectations for staff and students.
3. Maintains high visibility throughout the school.
4. Stresses academic achievement.
5. Is a facilitator. 39

Reavis indicates that the principal in the study exhorted teachers to expect students to learn, not to engage in negative discussions regarding students, and to teach to the students greatest potential. 40

In summary, Reavis indicated that the principal had success in revitalizing the school through maintaining a staunch moral stand; through a deep belief that people want to do what is right; through well developed themes that were consistently stated and implemented; by diligently pursuing the mission of the school. 41

39 Ibid., p. 44
40 Ibid., p. 45
41 Ibid., p. 46
Weldy (1979) in addressing qualities needed by a principal stated:

"Because of their training, they know stages of child development, levels of learning readiness, various learning styles, and effective teaching methodology. They cannot be expert in every subject area, but they can and should be experts in the teaching and learning processes." 42

Weldy pointed out the need for leadership in principals:

"Qualities of leadership that help the principal lead his faculty and students in the pursuit of their school's objectives would be similar to those required by political, business, or industrial leaders. Most successful principals would be leaders in any profession they might have chosen." 43

Ubben and Hughes (1987) stated: "Effective schools are the result of the activities of effective principals." 44


43 Ibid., p.35

44 Gerald C. Ubben and Larry W. Hughes The Principal: Creative Leadership for Effective Schools. Allyn and Bacon, Inc. Newton, Massachusetts. 1987 p.3
The authors list indicators of an effective principal:

"Principals in effective schools manifested a strong, direct leadership pattern, valued and maintained an orderly atmosphere, emphasized achievement by students, and emphasized the need for frequent evaluation of student progress toward clearly stated goals." ⁴⁵

Effectiveness of the principal is influenced by the principal's beliefs:

A principal's beliefs about the ability of all children to learn is extremely important. In most of the effective schools research findings, principals of effective schools have a strong belief in and commitment to the ability of all children to learn regardless of race, social conditions, or gender. These values and beliefs are extremely important because staff members will key onto what they believe the principal considers important. ⁴⁶

Sergiovanni referred to the effectiveness of the principal:

In higher achieving schools, principals exerted strong leadership, participated directly and

⁴⁵Ibid., p.4

⁴⁶Ibid., p.20
frequently in instructional matters, had higher expectations for success, and were oriented toward academic goals....that type of schooling does make a difference in student achievement and that type of schooling is greatly influenced by direct leadership from the principal.⁴⁷

Sergiovanni pointed to how the influence of the principal enables others to benefit from his leadership:

Enabling leadership is revealed and validated by principal intents, attributes, and behaviors that enable teachers, students, and staff to function better on behalf of the school and its purposes, to engage more effectively in the work and play of the school, and to promote the achievement of the school's objectives.⁴⁸

The review of the literature indicates that the principal is a key figure in school effectiveness.


⁴⁸Ibid., p.29
Findings and analysis of statistical data from the survey questionnaire are presented in this chapter. The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS-X Release 3.0) was used to perform the statistical calculations necessary to this study. The findings and analysis were based on the role functions presented in the survey questionnaire, and the null hypotheses.

The sixty point survey questionnaire was mailed to a population of 180 made up of 30 board presidents, 30 superintendents, and 30 elementary school principals in traditional school settings, as well as 30 board presidents, 30 superintendents, and 30 elementary school principals in outcome-based school settings. One hundred and eighty questionnaires were mailed and 112 were returned which was sufficient for the purposes of this study. The sample of 112 consisted of the following respondents: 14 board presidents, 15 superintendents, and 22 elementary principals of outcome-based schools, and 13 board presidents, 22 superintendents, and 26 elementary principals of traditional schools.

Each item of the survey questionnaire described a role function. As explained in Chapter 1, the items of the sixty point questionnaire were designed to discover the
perceptions of the role of the elementary school principal in outcome-based schools and traditional schools. The survey instrument used in this study evolved from two instruments used by Serem in his 1985 study.\(^1\) The instrument created for this study was refined by a randomly selected group of ten school administrators. Each item of the survey questionnaire represented a function of an elementary principal and respondents were asked to indicate how they perceived each function as a primary responsibility of the elementary school principal. Board presidents, superintendents, and elementary school principals were asked to give their perceptions of whether or not an elementary school principal held primary responsibility for performance of each listed role function.

Each questionnaire returned was analyzed with respect to title, that is, board president, superintendent, and elementary school principal; type of school, that is, traditional and outcome-based. Data thus gathered were used to answer research questions one and two via a one-way analysis of variance. Research question three which was demographic in nature, was answered via a two-way analysis of variance which considered the variables of size of school and years of service as a principal.

Finally, research question four was answered using the Chi Square. Variables of role function perceptions were cross-tabulated with board presidents, superintendents and elementary school principals. The cross-tabulation was performed for traditional school respondents and outcome-based school respondents, respectively.

Mean values were scrutinized to identify role functions perceived not to be the primary responsibility of the elementary principal by all respondents as a group, and by board presidents, superintendents, and elementary principals, respectively. This treatment was given to respondents of traditional schools and outcome-based schools.

Discussion is presented only on the items identified as role functions for which the elementary principal does not have primary responsibility.

The statistical analysis outlined above was conducted for Phase I of this study.

Of the 112 respondents to the sixty point questionnaire only 13 consented to the in-depth interviews. The Interview Schedule was comprised of ten role functions considered to be most crucial to an effective elementary school principal by a panel of ten experts in the field of education. The sample interviewed consisted of three board presidents, two superintendents, two superintendent/-principals, and six elementary school principals. Three board presidents, two
superintendent/principals, and one principal made up the group of interviewees representing traditional schools. Two superintendents and five elementary principals made up the group of interviewees representing outcome-based schools. The Constant Comparative Method of Qualitative Analysis was used to analyze responses and compare the responses for similarities, and finally to synthesize the responses under summary concepts. The survey data and interview data were treated separately in this study. Data from the survey questionnaire are treated in Phase I. Data from the interviews are treated in Phase II.

A qualitative analysis was performed for Phase II of the study which treats the data gathered from in-depth interviews. All of the interviews were tape-recorded so that the data could be analyzed thoroughly.

PHASE I

FINDINGS FROM THE SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Question One

What role functions listed in the questionnaire are considered most significant by the respondents in traditional schools?
Question Two

What role functions listed in the questionnaire are considered most significant by the respondents in outcome-based schools?

The null hypotheses are stated as follows:

HO(1) Among the respondent groups there is no significant difference in how they perceive the role of the principal in traditional schools.

HO(2) Among the respondent groups there is no significant difference in how they perceive the role of the principal in outcome-based schools.

One-way ANOVA was used on the above questions and hypotheses. Responses to the survey questionnaire were assigned points as follows: Absolutely Should (AS) = 1 point, Probably Should (PS) = 2 points, Not Sure (NS) = 3 points, Probably Should Not (PSN) = 4 points, and Absolutely Should Not (ASN) = 5 points.

Survey questionnaire data pertaining to research questions one and two were analyzed using one-way ANOVA. If the .01 level of significance was exceeded in F values then the null hypotheses were rejected. Survey questionnaire data pertaining to research question three were analyzed using two-way ANOVA, and scrutinized at the .001 level of significance. Survey questionnaire data pertaining to research question four were analyzed using the Chi Square
and scrutinized at the .001 level of significance. Group means generated by the ANOVA showed which role functions were considered significant or not significant. Role functions receiving a mean value of 2.25 or less were considered to be a primary responsibility of the elementary school principal, and mean values more than 2.25 indicated that respondents perceive that some other administrator could have the primary responsibility of performing the particular role function.

Group mean values for each item indicated how significant the group perceived the role function of the elementary school principal.

CATEGORIZING RESPONSES TO THE SIXTY POINT SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Figure 1 presents categories of responses to the survey questionnaire organized according to perceptions of the sixty role functions comprising the questionnaire. Values were assigned as follows: 1.00 means that the principal should absolutely assume primary responsibility for performing the role function; 2.00 means that the principal probably should assume primary responsibility for performing the role function; 3.00 means that the principal or some other administrator should take primary responsibility for performing the role function; 4.00 means that some
administrator other than the principal should probably assume the role function; 5.00 means that some administrator other than the principal should absolutely assume primary responsibility for performing the role function.
FIGURE I
CATEGORIES OF RESPONSES AND ASSIGNED VALUES
FOR THE SIXTY POINT SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Absolutely Should</th>
<th>Probably Should</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Probably Should Not</th>
<th>Absolutely Should Not</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table I is a summary of group means for each role function listed in the survey questionnaire. It represents all of the respondents by title, but without distinguishing type of school, that is, outcome-based school respondents are treated together with traditional school respondents. The purpose of grouping respondents by title without distinction of school was to gather data from the three main categories of respondents, namely board presidents, superintendents, and elementary school principals. By analyzing the data gathered from the total sample the researcher intended to facilitate the creation of a job description for the elementary school principal that would be acceptable to boards of education, superintendents, and elementary school principals in traditional schools and outcome-based schools. All sixty role functions contained in the survey questionnaire are listed in Table I. Respondents to the survey questionnaire indicated their perceptions of who had primary responsibility for the role functions listed. The group means displayed in Table I
indicate the level of agreement among all respondents to the survey questionnaire regarding their perceptions of primary responsibility for the role functions listed. The first column of group means in Table I displays the level of agreement for all 112 respondents to the survey questionnaire so that total congruity in perceptions can be noted. The columns to the right give similar information for board presidents, superintendents and elementary school principals of outcome-based schools and traditional schools. Examination of the group means in each column offers an overall view of each group's perceptions of the role of the elementary school principal. Figure I displays the scale used to classify role functions perceived to be the primary responsibility of the elementary school principal and role functions perceived not to be the primary responsibility of the elementary school principal. The asterisks in Table I indicate role functions perceived not to be the primary responsibility of the elementary school principal. Group means not marked by asterisks indicate that the respective groups perceived those role functions to be the primary responsibility of the elementary school principal. The data were organized in the above manner to provide the researcher with an overall view of the respondents' perceptions of the role of the elementary school principal. The results obtained in Table I also indicated congruence among the three major groups of this study regarding the role of the
elementary principal. Findings from analysis of the above data could then be used with results listed in Tables 2 through 6 of this study. Table 2 data came from a one-way analysis of variance of the data gathered from traditional school respondents and Table 3 data came from a one-way analysis of variance of the data gathered from outcome-based school respondents. The data analyzed to create Tables 4 and 5 came from elementary school principals in traditional schools and outcome-based schools. The principals were classified by years of experience and size of school and the results obtained from the two-way analysis of variance was also compared with results of the above listed tables to get a clearer understanding of the role of the elementary school principal.

Finally, Table 6 displays results from a cross-tabulation of data gathered from traditional school respondents, with data gathered from outcome-based school respondents. The cross-tabulation indicated whether or not there was a relationship between respondents of both school settings relevant to their perceptions of the role of the elementary school principal. The results of the cross-tabulation were also compared with results listed in Table I regarding perceptions of the role of the elementary school principal held by board presidents, superintendents, and elementary school principals. Thus Table I provides a general overview of perceptions of the elementary school
principal's role against which comparisons could be made with the more specific views of the perceptions held by respondents which are displayed in Tables 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 of this study. The first column of Table I is an ordinal listing of each item from the Opinion Scale of Elementary School Principals' Role Functions. The second column lists All Groups, that is, group means generated by board presidents, superintendents, and elementary school principals of both school settings. The third column lists mean responses for board presidents of both school settings. The fourth column lists mean responses for superintendents of both school settings. The fifth column lists mean responses of elementary school principals of both school settings.

Mean responses greater than 2.25 are marked by an asterisk and indicate role functions perceived not to be the primary function of the elementary school principal.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>QUESTION</th>
<th>ALL GROUPS N=112</th>
<th>BOARD PRESIDENTS N=27</th>
<th>SUPER-INTENDENTS N=37</th>
<th>ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS N=48</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Selecting professional staff personnel</td>
<td>1.487</td>
<td>1.464</td>
<td>1.838</td>
<td>1.229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Orienting newly hired certified personnel</td>
<td>1.522</td>
<td>1.500</td>
<td>1.432</td>
<td>1.604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Supervising certified staff personnel</td>
<td>1.168</td>
<td>1.143</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Selecting non-certified personnel</td>
<td>1.699</td>
<td>1.536</td>
<td>1.946</td>
<td>1.604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Orienting newly hired non-certified personnel</td>
<td>1.823</td>
<td>1.571</td>
<td>1.811</td>
<td>1.979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Supervising non-professional personnel</td>
<td>1.956</td>
<td>2.286*</td>
<td>1.486</td>
<td>2.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Counseling certified and non-certified personnel</td>
<td>1.903</td>
<td>1.857</td>
<td>1.649</td>
<td>2.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Evaluating certified staff personnel</td>
<td>1.179</td>
<td>1.333</td>
<td>1.108</td>
<td>1.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Evaluating non-certified personnel</td>
<td>1.867</td>
<td>1.821</td>
<td>1.730</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Directing staff development programs</td>
<td>1.982</td>
<td>1.393</td>
<td>2.703*</td>
<td>1.771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Reviewing the curriculum</td>
<td>1.708</td>
<td>1.286</td>
<td>2.054</td>
<td>1.688</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>1.867</td>
<td>1.750</td>
<td>1.838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Assisting teachers in creating effective remedial instruction plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Directing programs for exceptional children</td>
<td>2.566</td>
<td>2.429*</td>
<td>2.865*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Providing substitute teachers when needed</td>
<td>2.575</td>
<td>2.107</td>
<td>2.162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Arranging student class schedules</td>
<td>1.814</td>
<td>1.714</td>
<td>1.486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Directing the guidance program</td>
<td>2.345</td>
<td>1.857</td>
<td>2.595*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Guiding the student activity program</td>
<td>2.214</td>
<td>2.214</td>
<td>1.946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Controlling pupil behavior</td>
<td>1.640</td>
<td>1.815</td>
<td>1.432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Managing student personnel records</td>
<td>2.602</td>
<td>2.821*</td>
<td>2.432*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Managing staff personnel records</td>
<td>2.422</td>
<td>2.643*</td>
<td>2.432*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Keeping records of census and pupil attendance</td>
<td>2.743</td>
<td>2.464*</td>
<td>2.838*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Designing student progress report procedures</td>
<td>2.384</td>
<td>2.607*</td>
<td>2.389*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Overseeing the health and safety program</td>
<td>2.241</td>
<td>2.214</td>
<td>2.222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUESTION</td>
<td>ALL GROUPS N=112</td>
<td>BOARD PRESIDENTS N=27</td>
<td>SUPERINTENDENTS N=37</td>
<td>ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS N=48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Working with the board of education to determine the educational needs of the community</td>
<td>2.265</td>
<td>1.607</td>
<td>3.135*</td>
<td>1.979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Recommending policy for the board of education</td>
<td>2.735</td>
<td>2.500*</td>
<td>3.486*</td>
<td>2.292*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Handling public relations between the school and the communications media</td>
<td>1.920</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>1.865</td>
<td>1.917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Cooperating with PTA and other community groups</td>
<td>1.283</td>
<td>1.321</td>
<td>1.270</td>
<td>1.271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Conferencing with parents and other members of the community</td>
<td>1.336</td>
<td>1.429</td>
<td>1.270</td>
<td>1.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Designing a public relations program</td>
<td>2.188</td>
<td>2.143</td>
<td>2.667*</td>
<td>1.854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Managing the school lunch program</td>
<td>3.088</td>
<td>2.964*</td>
<td>3.108*</td>
<td>3.146*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Inventorying supplies and equipment</td>
<td>3.159</td>
<td>3.250*</td>
<td>3.081*</td>
<td>3.167*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Managing audio-visual activities</td>
<td>3.558</td>
<td>3.643*</td>
<td>3.459*</td>
<td>3.583*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Apportioning supplies and equipment</td>
<td>2.310</td>
<td>1.929</td>
<td>2.432*</td>
<td>2.438*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Planning for plant expansion and renovation</td>
<td>2.699</td>
<td>2.321*</td>
<td>3.243*</td>
<td>2.500*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Defining specification for supplies and equipment</td>
<td>3.053</td>
<td>2.893*</td>
<td>3.216*</td>
<td>3.021*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUESTION</td>
<td>ALL GROUPS N=112</td>
<td>BOARD PRESIDENTS N=27</td>
<td>SUPERINTENDENTS N=37</td>
<td>ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS N=48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervising a program of plant maintenance</td>
<td>3.310</td>
<td>3.107*</td>
<td>3.541*</td>
<td>3.250*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrying out research programs within the school</td>
<td>2.062</td>
<td>1.643</td>
<td>2.162</td>
<td>2.229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintaining assignment schedules for non-certified personnel</td>
<td>2.679</td>
<td>2.815*</td>
<td>2.730*</td>
<td>2.563*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making the school a safe place in which to work and learn</td>
<td>1.304</td>
<td>1.815</td>
<td>1.422</td>
<td>1.271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convincing teachers of their ownership in creating a safe, orderly climate for learning in the school</td>
<td>1.205</td>
<td>1.074</td>
<td>1.378</td>
<td>1.146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making frequent classroom visitations</td>
<td>1.054</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.054</td>
<td>1.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focusing on the instructional process during classroom observation</td>
<td>1.170</td>
<td>1.481</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving the instructional program through teacher evaluation</td>
<td>1.063</td>
<td>1.111</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establishing high but realistic learning standards as a priority goal of the school</td>
<td>1.143</td>
<td>1.222</td>
<td>1.162</td>
<td>1.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publicly stating expected learning standards of a school to all students and parents</td>
<td>1.321</td>
<td>1.556</td>
<td>1.270</td>
<td>1.229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUESTION</td>
<td>ALL GROUPS N=112</td>
<td>BOARD PRESIDENTS N=27</td>
<td>SUPERINTENDENTS N=37</td>
<td>ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS N=48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Implementing clearly defined policy regarding grouping of students for instruction</td>
<td>1.679</td>
<td>1.444</td>
<td>2.243</td>
<td>1.375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Providing a classroom climate that allows all students to learn</td>
<td>1.482</td>
<td>1.556</td>
<td>1.703</td>
<td>1.271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Encouraging heterogeneous grouping to prevent labeling</td>
<td>1.839</td>
<td>1.519</td>
<td>2.054</td>
<td>1.854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Improving time-on-task by inhibiting disciplinary problems</td>
<td>1.688</td>
<td>1.815</td>
<td>1.811</td>
<td>1.521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. Managing pull-out instruction so it does not hamper regular instruction</td>
<td>1.670</td>
<td>1.593</td>
<td>1.649</td>
<td>1.729</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. Acting as instructional leader</td>
<td>1.170</td>
<td>1.593</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. Planning on-going staff development plans for faculty</td>
<td>1.482</td>
<td>1.250</td>
<td>1.649</td>
<td>1.489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Conferencing with teachers on their accountability for student progress</td>
<td>1.124</td>
<td>1.071</td>
<td>1.054</td>
<td>1.208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. Weekly discussing instructional issues with faculty</td>
<td>1.442</td>
<td>1.393</td>
<td>1.378</td>
<td>1.521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. Using faculty meetings primarily to focus on instructional matters</td>
<td>1.496</td>
<td>1.857</td>
<td>1.270</td>
<td>1.458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QUESTION</td>
<td>ALL GROUPS N=112</td>
<td>BOARD PRESIDENTS N=27</td>
<td>SUPER-INTENDENTS N=37</td>
<td>ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS N=48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Providing meaningful instructional leadership</td>
<td>1.116</td>
<td>1.321</td>
<td>1.054</td>
<td>1.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. Publicly stating the priority goals of the school to the total community</td>
<td>1.646</td>
<td>1.786</td>
<td>1.946</td>
<td>1.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. Scheduling standardized testing each year</td>
<td>1.487</td>
<td>2.036</td>
<td>2.139</td>
<td>2.479*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Using test results to revise the instructional program</td>
<td>2.177</td>
<td>1.357</td>
<td>1.541</td>
<td>1.521</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Role functions considered not to be a primary responsibility of the elementary school principal
Table I shows that board presidents, superintendents, and elementary school principals differ slightly in their perceptions of the functions one through nine of the survey questionnaire, and all respondents concur that these items are the primary responsibility of the elementary principal, but board presidents show a slight disparity on item 6. All nine of these functions pertain to directing, supervising, and evaluating certified and non-certified personnel.

Superintendents indicate that the role function of "directing staff development programs" (item 10) should not be a primary responsibility of the elementary school principal. There was complete concurrence among respondents in their perception of item fourteen of the survey questionnaire: "directing programs for exceptional children." All agreed that the elementary principal should not have primary responsibility for that role function. That particular role function must be performed by special education personnel who are properly endorsed.

"Managing student personnel records," "managing the school lunch program," and "maintaining assignment schedules for non-certified personnel" were perceived by all respondent groups as not being primary functions of the elementary school principal. It is significant to note that these three functions are managerial in nature and not directly involved with instructional leadership.
In summary, Table I indicates that board presidents, superintendents, and elementary principals are all in agreement that the following items should not be considered role functions for which the elementary school principal has primary responsibility:

14 Directing programs for exceptional children
20 Managing student personnel records
21 Managing staff personnel records
22 Keeping records of census and pupil attendance
23 Designing student progress report procedures
26 Recommending policy for the board of education
31 Managing the school lunch program
32 Inventorying supplies and equipment
33 Managing audio-visual activities
35 Planning for plant expansion and renovation
36 Defining specifications for supplies
37 Supervising a program of plant maintenance
39 Maintaining assignment schedules for non-certified personnel

According to group means, thirteen items listed above were indicated as role functions for which the elementary principal should not have primary responsibility. All three groups of respondents held these perceptions. Individual groups within the sample identified eight other role functions for which the elementary school principal should
not have primary responsibility: Board presidents do not see survey questionnaire item 6: supervising non-professional personnel, as a role function for which the elementary principal has primary responsibility; superintendents do not see survey questionnaire item 10: directing staff development programs, as a role function for which the elementary principal has primary responsibility; elementary principals do not perceive items 15: providing substitute teachers when needed, or 18: guiding the student activity program, to be role functions for which they have primary responsibility; superintendents and elementary principals agree that items 17: directing the student guidance program, and 34: apportioning supplies and equipment, are role functions for which the principal should not have primary responsibility. Finally, superintendents do not regard items 25: working with the board of education to determine the educational needs of the community, or 30: designing a public relations program, to be role functions for which the elementary principal has primary responsibility.

The instrument utilized in this study assessed a broad range of role functions. A panel of educators with experience in education ranging from 10 to 37 years, assisted in selecting role functions perceived to be the most appropriate to the job of the elementary school principal.
To summarize, Table 1 indicates that elementary school principals have primary responsibility for 65% of the role functions that make up the Opinion Scale of Elementary School Principals' Role Functions. Table 1 also indicates that elementary school principals do not have primary responsibility for 35% of the role functions listed in the Opinion Scale. Specifically, 13 role functions were so identified by all groups of respondents in Table 1, and 8 role functions were so identified in Table 1 by individual groups within the sample of this study.

**ANALYSIS OF TABLE I DATA RESULTING FROM THE SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE**

Items one through thirteen of the Survey Questionnaire pertain to the instructional program of a school. Specifically, items one through nine relate to selecting, supervising, and evaluating staff, and items ten through thirteen relate to planned activities with the faculty to improve the instructional process.

The group means indicate that items one through thirteen are perceived as being role functions that are the primary responsibility of the elementary school principal with two exceptions. Board presidents are somewhat unsure that elementary school principals should supervise non-professional personnel (item 6), and superintendents are not
sure that elementary principals are primarily responsible for item 10: "directing staff development programs."

Supervision of non-professional personnel may ultimately rest on the building principal, however, in practice, non-professional personnel are often supervised by the professional staff member for whom they perform duties. Further, the Illinois mandate requiring principals to spend more than fifty percent of their time as instructional leader would likely cause principals to delegate supervisory duty of non-professional personnel to someone else. One could assume that board presidents believe that supervision of non-professional personnel may not be a responsibility of the principal since those personnel are immediately responsible to someone other than a principal.

The directing of staff development programs would more likely be a primary duty of a school superintendent or his designee. Superintendents are responsible for staff development for the entire school district that they serve. The principal, on the other hand, may be held responsible for the implementation of staff development plans at the building level. Staff development programs are regulated in Illinois. Educational Service Regions of Illinois require that a committee of twenty-five percent administrators, fifty percent teachers, and twenty five percent school service personnel form a committee to help plan staff development.
Group means relevant to item 14 indicate that all groups perceive that some other school administrator should have the primary responsibility of "directing programs for exceptional children." Elementary principals should be aware that the School Code of Illinois, as well as Public Law 94-145, requires that very strict rules and regulations need to be followed in administering special education. Principals need to call on the expertise of special education administrators available to them.

Elementary school principals indicate through the group means for item 15 that they do not consider the role function of "providing substitute teachers when needed" as one of their primary responsibilities.

Board presidents are indicated by the group means for item 17 as perceiving that directing the guidance program probably should be a primary responsibility of the elementary school principal while superintendents and elementary school principals indicate that the role function could be performed by some other administrator. Superintendents and elementary school principals are in a position to assign responsibility relevant to directing the guidance program of a school since they are able to see the school in operation.

Group means for item 18 indicate that elementary school principals perceive that some other school administrator should have the primary responsibility of "guiding the
student activity program." Elementary school principals in practice are ultimately responsible for the student activity program, but may want to delegate the role to someone else.

The group means for items 20 - managing student personnel records, 21 - managing staff personnel records, 22 - keeping records of census and pupil attendance, and 23 - designing student programs report procedures, show congruence among the respondents in that they consider the role functions listed as not being the primary responsibility of the elementary school principal. It is interesting to note that the four role functions listed here do not require the expertise of an instructional leader. They are functions that could be delegated to a secretary.

Elementary school principals perceive that item 24, "overseeing the health and safety program" is a role function that should be delegated to some other administrator.

Group means indicate that items 31 through 37, and item 39 are role functions for which the elementary principal should not have primary responsibility. On examination, it will be noted that these role functions can be performed by someone who is not an instructional leader. In Illinois School Reform Legislation the principal is required to spend more than 50% of his or her time on instructional leadership. Guiding the student activity programs could be delegated to someone other than the elementary principal.
If their duty was delegated then the elementary principal would be able to devote more time as leader of instruction.

Management of student and staff personnel records, as well as records of census and pupil attendance are tasks that could be delegated to someone other than the principal.

Group means generated by responses to items 40 through 60 indicate that the elementary school principal should have the primary responsibility for these role functions with only one exception. The exception is noted among elementary school principals themselves who perceive item 59, "scheduling standardized testing each year" as a role function that could be delegated to some other administrator.

The review of the literature revealed that instructional leadership pertained to areas in which the principal could influence teachers to provide more effective instruction; for example, involvement in staff development, curriculum committees, discussions on instructional observation and evaluation of certified personnel, and in enhancing school climate. An effective principal can direct teachers to more effective schooling by his or her leadership in the areas listed above. Supervision of non-professional personnel, management of student and staff personnel records as well as management of records of census and pupil attendance are role functions which some would classify as administrative only. The review of the
literature indicated that the principal needs to decide between what is administrative only and what is instructional leadership.

Role functions that could affect instructional leadership by the principal are indicated in Table I as follows:

Directing programs for exceptional children
Managing student personnel records
Managing staff personnel records
Keeping records of census and pupil attendance
Designing student progress report procedures
Recommending policy for the board of education
Managing the school lunch program
Inventorying supplies and equipment
Managing audio-visual activities
Planning for plant expansion and renovation
Defining specifications for supplies
Supervising a program of plant maintenance
Maintaining assignment schedules for non-certified personnel
Supervising non-professional personnel
Providing substitute teachers when needed
Guiding the student activity program
Directing the student guidance program
Apportioning supplies and equipment
Working with the board of education to determine the educational needs of the community
Designing a public relations program

The role functions listed above would affect the principal's role as instructional leader because they are functions that are not performed during the teaching process. The statistical analysis performed indicated that these role functions could be performed by someone other than the principal, and if the principal is to spend most of his or her time as instructional leader then the role functions listed above should be delegated by the principal.

Illinois mandates that the principal must spend more than fifty percent of the time on instructional leadership and by delegating role functions to others, the principal can afford the time thus saved for the performance of role functions that are part of instructional leadership. Instructional leadership is highly significant according to the review of the literature. Through instructional leadership a principal can made teaching more effective, for the principal will be able to devote more time to the teachers for classroom observations, and follow-up conferences, participation in workshops, staff development plans, and in all of the other areas in which teachers need support to improve their instructional expertise.
Table 2 lists significant differences among the means for Board Presidents, Superintendents, and Elementary School principals in traditional schools. The sample was made up of sixty-one respondents. As stated previously, role functions receiving a mean value of 2.25 or less were considered to be a primary responsibility of the elementary school principal. One-way analysis of variance at the .01 level of significance produced only three items with statistical significance.

"Providing substitute teachers when needed" is perceived by board presidents to be a role function for which elementary principals have primary responsibility. Superintendents indicate that they perceive the role function as one that could be delegated, but principals themselves indicated that this probably should not be one of their primary functions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROLE FUNCTION</th>
<th>DEGREES OF FREEDOM</th>
<th>MEAN SQUARES</th>
<th>MEANS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BETWEEN WITHIN</td>
<td>BETWEEN WITHIN</td>
<td>SIG OF F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Providing substitute teachers when needed</td>
<td>2 59</td>
<td>9.204 1.318</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Working with the Board to determine educational needs of the community</td>
<td>2 59</td>
<td>9.809 1.690</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Designing a public relations program</td>
<td>2 59</td>
<td>6.316 1.214</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(p < .01)

* These data are from respondents of traditional schools
As Table 2 indicates, this study found statistical significance at the .01 level of significance among the groups of respondents of traditional schools regarding their perceptions of who has primary responsibility for certain role functions.

Based on the results of the test the means that were significantly different at the .01 level of significance were those generated for the following role functions: providing substitute teachers when needed, working with the board of education to determine the educational needs of the community, and designing a public relations program.

This study found that 100% of the responding principals of traditional schools perceive that they should not have primary responsibility for providing substitute teachers. The arranging for substitute teachers could be facilitated through a secretary, thus a principal would be able to devote the time saved to duties that demand the skills and the expertise of a principal.

Board presidents and elementary principals are clearly in agreement regarding their perception of the role function 25: "working with the board of education to determine the educational needs of the community," but superintendents perceive that someone other than the elementary principal has primary responsibility for this role function. In
practice, superintendents have primary responsibility for this function. Board presidents and elementary principals agree that the elementary principal has the primary responsibility for the role function 30: "designing a public relations program." Superintendents perceive that the principal should not have the primary responsibility for the role function. This view is indicated by the statistical analysis of item 30, but since boards of education are in charge of school districts, superintendents holding this opposing view would be obliged to persuade a board that principals should not be primarily responsible for designing a public relations program, or accept the perception of the board.

**SUMMARY OF TABLE 2**

In summary, Table 2 displays role functions which are perceived differently among respondents of traditional schools. Null hypothesis one states: Among the respondent groups there is no significant difference in how they perceive the role of the principal in traditional schools.

The one-way analysis of variance performed on the sixty point survey questionnaire to answer research question one and null hypothesis one indicated statistically significant differences at the .01 level for the following role functions:

**Role Function 15:** Providing substitute teachers when needed. Superintendents and elementary principals perceive
that someone other than the principal should have the primary responsibility for this role function, while board presidents perceive that the elementary principals should have primary responsibility for this role function. **Null hypothesis one is rejected.**

**Role function 25:** Working with the board of education to determine the educational needs of the community. Superintendents perceive that someone other than the principal should have the primary responsibility for this role function, while board presidents and elementary principals perceive that the elementary principal should have primary responsibility for this role function. **Null hypothesis one is rejected.**

**Role function 30:** Designing a public relations program. Superintendents perceive that someone other than the principal should have the primary responsibility for this role function, while board presidents and elementary principals perceive that the elementary principal should have primary responsibility for this role function. **Null hypothesis one is rejected.**

For all of the other role functions listed in the Opinion Scale of Elementary School Principals' Role Functions with the exception of those listed above, **null hypothesis one is accepted.**
Table 3 displays significant differences among the means for Board Presidents, Superintendents, and Elementary School Principals in outcome-based schools.

Again, it should be noted that Table I gave an overall view of perceptions of the role of the elementary school principal, Table 2 displayed perceptions of traditional school respondents, and Table 3 displays perceptions of outcome-based school respondents. Table 3 emphasizes perceptions of outcome-based school respondents because outcome-based schools claim that part of their major emphasis is placed on instructional leadership of the principal.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROLE FUNCTION</th>
<th>DEGREES OF FREEDOM</th>
<th>MEAN SQUARES</th>
<th>SIG OF F</th>
<th>MEANS BOARD PRESIDENTS N=14</th>
<th>MEANS SUPER- INTEND N=15</th>
<th>MEANS ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS N=22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 Supervising non-professional personnel</td>
<td>2 48</td>
<td>11.048 .726</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>2.428</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>2.454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Counselling certified and non-certified personnel</td>
<td>2 48</td>
<td>6.360 .960</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>1.857</td>
<td>1.266</td>
<td>2.454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Directing staff development programs</td>
<td>2 48</td>
<td>16.566 .913</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.214</td>
<td>3.200</td>
<td>1.636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Reviewing the curriculum</td>
<td>2 48</td>
<td>7.864 .879</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.428</td>
<td>2.800</td>
<td>1.727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Arranging student class schedules</td>
<td>2 48</td>
<td>8.378 1.110</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>1.428</td>
<td>1.200</td>
<td>2.454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Working with the Board to determine the educational needs of the community</td>
<td>2 48</td>
<td>14.383 1.412</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.357</td>
<td>3.333</td>
<td>2.181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Planning for plant expansion and renovation</td>
<td>2 48</td>
<td>5.591 1.009</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>1.928</td>
<td>3.066</td>
<td>2.136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE 3 (CONTINUED)**

**STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT RESULTS FROM ONE-WAY ANOVA***

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROLE FUNCTION</th>
<th>BETWEEN</th>
<th>WITHIN</th>
<th>BETWEEN</th>
<th>WITHIN</th>
<th>SIG OF F</th>
<th>MEANS BOARD PRESIDENTS N=14</th>
<th>MEANS SUPER-INTEND N=15</th>
<th>MEANS ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS N=22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36 Defining specifications for supplies and equipment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>6.397</td>
<td>1.101</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>2.071</td>
<td>3.400</td>
<td>2.727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47 Implementing clearly defined policy regarding grouping of students for instruction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>7.492</td>
<td>.962</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>1.500</td>
<td>2.600</td>
<td>1.363</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 Providing a classroom climate that allows all students to learn</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>5.398</td>
<td>1.023</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>1.428</td>
<td>2.333</td>
<td>1.272</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* These data are from respondents of outcome-based schools
Superintendents indicate that they perceive the elementary school principal should absolutely assume primary responsibility for performing the role function 6: "supervising non-professional personnel." Board presidents and elementary principals perceive that the principal or some other administrator should take primary responsibility for performing the role function.

Board presidents and superintendents of outcome-based schools perceive that the elementary school principal should assume primary responsibility for the role function 7: "counselling certified and non-certified personnel." The elementary principals themselves perceive that they or some other administrator could assume the primary responsibility for this role function.

Board presidents and elementary principals of outcome-based schools are in agreement that the elementary school principal should assume the primary responsibility for the role function 10: "directing staff development programs." Superintendents have the perception that the principal or some other administrator should take primary responsibility for this role function. In practice the directing of staff development programs is generally a district level function.
Board presidents and elementary principals of outcome-based schools perceive that the elementary principal should probably assume primary responsibility for the role function 11: "reviewing the curriculum." Superintendents of outcome-based schools indicated that the principal or some other administrator should take primary responsibility for this role function.

Board presidents and superintendents of outcome-based schools perceive that the elementary school principal probably should assume primary responsibility for the role function 16: "arranging of student class schedules." Elementary principals perceive that they or some other administrator should take primary responsibility for this role function.

Board presidents and elementary principals of outcome-based schools believe that elementary principals probably should have the primary responsibility for the role function 25: "working with the board of education to determine the educational needs of the community." Superintendents tend toward the perception that some administrator other than the principal should probably assume the primary responsibility for the role function.

Board presidents and elementary principals of outcome-based school perceive that elementary principals probably should have primary responsibility for the role function 35: "planning for plant expansion and renovation."
Superintendents perceive that the principal or some other administrator should take primary responsibility for this role function. Although perceptions differ regarding role function 35, in practice the view of the superintendent is the rule rather than the exception. When plant renovation and expansion are considered, it is the superintendent who presents the plans to the board of education and it is the superintendent who is given the duty as designated in the Illinois School Code.

Superintendents perceive that some administrator other than the principal should probably assume the role function 36: "defining specifications for supplies and equipment." Elementary principals perceive that the principal or some other administrator should take primary responsibility for this role function. Board presidents perceive that the principal probably should assume primary responsibility for performing this role function.

Board presidents and elementary principals perceive that the principal probably should assume primary responsibility for performing the role function 47: "implementing clearly defined policy regarding grouping of students for instruction." Superintendents perceive that the principal or some other administrator should take primary responsibility for performing this role function.

Board presidents and elementary principals perceive that principals probably should assume primary
responsibility for performing the role function 48: "providing a classroom climate that allows all students to learn." Superintendents perceive that the principal or some other administrator should take primary responsibility for performing this role function.

**SUMMARY OF TABLE 3**

In summary, Table 3 displays role functions which are perceived differently among respondents of outcome based schools. Null hypothesis 2 states:

Among the respondent groups there is no significant difference in how they perceive the role of the principal in outcome-based schools.

The one-way analysis of variance performed on the sixty point questionnaire to answer research question two and null hypothesis 2 indicated statistically significant differences at the .01 level for the following role functions:

**Role function 6:** Supervising non-professional personnel. Board presidents and elementary principals perceive that someone other than the principal should have primary responsibility for this role function, while superintendents perceive that elementary principals should have primary responsibility for this role function. Null hypothesis 2 is rejected.

**Role function 7:** Counselling certified and non-certified personnel. Elementary principals perceive that
someone other than the principal should have primary responsibility for this role function, while board presidents and superintendents perceive that elementary principals should have primary responsibility for this role function. **Null hypothesis 2 is rejected.**

**Role function 10:** Directing staff development programs. Superintendents perceive that someone other than the principal should have primary responsibility for this role function, while board presidents and elementary principals perceive that the principal should have primary responsibility for this role function. **Null hypothesis 2 is rejected.**

**Role function 11:** Reviewing the curriculum. Superintendents perceive that someone other than the principal should have primary responsibility for this role function, while board presidents and elementary principals perceive that the principal should have primary responsibility for this role function. **Null hypothesis 2 is rejected.**

**Role function 16:** Arranging student class schedules. Elementary principals perceive that someone other than the principal should have primary responsibility for this role function, while board presidents and superintendents perceive that the principal should have primary responsibility for this role function. **Null hypothesis 2 is rejected.**
Role function 25: Working with the board of education to determine the educational needs of the community. Superintendents perceive that someone other than the principal should have primary responsibility for this role function, while board presidents and elementary principals perceive that the principal should have primary responsibility for this role function. Null hypothesis 2 is rejected.

Role function 35: Planning for plant expansion and renovation. Superintendents perceive that someone other than the principal should have primary responsibility for this role function, while board presidents and elementary principals perceive that the elementary principals should have primary responsibility for this role function. Null hypothesis 2 is rejected.

Role function 36: Defining specifications for supplies and equipment. Superintendents and elementary principals perceive that someone other than the principal should have primary responsibility for this role function, while board presidents perceive that the elementary principals should have primary responsibility for this role function. Null hypothesis 2 is rejected.

Role function 47: Implementing clearly defined policy regarding grouping of students for instruction. Superintendents perceive that someone other than the principal should have primary responsibility for this role
function, while board presidents and elementary principals perceive that the elementary principals should have primary responsibility for this role function. Null hypothesis 2 is rejected.

Role function 48: Providing a classroom climate that allows all students to learn. Superintendents perceive that someone other than the principal should have primary responsibility for this role function, while board presidents and elementary principals perceive that the elementary principals should have primary responsibility for this role function. Null hypothesis 2 is rejected.

For all of the other role functions listed in the Opinion Scale of Elementary School Principals' Role Functions with the exception of those listed above, null hypothesis 2 is accepted.

Question Three

What difference does size of the school and years of experience make to the perceptions held by elementary school principals regarding the role of the elementary school principal?

To answer question three the following null hypothesis was constructed:

H0(3) The role of the elementary school principal as perceived by the principals themselves does not depend upon
Research question three and null hypothesis three applied to all of the elementary principals of the study. The total group of principals in this study was treated homogeneously in order that data would be generated representing perceptions of principals from traditional schools and outcome-based schools. Again, it should be noted that research question three and null hypothesis three of this study pertains to elementary school principals treated as one group, but the factors of school size and years of experience of the principal are part of the analysis. The purpose of this component of the study was to examine how principals themselves perceive their role. The intent of the researcher was to analyze the data thus obtained to facilitate a job description for the elementary school principal that could be accepted in either school setting. The total group of principals responding was 48.

Two-way analysis of variance was used to set up a dichotomy between years of service and size of school. One purpose of looking at the principal as a homogeneous group was to consider the perceptions of principals themselves regarding their responsibilities, and to analyze data gathered from the group. Another purpose was to create general concepts from the analysis which could be applied to delineating a
job description for an effective elementary school principal.

The results of the two-way ANOVA are tabularly represented in tables 4 and 5.

Tables 4 and 5 list role functions for which the elementary school principal does not have primary responsibility. Statistical significance indicated in Tables 4 and 5 was measured at the .001 level.

Table 4 lists group means by size of school and years of experience. Table 4 lists 33 principals with five or more years of experience, and 15 principals with less than five years experience. Also listed are 15 principals with schools of 500 students or more and 33 principals with schools of less than 500 students.
### TABLE 4

**ROLE FUNCTIONS BY YEARS OF EXPERIENCE AND SIZE OF SCHOOL**

**MAIN EFFECTS**

\( N = 48 \) ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEARS OF EXPERIENCE</th>
<th>SIZE OF SCHOOL</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 YEARS OR MORE</td>
<td>LESS THAN 5 YEARS</td>
<td>500 OR MORE</td>
<td>LESS THAN 500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( N )</td>
<td>( MEAN )</td>
<td>( N )</td>
<td>( MEAN )</td>
<td>( N )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q12</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q51</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( p < .001 \)
The "size of school" indicates whether or not there is statistical significance between the role functions of the principal. The group means in Table 5 indicate that size of school is a factor in the perceptions held by elementary school principals regarding primary responsibility for role functions. The following are role functions for which the elementary principal does not hold primary responsibility:

The role functions listed in Table 4 were found not to be the primary responsibility of the elementary school principal.

- Advising teachers in diagnosing difficulties of pupils.
- Assisting teachers in creating effective remedial instruction plans.
- Arranging student class schedules.
- Managing student personnel records.
- Managing pull-out instruction so it does not hamper regular instruction.

These five role functions would affect the role of the principal as instructional leader because they are role functions that are not involved in the teaching process. If such role functions are delegated by the principal then the principal will have more time to perform as an instructional leader.

Testing at the .001 level of significance, the role functions listed above are perceived not to be the primary responsibility of the elementary principal.
Null hypothesis 3 is rejected for the above role functions. The principals with schools of more than 500 students perceived that elementary principals should not have primary responsibility for: advising teachers in diagnosing learning difficulties of pupils, assisting teachers in creating effective remedial instruction plans, arranging student class schedules, managing student personnel records, and managing pull-out instruction so it does not hamper regular instruction.

Table 5 lists the relationships between the two variables of school size and years of service. Table 5 lists 11 principals who have five or more years of experience in schools with 500 or more students and 4 principals who have less than five years of experience with schools of 500 or more students. Also listed are 22 principals who have five or more years of experience in schools with less than 500 students and 11 principals who have less than five years experience with schools of less than 500 students.
TABLE 5
ROLE FUNCTIONS BY YEARS OF EXPERIENCE
AND SIZE OF SCHOOL
TWO-WAY INTERACTIONS
N = 48 ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIZE OF SCHOOL:</th>
<th>500 OR MORE</th>
<th>LESS THAN 500</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YEARS OF EXPERIENCE:</td>
<td>5 YEARS OR MORE</td>
<td>LESS THAN 5 YEARS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p < .001
Table 5 displays results of a two-way analysis of variance performed on data gathered from elementary principals of both school settings. Factors of size of school and years of experience as a principal were included in the statistical analysis.

Four principals with less than five years experience with schools of 500 or more students indicated that the elementary school principal should not have primary responsibility for directing staff development programs. Eleven principals with five or more years experience with schools of 500 students or more, 22 principals with five or more years experience with schools of less than 500 students, and 11 principals with less than five years experience with schools of less than 500 students indicated that the elementary school principal should have primary responsibility for directing staff development programs.

In Table 5 the size of school and years of experience indicate whether or not relationships exist relevant to perceptions held by the principals relevant to the role function listed:

**Role function 10:** Directing staff development programs.

As indicated, role function 10 was found statistically significant at the .001 level. Principals with less than five years experience who are in schools with more than 500 students indicate that someone other than the principal
should take primary responsibility for this role function. Principals with more than five years experience who are in schools with more than 500 students perceive that the principal should assume primary responsibility for performing this role function. Principals in schools with less than 500 students who have more or less than five years experience indicate that the principal should assume primary responsibility for role function 10. Null hypothesis 3 is rejected.

**SUMMARY ANALYSIS**

The elementary school principals were grouped together to answer research question three and null hypothesis three. The intent was to discover how elementary school principals themselves perceived the role of the elementary school principal. Forty eight elementary principals provided the demographic data indicating years of experience and size of school. Principals with schools of more than 500 students perceived that they should not have primary responsibility for the five role functions listed in Table 4.

Principals with less than five years experience who are in schools with more than 500 students indicate that they should not have primary responsibility for role function 10 which is listed in Table 5.
Since statistical significance is noted for role functions 12, 13, 16, 20, and 51 in Table 4, and for role function 10 in Table 5, null hypothesis 3 is rejected for these role functions. For all of the other role functions listed in the Opinion Scale of Elementary School Principals' role Functions, null hypothesis 3 is accepted. As previously noted the role functions listed in Tables 4 and 5 should be delegated by the principal for they are seen as role functions that are not directly involved in the teaching process. Such role functions would interfere with the role of instructional leader which the review of the literature indicated is essential to effective schooling.

Question Four

Is there a difference in the perception of the role of the elementary school principal among the traditional school respondents and the outcome-based school respondents, that is, what group had the most agreed upon role functions?

To answer question four the following null hypothesis was used:

HO(4) There is no significant relationship between perceptions of the principalship role among traditional school respondent groups and outcome-based school respondent groups.

Question four and null hypothesis HO(4) were answered using chi square. Table 6 tabularly displays the
statistical significances indicating relationships between perceptions of the principalship role among respondent groups in both school settings.
### TABLE 6
CROSS-TABULATIONS FOR TRADITIONAL SCHOOLS AND OUTCOME-BASED SCHOOLS
TRADITIONAL SCHOOLS N=61, OUTCOME-BASED SCHOOLS N=51

| ROLE FUNCTION | BOARD PRESIDENTS | | SUPERINTENDENTS | | ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS |
|---------------|------------------|----------------|-----------------|------------------|
|               | N=14             | N=15           | N=22            |                  |
|               | NUMBER | PERCENT | NUMBER | PERCENT | NUMBER | PERCENT |
| 2  | Orienting Newly Hired Certified Personnel | | | | |
| Absolutely should | 6 | 42.9 | 11 | 73.3 | 10 | 45.5 |
| Probably should | 4 | 28.6 | | | 10 | 45.5 |
| Not sure | 4 | 28.6 | | | | |
| Probably should not | | | 4 | 26.7 | | |
| Total | 14 | 100.0 | 15 | 100.0 | 22 | 100.0 |
| 5  | Orienting Newly Hired Non-Certified Personnel | | | | |
| Absolutely Should | 10 | 71.4 | 11 | 73.3 | 6 | 27.3 |
| Probably should | 4 | 28.6 | | | 12 | 54.5 |
| Not sure | | | | | 4 | 18.2 |
| Probably should not | | | 4 | 26.7 | | |
| Total | 14 | 100.0 | 15 | 100.0 | 22 | 100.0 |
### TABLE 6 CONTINUED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Absolutely should</th>
<th>Probably should</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Probably should not</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>6 Supervising Non-</strong>&lt;br&gt;Professional Personnel</td>
<td>3 21.4</td>
<td>2 14.3</td>
<td>9 64.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15 100.0</td>
<td>10 45.5</td>
<td>2 9.1</td>
<td>6 27.3</td>
<td>22 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>p</em> &lt; .001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Absolutely should</th>
<th>Probably should</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
<th>Probably not sure</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>10 Directing Staff Development</strong>&lt;br&gt;Programs</td>
<td>11 78.6</td>
<td>3 21.4</td>
<td>10 66.7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 13.3</td>
<td>3 20.0</td>
<td>2 9.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15 100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>p</em> &lt; .001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>|                      |                   |                |         |                     | 22 100.0 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 6 CONTINUED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BOARD PRESIDENTS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25* Working with the Board of Education to Determine the Educational Needs of the Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolutely should</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably should</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably should not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolutely should not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Recommending Policy for the Board of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolutely should</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably should</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probably should not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absolutely should not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 6 CONTINUED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>38</th>
<th>Carrying out Research Programs Within the School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Absolutely should</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p &lt; .001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>50</th>
<th>Improving Time-On-Task by Inhibiting Disciplinary Problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Absolutely should</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p &lt; .001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DESCRIPTION OF TABLE 6

Statistical significance for role functions listed in Table 6 was indicated via a chi square analysis. Cross-tabulation of the data was tested at the .001 level of significance. The data gathered from traditional schools and outcome-based schools were cross-tabulated using titles of respondents, and possible responses to each item of the sixty point survey questionnaire. The results of this chi square analysis revealed seven role functions with statistical significance. Of the seven role functions appearing statistically significant, six of them are so indicated by outcome-based school respondents. Role function 25 is the only one indicated statistically significant by respondents of traditional schools.

The first column indicates the number and description of each statistically significant role function. The second column lists the number and percentage of board presidents responding in each category of opinion, that is, absolutely should, probably should, not sure, probably should not, and absolutely should not. The third and fourth columns lists the same data for superintendents and elementary principals respectively.

Role functions which were perceived differently among respondents of outcome-based schools, and among respondents
of traditional schools are listed in Table 6. For the role functions listed null hypothesis 4 is rejected. For all of the other role functions listed in the Opinion Scale of Elementary School Principals' Role Functions, cross-tabulations showed no statistical significance relevant to perceptions of role functions among respondents of both school settings, therefore null hypothesis 4 is accepted for these role functions.

In summary, the cross-tabulations indicated more disparity among outcome-based school respondents than among the traditional school respondents. Significance was tested at the .001 level.

Relevant to role function 2: orienting newly hired certified personnel 28.6% of board presidents did not perceive this to be a primary responsibility of the elementary school principal, and 26.7% of the superintendents indicated that some other administrator should have the responsibility. Null hypothesis four is rejected.

Role function 5: orienting newly hired non-certified personnel was perceived by 26.7% of the superintendents and 18.2% of the elementary principals as a primary responsibility of someone other than the principal. Null hypothesis four is rejected.

Role function 6: supervising non-professional staff personnel was perceived by 64.3% of the board presidents and
36.4% of the elementary principals as a primary responsibility of someone other than the principal. Null hypothesis four is rejected.

Role function 10: directing staff development programs was perceived by 66.7% of the superintendents as a primary responsibility of someone other than the principal. Of the elementary principals, 18.2% perceived the role function as a primary responsibility of someone other than themselves. **Null hypothesis four is rejected.**

Role function 26: recommending policy for the board of education was perceived by 66.7% of superintendents and 45.5% of elementary principals as a primary responsibility of someone other than the principal. **Null hypothesis four is rejected.**

Role function 38: carrying out research programs within the school was perceived by 53.4% of the superintendents and 45.5% of the elementary principals as a primary responsibility of someone other than the principal. **Null hypothesis four is rejected.**

Role function 50: improving time-on-task by inhibiting disciplinary problems was perceived by 40% of the superintendents and 18.2% of the elementary principals as a primary responsibility of someone other than the principal. **Null hypothesis four is rejected.**
Cross-tabulations indicated only one role function with statistically significant differences among respondents of traditional schools.

Role function 25: working with the board of education to determine the educational needs of the community was perceived by 28.6% of the board presidents and 45.5% of the superintendents and 19.2% of the elementary principals as a primary responsibility of someone other than the principal. Null hypothesis four is rejected.

It is interesting to note that the one role function showing statistical significance for traditional school respondents is one involving public relations with the community. Also of interest is that of the role functions showing statistical significance for the outcome-based school respondents, three of them involve personnel, three involve improvement of instruction, and one involves relating with the Board of Education.

Research question four sought to find what group of respondents had the most agreed upon role functions. From the chi square analysis traditional school respondents have the most agreement regarding their perception of who has primary responsibility for the sixty role functions listed in the survey questionnaire.

According to the statistical analyses performed and listed in Table I it is quite evident that 65% of the role functions listed in the sixty point survey questionnaire are
perceived as being the primary responsibility of the elementary school principal. Identifying role functions determined not to be the primary responsibility of the elementary school principal by respondents of traditional schools and outcome-based schools, provides information for the exclusion of role functions from a job description design to assist an elementary school principal in becoming an effective leader. Since the job description was created from the perceptions of respondents in both school settings, it could be applied to principals in either setting. Thus, 39 role functions are considered in the process of creating a job description for the elementary principal which appears in Appendix E. As previously noted Table 1 was generated from frequency distributions from the total sample of the study. The intent of the researcher was to examine the perceptions held by board presidents, superintendents, and elementary school principals of both school settings and thus create a job description reflecting congruity in the three groups of respondents.

The content of the job description also considers the following findings:

Table 2 noted three role functions with statistical significance from perceptions of traditional school respondents, while Table 3 noted ten role functions with statistical significance from perceptions of outcome-based school respondents. Tables 4 and 5 list a total of six role
functions which are statistically significant from responses by elementary principals. Table 6 lists seven role functions identified as statistically significant among outcome-based school respondents, and one role function identified as statistically significant among traditional school respondents. Phase 1 of this study sought to discover role functions for which the elementary school principal does not have primary responsibility. The role functions for which the elementary principal does have primary responsibility make up the major portion of the job description found in Appendix E. The reason for including the role functions so identified is that the statistical analysis performed indicated that board presidents, superintendents, and elementary school principals perceived the role functions to be the primary responsibility of the principal. Role functions identified through the statistical analyses as not being the primary responsibility of the principal are included in the job description (Appendix E) but are indicated as being delegated by the principal. Phase 2 of the study focused on ten role functions of the elementary school principal determined to be most crucial to an effective principal. The interviewees were probed relevant to the significance with which they rated each item of the interview schedule. The results of Phase 2 were used in the creation of the job description for the elementary school principal found in Appendix E.
PHASE 2

PRESENTATION OF INTERVIEW DATA AND ANALYSIS

Phase II is a qualitative analysis performed on the data generated from the in-depth interviews. The in-depth interviewing permitted the probing into the context and reasons for answers given relevant to the ten items that made up the interview schedule. As described previously, a panel of experts identified ten role functions most crucial to performing the role of an effective elementary school principal. The ten items so identified made up the interview schedule. They substantially reflect the survey data findings. By focusing on these ten role functions the researcher attempted to find what was most essential in being an effective elementary school principal. One purpose of the in-depth interviewing was to go deeper into the motivation of the respondents, and to find what caused them to answer as they did. The open-endedness of the questions allowed for the probing.

To determine perceptions of significance relevant to role functions, values were assigned to each of the ten role functions that made up the interview schedule. A scale of one to five was used to measure the degree of significance of each interview item as perceived by the interviewees. The range was from 1 = low significance to 5 = high significance relevant to the respondents' perception of each
item as a responsibility of the elementary school principal. To encourage frankness and honesty the participants of the interviews were assured of anonymity.

Thirteen respondents to the survey questionnaire consented to an interview. The participants in the interview consisted of two superintendents, and five elementary principals of outcome-based schools, while traditional schools were represented by three board presidents, two superintendent/principals, and one elementary school principal. Among outcome-based school interviewees, New York was represented by one superintendent, and three elementary school principals. Indiana outcome-based schools were represented by one superintendent and two elementary school principals. Among traditional school interviewees, Illinois was represented by three board presidents, two superintendent/principals, and one elementary principal. No outcome-based schools were identified in Illinois, so the interviewees in Illinois were from traditional school settings. The interviewees of the traditional schools in Illinois were the only respondents of the total sample who agreed to be interviewed. In the qualitative analysis which follows, interviewees are grouped according to title and type of school. The grouping of the interviewees was done only to facilitate categorization, and is in no way meant to indicate balanced pairs, or to be representative of outcome-based schools and traditional
schools. The interviewees of this study were all respondents to the survey questionnaire and were the only respondents who agreed to be interviewed, hence the small number in the sample.

The participants in the interviews were asked to respond to each of the following items relevant to how he/she perceived each role function as a primary responsibility of the elementary school principal:

- Hiring professional staff personnel
- Supervising professional staff personnel
- Directing staff development plans
- Reviewing curriculum
- Publicizing priority goals of the school
- Visiting the classroom frequently
- Focus of classroom observation
- Teacher evaluation to improve the instructional program
- Publicly stating learning standards
- Discussing instructional issues with faculty

**DESCRIPTION OF TABLE 7**

Table 7 displays the ratings given to each item of the interview schedule by all of the participants in the in-depth interviews. The ratings are categorized by type of school and respondents within each type of school.
Table 7 displays the ratings given to each item of the interview schedule by interview participants. Column one lists the items of the interview schedule. The second column vertically lists the ratings of each board president participating in the interviewing, and the same sequence follows from left to right for superintendent/principals, and principals of traditional schools, followed by superintendents and elementary principals of outcome-based schools. The rating scale ranged from low = 1 to high = 5.
### TABLE 7

**RATINGS OF INTERVIEW SCHEDULE ITEMS**

<p>|                                | TRADITIONAL SCHOOL: | OUTCOME-BASED SCHOOL: |
|                                | SUPERINTENDENT/PRESIDENTS | SUPERINTENDENT/PRIINCIPAL | SUPERINTENDENT | ELEMENTARY PRINCIPAL |
|                                | N=3                  | N=2                       | N=1            | N=2                  | N=5                  |
| 1 Hiring professional staff personnel | 5 4 5             | 5 5 5                     | 5              | 5 5                  | 5 3 5 5 5 4          |
| 2 Supervising professional staff personnel | 4 4 3             | 4 5 3                     | 4              | 5 5                  | 5 5 5 5 5            |
| 3 Directing staff development plans | 4 4 4             | 3 5 3                     | 3              | 5 3                  | 5 5 5 5 5            |
| 4 Reviewing curriculum          | 3 3 5             | 3 4 4                     | 3              | 5 2                  | 5 3 5 4             |
| 5 Communicating with community regarding priority goals | 4 3 3             | 4 4 4                     | 4              | 5 4                  | 5 4 5 4 4          |
| 6 Making frequent classroom visitations | 3 5 3             | 0* 0                      | 0              | 5 5                  | 5 4 5 5 4          |
| 7 Focusing on instructional process during classroom observations | 4 5 4             | 0 0                       | 0              | 5 5                  | 5 5 5 5 5          |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Improving the instructional program through teacher evaluation</td>
<td>5 4 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 0 0 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Publicly stating learning standards</td>
<td>5 3 4 0 0 0 5 5 4 5 4 5 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Weekly discussing instructional issues with faculty</td>
<td>5 4 5 0 0 0 5 5 4 4 0 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0* = MISSING VALUE (NO RATING GIVEN)
Table 7 reveals that all of the administrators of outcome-based schools and traditional schools rate each item of the interview schedule in the high range with few exceptions. One elementary principal of outcome-based schools gave item one a medium rating. A medium rating was given item three by one superintendent/principal and one principal of traditional schools, and by one superintendent of outcome-based schools. A medium rating was given to item four by one superintendent/principal of traditional schools, and by a superintendent and two elementary principals of outcome-based schools.

The board presidents of traditional schools rated each item in the high range with the following exceptions: one board president rated item two in the medium range, two board presidents rated item four in the medium range, two board presidents rated item five in the medium range, two board presidents rated item six in the medium range, and one board president rated item nine in the medium range. No greater differences are noted among the ratings; however, in the responses given during the interviews subtle differences were noted relevant to the respondents' perceptions of the elementary school principals responsibilities.

All interviewees were asked identical questions, and the questions were given in the same order so that the format of the interview would be standardized. All of the
interviews were tape-recorded to facilitate thorough analysis of the data, and significant factors were recorded in writing during each interview. Responses to each item were compared to identify similarities, analyzed, and synthesized into emergent concepts. The questions, emergent concepts, and supporting quotes from the interviews are contained in the following pages along with analyses of the responses from board presidents, superintendents and elementary school principals. Again it should be noted that the interviewees are grouped only for classification purposes and no attempt is made to present a balanced representation of traditional schools and outcome-based schools.

The data from individual interviews were reported collectively under each interview schedule item and categorized according to respondents.

Interview Question One

To what degree of significance do you perceive the principal being involved in hiring professional staff personnel?

Based on the responses to interview question one, the following concept emerged: The interviewees indicated that the elementary school principal should be involved in the hiring of certified staff personnel. They see the staff as a team and new teachers as potential players for those
teams. The respondents see the principal as being uniquely able to know the needs of his particular school. The school will have a much better chance of being effective if the best teachers are chosen by the principal.

**INTERVIEW QUESTION ONE**

**RESPONSES FROM PRINCIPALS OF OUTCOME-BASED SCHOOLS**

Principals of outcome-based schools put a high priority on the involvement of the elementary principal in hiring professional staff personnel. The principals focused on selecting the people who will fit with the present staff. As one principal stated: "It is very important to seek teachers who will fit in your school setting."

Another principal stated: "The team will be working as a team." One principal highlighted the matching of staff thus: "The new people should model the staff we already have."

**RESPONSES FOR SUPERINTENDENTS OF OUTCOME-BASED SCHOOLS**

The superintendents were in agreement that selecting professional staff personnel required thoroughness, so that the finest people could be found. Though interviewees emphasized the importance of involvement in the hiring of professional staff personnel, it must be remembered that the hiring of personnel is a duty of boards of education. As one superintendent stated: "We look for best
characteristics in candidates. Prerequisites for hiring are optimistic and excited. We don't want negative teachers."
Ultimately the decision to hire rests with the board of education. The superintendents of outcome-based schools indicated that principals should be involved in selecting professional staff personnel and that the principals in this role should help identify candidates who are optimistic, positive, excited about teaching, and who have the characteristics necessary to be an effective teacher.

RESPONSES OF SUPERINTENDENT/PRINCIPALS OF TRADITIONAL SCHOOLS

These administrators spoke of how vital it was to be involved in hiring professional staff personnel. One superintendent/principal stated: "You need to know the staff and the community, so you can ask 'Is this teacher going to meet my needs?'" Another respondent said: "We need the right team, and the principal needs to pick the team." Again, it is the duty of the board of education to hire personnel, but the principal may be involved in the selection process.

RESPONSES FROM BOARD PRESIDENTS OF TRADITIONAL SCHOOLS

The board presidents agreed that the elementary school principal should be involved in the hiring of professional staff personnel. One board president emphatically stated:
"The principal must be involved in hiring professional staff personnel. We spend a lot of time selecting professional staff and several committees are involved." Ultimately, the decision to hire rests with the board of education.

**SUMMARY**

Based on the responses given to question one of the interview schedule it is apparent that the administrators and board presidents interviewed are in agreement on the importance of the elementary school principal being involved in the hiring of professional staff personnel. It should be noted that boards of education have the duty to hire professional staff personnel, but principals can be involved in the selection process. By involving the principal in the hiring process the principal can draw on his or her knowledge of the needs of the particular staff and student body, and help select personnel who may fulfill those needs through the school district's educational programs. In reference to the research questions and null hypothesis it is evident that in the interview sample there is no difference in the perceptions of the role of the elementary school principal among respondents of outcome-based schools and traditional schools. Interviewees of both school settings indicated their beliefs in the importance of the principal being involved in the selection of professional staff personnel.
The central theme in the responses to interview question one was that principals know the needs of their buildings and how the present staff functions; therefore they would know how well new employees would fit into their school setting.

The significance of a principal intimately knowing the needs of his building is an obvious advantage in selecting the best personnel to meet those needs, but the principals should assess the needs of the building at the point in time when new personnel are hired.

The board presidents interviewed agreed that the involvement of the principal in hiring certified personnel was highly significant. Two board presidents emphasized the need for a screening committee to assist in the careful selection of professionals. They believed that this would help preclude future problems which may occur if weak candidates were chosen.

If we believe that local schools needs are better understood by the building principal then we have discovered an area where the school board, which is the hiring body, may advantageously include the principal in the hiring process.
Interview Question Two

What is your perception of the significance of the elementary school principal supervising professional staff personnel?

Based on the responses to interview question two the following concepts emerged: Supervision means to observe the instructional program taking place. Supervision is especially needed by first and second year teachers. The principal needs to see that the job is being done. It is through supervision of professional staff personnel that the principal facilitates the improvement of instruction and communicates the vision of the school to the staff.

INTERVIEW QUESTION TWO

RESPONSES FROM PRINCIPALS OF OUTCOME-BASED SCHOOLS

Principals of outcome-based schools affirmed that supervision of professional staff personnel was a highly significant responsibility of the elementary school principal. One principal stated: "The principal needs to know that the job is being done." These principals of outcome-based schools emphasized the need to conference with teachers to make supervision meaningful. One person expressed significance thus: "I meet with everyone individually to focus on their goals." Another principal stated: "It should be a clinical approach to supervision."
RESPONSES FROM SUPERINTENDENTS OF OUTCOME-BASED SCHOOLS

While stating that supervision by the principal was of high significance, one superintendent emphasized poor teaching: "Supervise poor teachers thoroughly." Another superintendent focused on supervision of new teachers: "It is significant especially for the first and second year teachers." Interestingly, none of the respondents mentioned financial restraints which would very likely affect a program of supervision. The Illinois mandate that the principal should spend more than fifty percent of the time as instructional leader may necessitate hiring other personnel to handle duties that could hinder the principal in performing that important phase of the principalship. If state mandates are given to principals then obviously the principals are being given more responsibilities; yet a principal has time constraints that limit the amount of work that can be accomplished.

RESPONSES FROM THE PRINCIPALS OF TRADITIONAL SCHOOLS

In regard to supervision of professional staff personnel the traditional school principal interviewed stated: "We want to see that job is being done, and through more supervision, problems are minimized." The principal indicated that principals should not only observe the teachers, but that conferences are necessary to discuss improvement of instruction.
RESPONSES FROM SUPERINTENDENTS/PRINCIPALS OF TRADITIONAL SCHOOLS

These respondents agree that supervision is a highly significant responsibility of the elementary school principal. As one superintendent/principal stated: "We hold the teachers accountable through this part of the principal's job."

RESPONSES FROM BOARD PRESIDENTS OF TRADITIONAL SCHOOLS

One board president did not perceive supervision to be highly significant, contending: "If you have chosen real professionals you don't have to worry much about supervision." One may infer that the need for on-going supervision is not understood or valued by the respondent. Effective schools research holds that supervision is needed to see that goals are set and that students work to meet the goals. Another board president was quite explicit in his belief in supervision of professional staff personnel. The two board presidents interviewed agreed that supervision was a significant role function of the elementary school principal.

SUMMARY

In summary, all of the interviewees spoke of the necessity of supervision so that the principal would know
that teachers were providing effective instruction. Through conferencing, during the supervision process, teachers are allowed to participate with the principals in setting goals rather than the teachers operating from unilateral decisions of the principals. The American public still asks for accountability in our schools, and it is the duty of school administrators to measure accountability through supervision.

Illinois mandated observation and evaluation of teachers in the school reform legislation of 1985. According to Illinois law, a principal must spend more than fifty percent of his time as instructional leader, and this responsibility necessitates supervision of professional personnel. The duties of a principal are many and if supervision is essential to effective schooling, and educators perceive supervision as highly significant, then in practice changes may be necessary in order that principals may have the time to effectively supervise. The job description presented in Appendix E of this study suggests what role functions an elementary school principal should be held primarily responsible for performing and role functions that may be delegated to someone other than the principal.
Interview Question Three

How significant do you perceive the responsibility of the elementary school principal to be in directing on-going staff development plans for the faculty?

Based on the responses to interview question three the following concept emerged: Administrators perceive the responsibility of an elementary school principal in directing on-going staff development plans as highly significant. Staff development is seen as a way for the principal to promote the vision of the school and to provide for the professional growth of teachers. The principal can plan staff development from needs which surface from conferences with teachers. Our schools need and want staff development, because through staff development, schools can update their instructional programs and thus strive to be more effective. The principal should not be held solely accountable for staff development, but should be an integral part of a staff development team. Staff development in some areas is designed at district level. A principal may be given the responsibility of implementing staff development at the building level. Since staff development plans are apt to cover a multitude of subjects, a principal may find it necessary to call on the expertise of staff members, or to seek experts from elsewhere.
RESPONSES FROM PRINCIPALS OF OUTCOME-BASED SCHOOLS

Principals of outcome-based schools agreed on the importance of the principal being involved in on-going staff development plans. One principal spoke of professional development: "Teaching is a science and we constantly need to enhance our knowledge." These principals emphasized the necessity of follow-up from staff development: "Always carry out what comes from staff development." Review of the literature revealed that implementing research was a hallmark of effective schools.

RESPONSES FROM SUPERINTENDENTS OF OUTCOME-BASED SCHOOLS

Superintendents of outcome-based schools also spoke of the need to research continually with a view of improving instruction: "Tendencies need to be made known to the teachers." Making teachers aware of current research is seen as a duty by these superintendents. Effective school research indicates that teachers should be provided with information gleaned from research that will facilitate their quest for more effective teaching. An alert principal could provide his or her staff with pertinent information, and this could be a duty of an effective elementary school principal.

One superintendent particularly noted the support of the board of education regarding staff development for teachers: "Every teacher has fifteen personal development
days: ten of the personal development days take place in
the summer, and these days are approved by the board of
education." The teachers receive pay for these personal
development days. The school district believes that the
gains made through its teachers study of research, and
working on curriculum committees etc. is a sound financial
investment by which the teachers become more effective
educators. Some school districts may hold similar beliefs
but may be prevented from putting them into practice because
of financial restraints, or possible conflicts with
collective bargaining agreements.

RESPONSES FROM SUPERINTENDENT/PRINCIPALS OF
TRADITIONAL SCHOOLS

The superintendent/principals of the traditional
schools showed no disparity with the other respondents to
interview question three. One superintendent/principal
focused on expertise of the principal relevant to the
directing of staff development plans: "What is the
principal's background? Does he have the expertise, or does
he have to delegate this duty?" A principal is responsible
for the instructional program in his or her school and that
responsibility would include staff development. Since a
principal may not have expertise in every area of the
curricula, portions of the staff development could be
delegated by the principal. Overall the principal would
have the responsibility of implementing staff development at the building level.

RESPONSES OF BOARD PRESIDENTS OF TRADITIONAL SCHOOLS

One board president spoke of budgetary implications associated with staff development, but it was evident that knowledge of staff development was lacking. This researcher probed with questioning to discover if the board president had knowledge of staff development. It became quite evident that the board president did not understand the meaning of staff development, and seemed to have the concept confused with professional development on an individual basis. Professional development is understood in some areas as the action taken by a person to improve in a professional capacity; for example, a person may take graduate courses, attend workshops, etc. Another board president stated: "Teachers should do a lot of staff development on their own. The principal should not have to do it at all." Through probing the board presidents it was discovered that they perceived staff development to mean individual teachers improving themselves through their own efforts. Again, the principal would have primary responsibility of implementing staff development at the building level.

The traditional school principal did not respond to item three of the interview schedule.
The interviewees ranked "...directing on-going staff development plans for faculty..." as 5, that is, highly significant. Eighty percent of the interviewees perceived that the principal should know the professional needs of the staff and provide for those needs through staff development, and the interviewees expressed the necessity of follow-up, without which they believed staff development would not be very worthwhile. If the content of staff development is valuable enough to present, then the staff should apply what they have learned wherever possible.

Most of the interviewees expressed the opinion that the principal alone was not responsible for directing staff development, and that experts and the rest of the staff should share in the responsibility. Principals may be allowed to plan staff development for their schools, but in some areas they may not have the authority to do so. Ultimately it is a duty of the superintendent to direct staff development programs for the board of education.

In some areas certain personnel are legally required to cooperate with the administrators in planning staff development. It is interesting to note that the Educational Service Region for Cook County, Illinois, requires school districts in its jurisdiction to carry out the requirements of The School Code of Illinois which specifies that planning committees must be formed to design school district
Teacher Institute Days (staff development programs), and that these committees be comprised of fifty percent teachers, twenty-five percent administrators, and twenty-five percent school service personnel. Thus the Educational Service Regions are facilitating team effort, and collegiality, and thereby enhance the staff development efforts.

The answers given by board presidents seemed to indicate that their conception of staff development consisted of short term goals only, and related more to discussion of instructional issues rather than a fully planned staff development program. Some board presidents may not be familiar with the instructional programs of a school district, and superintendents could benefit from enlightening their board presidents on educational programs including staff development.

In the review of the literature it was indicated that implementing research is a hallmark of effective schools. Staff development affords an opportunity to incorporate research where applicable.

Review of the literature also indicated the respect teachers have for principals who exhibit expertise in various areas of schooling. Clearly, teachers would respect principals who demonstrate expertise in presenting components of staff development plans. Effective principals
also call on the expertise of personnel within the school's staff.

One major restraint to developing staff development plans may be financial resources. The State of Illinois, for example, does not provide substantial funding for staff development and the same is true of Cook County. If funds generated within the school district are inadequate then the district would be limited in drawing on human and material resources. If staff development plans extended past a fiscal year then another possible problem presents itself, because revenue would have to be identified in creating the budget for the next fiscal year.

To enhance the quality of staff development programs, Educational Service Regions can insist that school districts within their jurisdiction implement mandates requiring the schools to have committees that plan for meaningful staff development programs, and by monitoring the school district to observe that staff development plans are being carried out. School districts are expected to provide staff development. Currently costs for human and material resources are high. School districts are left to bear the financial burden of staff development. In Illinois, the State Board of Education provides categorized grants for staff development, and the Educational Service Region for Cook County, Illinois provides meager reimbursements for
staff development. Both financial resources combined only pay a small fraction of staff development costs.

Interview Question Four

How significant do you perceive the role of the elementary school principal in reviewing the curriculum?

Interview question four sought to find perceptions of the participants regarding the involvement of the elementary school principal in reviewing the curriculum. As a result of the responses to interview question four the following concept emerged: Most of the interviewees do not see curriculum revision as a prime responsibility of the elementary school principal. The principal alone should not review curriculum, but should be an integral part of a curriculum team. The goals of the school should be kept in mind as curriculum is reviewed. Teacher judgement and test scores are two factors essential to practical curriculum revision.

RESPONSES FROM PRINCIPALS OF OUTCOME-BASED SCHOOLS

Two of the principals emphasized the need for a curriculum committee, and indicated their belief that principals should not function alone in reviewing the curriculum. One principal stated: "The curriculum specialist would be more involved with the team than the principal." Another principal stated: "The principal must
be aware of the curriculum and align it with staff syllabi, but the principal can't do everything."

RESPONSES FROM SUPERINTENDENTS OF OUTCOME-BASED SCHOOLS

The superintendents interviewed agreed that the principal was not solely responsible for reviewing curriculum. One superintendent stated: "The principal can only do so much...it is done district wide." The superintendents also emphasized improvement of instruction through curriculum review. One superintendent commented: "We can evaluate the effectiveness of the curriculum in a particular building; for example, it may be indicated by test scores." Achievement test scores and criterion test scores were also cited as indicators of effective or ineffective curriculum design.

Interview schedule item four pertained to how interviewees perceived the significance of the role of the elementary school principal in reviewing the curriculum. The first superintendent quoted indicated that reviewing the curriculum is a district function, and that the principal should not be solely responsible for it. The second superintendent quoted indicated the use of test scores in a particular building in evaluating curriculum, and thus would point to the responsibility of the principal at the building level.
The interviewees agreed that the elementary school principal should not solely be responsible for curriculum review. They also agreed that the principal should be part of the curriculum committee. One superintendent/principal reported: "The principal needs to be an integral part of the committee."

The principal interviewed from the traditional school emphasized discovery of more appropriate text books; and consideration of procedures used in the instructional program that may need to be changed. The focus was on the need for change: "Curriculum revision helps us to note changes that have to be made; for example, new texts and procedures are considered." The traditional school principal interviewed indicated that reviewing curriculum was his responsibility at the building level.

One board president focused on the principal delegating responsibility for curriculum review to faculty members who have the necessary expertise in various areas of curricula: "Principals are not all experts in curriculum. Others in the faculty have more expertise than the principal."
Another board president stated: "This function should not be a prime responsibility of the principal. The principal appoints teachers to be coordinators of math, music, etc. The principal pulls teachers together on Teacher Institute Days." The third board president saw curriculum review as the most important part of the principalship: "Reviewing the curriculum is the most important overall job of the principal. The principal should guide the professional staff in delivering the curriculum."

One way a principal can help the staff deliver curriculum is to utilize teacher evaluation procedures. Through observing and evaluating teachers, the principal can point out areas in which the teacher is observing the curriculum goals, objectives, and skills of district curriculum guides. The staff members and the principal can discuss how the components of the curricula are being delivered during conferences between the principal and staff members.

**SUMMARY**

About half of the interviewees ranked reviewing the curriculum as medium on the significance scale, and about half of the interviewees gave it a high rating of significance. Interviewees in New York, Indiana, and Illinois concurred that the principal should draw upon the expertise of their staff for curriculum revision, but they
maintained that the principal must be an integral part of curriculum revision. When probed the interviewees of the three states agreed that the principals should be the chairperson of the curriculum committees. If the principal has primary responsibility for reviewing the curriculum at the building level, then it would be to the advantage of the principal to be chairperson of curriculum committees.

The interviewees emphasized curriculum revision, and believed that the principal should take part in it. Two of the board presidents interviewed agreed that the principal should take part in curriculum revision, but added that the principal should utilize staff members who may have more expertise in curriculum than the principal.

None of the interviewees mentioned financial implications that would affect curriculum revision. Obviously, curriculum review necessarily includes cost factors. In some school districts curriculum review is done only at district level. The cost of continuous curriculum review would depend partly on what components a district would include in its plans. For example, curriculum coordinators, curriculum specialists for specific content areas, consultants from outside and inside the district, and resource materials would need to be included in the school district budget. In some cases time spent outside of the contractual agreements may have to be budgeted separately because of stipulations in a collective bargaining
agreement. Creation of curriculum teams could require the budgeting of extra funds. Parameters would be needed to address the responsibilities of the curriculum teams, and discussions would be needed to determine how the teams would be used.

In light of the Illinois State mandate that principals spend more than fifty percent of their time as instructional leaders, boards of education, and central office administrators should note that while the principal is perceived to be an essential member of the curriculum teams, it does not follow that the principal needs to be the expert of the teams. Review of the literature indicated that delegation of tasks is a hallmark of effective leadership. Boards of education and superintendents would be wise to consider this factor when dealing with the job description of school principals.

Another purpose for reviewing curriculum noted by the interviewees was to align district goals with curriculum. Achievement test results could be one criterion for evaluating effectiveness of curriculum, but the content of standardized achievement tests does not always match the curriculum in particular areas. Criterion referenced tests were also cited by some interviewees as a tool in reviewing curriculum. Criterion referenced tests can be constructed so that they match a school district's curriculum. The teachers who deliver curriculum could be able to indicate
through their experiences what is effective or ineffective in curriculum. Again, at the building level the principal would have primary responsibility for the implementation of the factors listed above.

**Interview Question Five**

How significant do you perceive the responsibility of the elementary school principal to be in communicating priority goals of the school to the entire community?

As a result of the responses to interview question five the following concept emerged: respondents believe that the community should be involved with the school in establishing overall priority goals, and that the whole community should be made aware of the goals. Newsletters written by the superintendent and the principal would help bring the school news to the community.

**RESPONSES FROM PRINCIPALS OF OUTCOME-BASED SCHOOLS**

Principals of outcome-based schools agreed that priority goals of the school should be made public. The interviewees also concurred that it was very advantageous to involve the community in goal setting. As one principal stated: "It is important that the principal be involved in communicating priority goals of the school to the entire community." Another principal focused on the benefit of
communicating with parents: Another principal stated: "The principal can only do so much with communication."

RESPONSES FROM SUPERINTENDENTS OF OUTCOME-BASES SCHOOLS

The superintendents interviewed clearly put the responsibility for communication of goals on the elementary school principal: "Informing the school community should be done through the principal." and "Principals must essentially communicate with the community."

RESPONSES FROM SUPERINTENDENTS/PRINCIPALS OF TRADITIONAL SCHOOLS

The superintendents/principals of traditional schools emphasized hierarchial authority in their responses to interview question five: "If the superintendent has delegated it to the principal then it is O.K.; otherwise, the superintendent should do it." and "Yes, although this should always be checked with a higher authority."

RESPONSES FROM THE PRINCIPAL OF TRADITIONAL SCHOOLS

The principal indicated his respect for the office of the superintendent and emphasized shared responsibility: "This responsibility should be shared with the superintendent." and "The superintendent could have a monthly newsletter to tell what events are planned and the principal could have a weekly newsletter to tell how events came off."
RESPONSES FROM BOARD PRESIDENTS OF TRADITIONAL SCHOOLS

Two of the board presidents indicated that they positively valued communication or priority goals of the school to the entire community and saw this as an important responsibility of the elementary school principal. One board president stated: "Communicating with the community regarding priority goals of the school is very important. You can put people at ease, talk with particular groups in the community and through effective public relations, the principal will have the community support. Involving the community proves itself to be the right way to go." Another board president saw the responsibility as shared by the board of education, the superintendent, and the principal: "School district goals are stated through the superintendent, the Board of Education, and the principals to the school district community. The principal needs to do a good job of relating goals to his/her school community."

The third board president did not place a lot of importance on communication and stated: "Communicating priority goals to the entire community is not as important as the other duties of the principal. The principal wouldn't be able to communicate all of the goals in great detail."

SUMMARY

Analysis of the responses to interview question five revealed that it is beneficial to communicate with the
school community. Two superintendents interviewed perceived that the principal should have the responsibility of communicating priority goals to the entire community only if the superintendent has control over the function and delegates the job to the principal. At the district level the superintendent would be directly responsible to the board of education for the communication of priority goals to the entire community. From this viewpoint the principal would not have primary responsibility for the role functions. The principal would very likely have the primary responsibility for communicating priority goals to the community of his or her school but this would probably be done under the direction of the district office.

Two of the interviewees suggested that newsletters were the best way to communicate with the community. One may question whether or not it would be better to communicate through boards of education, PTA meeting, news media, and any other vehicles that may share the mission of the school with the surrounding community. It became apparent during the interviews with these respondents that they wanted to assert their belief that communicating with the entire community should be in the domain of the superintendent, and that the principal should be required to review communication with the superintendent. By law the superintendent carries out the policies of the board of education for which he works and one can understand why a
superintendent would be particularly concerned about the responsibility of communicating with the entire community.

Boards of education and superintendents can aid greatly in creating more effective schools by directing principals to carry out board policy in this important aspect of schooling. It should be noted that boards of education are a legislative body. Policy adopted by the board of education is the equivalent of law for a school district. If a board of education has policy regarding communicating with the community, then it should direct the principals to carry out the policy. Well defined policy, when properly executed, can greatly increase the effectiveness of our schools. The responsibilities of a principal towards communication with the community could be enhanced by clearly delineating what the responsibility entails.

Interview Question Six

How significant do you perceive the responsibility of the elementary school principal to be in frequently visiting classrooms?

As a result of the responses to interview question six the following concepts emerged: frequently visiting the classrooms is seen by all respondents as a highly significant responsibility of the elementary school principal. The classroom is the place where the instructional program is mostly in evidence. To be
effective a principal needs to know what is going on in the school. Teachers feel good about the principal showing concern. By staying in close contact with the teachers as much as possible, the principal would be made aware of what is needed. Collegiality and positive attitudes are built through frequently visiting teachers in their classrooms.

RESPONSES FROM THE PRINCIPALS OF OUTCOME-BASED SCHOOLS

Principals of the outcome-based schools related frequency of visits to need as one stated: "We may need to spend a large block of time for visiting." Another believed need determined frequency: "Frequency depends upon need." If the purpose of the visit is to observe teaching as part of on-going supervision/evaluation, then the principal would probably observe a complete lesson. If a teacher was having continuous problems with maintaining discipline in the classroom, then the principal may make frequent short visits to monitor the situation, or the principal may want to observe during a large block of time to discover how disciplinary problems may develop. In Illinois, a principal has the responsibility of evaluating teachers at least once in two years, and this would include visiting the teachers classroom to observe instruction.

Another principal emphasized enabling teachers through classroom visitations: "If the principal is a facilitator we need to know where the help is needed, then we can be a
good coach." The principal explained that the principal would recognize areas of need through classroom observations. Discovering the areas in which the teacher needs help would facilitate the efforts of the principal in increasing the teachers effectiveness.

RESPONSES FROM SUPERINTENDENTS OF OUTCOME-BASED SCHOOLS

Superintendents stressed being aware of what is transpiring in the classrooms as the main purpose of frequent visitations: "We need to go in to the classrooms to know what is going on" and "We may want to know, for example, how the new math series is working." In using the pronoun "we" the superintendent was referring to overall responsibility for classroom visitations but in context he was referring to the responsibility of the elementary principal. One superintendent emphasized monitoring to see that the teacher is delivering instruction according to school district plans: "The principal needs to be there to be certain that teachers are performing as they should, that is, according to the district curriculum."

RESPONSES FROM BOARD PRESDENT OF TRADITIONAL SCHOOLS

One board member indicated a lack of support for a principal making frequent classroom visits: "It's okay for the principal to be around the building but he/she shouldn't go into the classrooms too frequently. The word "too" in
the preceding quote does not preclude the belief in frequent visits. It only cautions against visits so frequent that effective instruction would be interrupted. Too much visitation would interfere with teaching. With good rapport between principal and teacher and with parents you know how the teachers are doing." Another board president indicated that he supported frequent classroom visits by the principal: "The more time the principal spends in classrooms, the more the teachers will relax and the nervousness will disappear. The process of classroom visitation becomes easier as frequency increases." The same board president indicated rationale for frequent classroom visits:

"The teacher is nervous because the evaluation by the principal could affect the teacher's job. The kids can perceive the nervousness. Principals and teachers become better acquainted through frequent visits. The principal can observe something during a visit, reconsider it during another visit, and see where the teacher is going with ideas which perhaps wouldn't be obvious in a single observation."

The latter view reveals compassion for the teachers and an awareness of the milieu in which they operate. A third board president showed some support for the principal making classroom visitations: "The principal should show some interest by visiting classrooms. The principal should be seen and be available, but visits don't have to be every day
SUMMARY

The superintendent/principals and the principal of the traditional schools did not respond to item six of this interview schedule.

Most of the interviewees spoke of the need to see what was happening in the classrooms if principals wanted to improve the instructional program. The review of the literature for this study supports the view that frequent classroom visits should be made, particularly the finding in the effective schools research. Clearly a principal would have to visit classrooms to find out what is being taught, and it may take several visits to understand the direction of certain lessons.

It should be noted that in some areas collective bargaining agreements would impact on these perceptions because of the specificity in them regarding frequency and length of classroom observations. Some collective bargaining agreements contain specific timeliness that must be followed for classroom visitations. One could easily understand that at least some teachers may be offended by frequent classroom visits, and in this case a principal would need to set the teacher at ease, and be sure to specifically follow the collective bargaining agreement regarding observations and teacher evaluation. It is
necessary in Illinois that teachers have input for the creation of systems for evaluation, and if a school district modifies its plan for evaluation, then approval must be sought from the Illinois School Board of Education.

According to Illinois school reform legislation the teachers must take part in the development of instruments for evaluation. Some may want to use a model of clinical supervision, others may want to use a less structured model, however, the principal must work within the parameters of the collective bargaining agreement applicable to his/her school. The involvement of teachers in generating a plan for evaluation would allow the principal to hear what the teachers consider to be important.

An evaluation plan to be most effective would necessarily have a statement on frequency of classroom visits. Some districts may specify more frequent visits for new teachers, while other districts may specify frequent visits for all teachers. Some districts may include duration of visits as well as frequency of visits in their plan for evaluation.

One purpose of visiting classrooms is to make sure that curriculum is being delivered according to district goals. If the principal discovers areas where a teacher needs help then more visits may be required so that the teacher and principal can discuss ongoing change.
Superintendents are required to report to the board of education regarding the state of the school and this reporting can be facilitated greatly through the help of a very active principal who frequently visits classrooms, and knows how his/her school is operating. If a principal spent most of the time in the office instead of personally being involved in the daily operation of the school, then his/her knowledge of the school would not be adequate. A principal who does have first-hand knowledge of his/her building could provide much significant data to the superintendent and the board of education so that the board would be continuously aware of the educational programs.

Lack of agreement among interviewees in response to item six of the interview schedule indicates that there is either ignorance of effective school research on classroom visitations or that some of the interviewees do not subscribe to the belief that classrooms should be visited frequently.

**Interview Question Seven**

What is the significance of focusing on the instructional process during classroom observations?

As a result of the responses to interview question seven the following concepts emerged: respondents agree that this responsibility is of the highest significance. The whole purpose of visiting the classrooms is to improve instruction, and the teachers know that it is the reason why
the principal is there. The principal needs to observe how
the instruction is being delivered and then dialogue with
the teachers regarding it.

RESPONSES FROM THE PRINCIPALS OF OUTCOME-BASED SCHOOLS

Principals of outcome-based schools completely agreed
that focusing on the instructional process was the very
reason for conducting classroom observations. One principal
observed: "The principal should always focus on the
instructional program during classroom visitations."
Another principal elaborated on what his district does to
make observations more meaningful: "To help us focus during
observations, we use a sheet designed to help us see that
the instructional process is being covered." The same
principal described the function of observation thus:
"Reacting directly to the instructional process through note
taking and sharing with the teachers."
RESPONSES FROM SUPERINTENDENTS OF OUTCOME-BASED SCHOOLS

Both of the superintendents of outcome-based schools agreed that the focus of classroom observation was on the instructional process: "The teacher knows that the principal is there to improve instruction." and "Focusing on the instructional process during observations is the highest of all functions."

RESPONSES FROM BOARD PRESIDENTS OF TRADITIONAL SCHOOLS

One board president related the instructional process to teacher evaluation and reported: "The instructional process is what the teachers are evaluated on and that is why it is the focus of classroom observations." Another board president who previously stated that frequent visits to the classroom was not important qualified the statement by responding to interview question seven thus: "When the principal does make himself available, he should be focusing on the instructional process." The response of the third board president indicates practical reasons for classroom observation: "During the times you are in the classroom you make sure the lesson plans are being followed.

SUMMARY
Superintendent/principals and the principal of the traditional schools did not respond to item seven of the interview schedule.

All of the interviewees acknowledged that focusing on the instructional process was the purpose of classroom observations. One hundred percent of them agreed that this role function of the elementary school principal had a high level of significance. All of the interviewees believed that "focusing on the instructional process during classroom observations" is the most important of the ten items on the Interview Schedule. It is very interesting to note that there was complete congruence on this particular point.

Analysis of the responses to interview question seven revealed that improvement of instruction is the main purpose of classroom observations. School administrators could implement effective change in their instructional programs through clearly incorporating this main purpose of classroom observations in their plans for observation and evaluation. If improvement of instruction is the main purpose for classroom observations it follows that the principal must do something after the observation so that instruction will be improved. The principal must conference with the teachers to discuss ways in which instruction will be improved.

Focusing on the instructional process during visits would allow the principal to note how the teacher is teaching and how the students are learning. By observing
the teacher, the principal could note any areas of instruction that need improvement as well as areas of effective teaching. The principal could then share this information during a conference with the teacher.

Interview Question Eight

How significant do you perceive the responsibility of the elementary school principal to be in improving the instructional program through teacher evaluation?

As a result of the responses to interview question eight the following concepts emerged: improving instruction through teacher evaluation is an important responsibility of the elementary school principal, and feedback is essential in this process. The principal should write notes on what is being done and use the anecdotal notes to plan with the teachers for improvement. Needs of the school can be realized through a meaningful program of evaluation. Evaluation of teachers is also important for purposes of granting tenure or for dismissal of teachers.

RESPONSES FROM PRINCIPALS OF OUTCOME-BASED SCHOOLS

Principals indicated that they were supportive of teachers and used evaluation for the purpose of improving instruction. As one principal reported: "It is highly important that the principal improve the instructional program through evaluation, because the teachers have to
know where they are going and how they will get there...the principal needs to ask the right questions so that the teacher will find how to grow.

RESPONSES FROM SUPERINTENDENTS OF OUTCOME-BASED SCHOOLS

Superintendents agreed that evaluation must be meaningful to teachers, as one superintendent stated: "We had to change the assessment form so that teachers know what indications are being made for improvement of instruction." The plan for evaluation is ultimately a district level responsibility; however, the principal has the responsibility for the plan at the building level. In Illinois the plans for evaluation must include input from the teachers. The building principal has the responsibility relevant to improving the instructional program through teacher evaluation. Another superintendent stated: "Evaluation is highly important, we have a specific format for watching instruction going on and use anecdotal records for planning." Again, the elementary principal has the responsibility for observing the teachers and evaluating their performance.

RESPONSES FROM SUPERINTENDENT/PRINCIPALS OF TRADITIONAL SCHOOLS

The superintendent/principals of traditional schools interviewed expressed belief in the principal improving
instruction through teacher evaluation. One interviewee stated: "The elementary principal definitely should evaluate teachers, you strengthen programs through it." The other stated: "It has high significance--it is part of the job."

RESPONSES FROM THE PRINCIPAL OF TRADITIONAL SCHOOLS

The principal interviewed from the traditional schools stated: "Evaluation of personnel is done in part for granting of tenure or dismissal." The principal perceived that it was an elementary principal's responsibility to improve the instructional program through teacher evaluation, and emphasized the granting of tenure to effective teachers and dismissal for ineffective teachers.

RESPONSES FROM BOARD PRESIDENTS OF TRADITIONAL SCHOOLS

One board president stated: "If you have the professionals then you can improve the instructional program and the only way to do this is to listen to the teachers." The preceding quote was explained in terms of "professionals" meaning teachers who have had an adequate preparation to become teachers, and that the principal needs to actively listen to teachers in order to work with them for the improvement of instruction. Another board president stated: "Part of the principal's job is to see what the teachers are doing and then telling them what they could do
about it. Telling the teacher what to do is an important aspect of improving instruction." The third board president stated:

"The principal is involved in improving the instructional program, but other personnel are used to improve the instructional delivery of various programs, and this is because the principals need help—we were asking too much of them prior to Illinois School Reform legislation."

**SUMMARY**

It is interesting to note the third board president's concern regarding the overburdening of principals. Serem (1985), noted in his research that principals would function more effectively if they had less stress.² Serem explained that if a principal knew what was required of him/her, then the person could perform those functions. He noted that principals in Wyoming left their jobs because of stress, and concluded that the stress came from role ambiguity. The principals did not know what was expected of them. Serem recommended the creation of a job description for principals so that stress would be avoided.

All of the interviewees ranked "improving the instructional program through teacher evaluation" as a highly significant responsibility of the elementary school principal. They saw this function as having the highest

---

² Ibid., p. 73.
significant because through it the principal works with the teachers in mutually planning for more effective teaching. The interviewees perceived evaluation to exist for the improvement of instruction. Teacher evaluation as noted by the interviewees must involve actual observation of teachers while they are providing instruction. It is necessary for the principal to note what is being taught and to conduct conferences with the teachers to discuss what was observed.

Analysis of the responses to interview question eight found that evaluating teachers is essential to improving instruction. If teachers give more effective instruction because of principals evaluating them clearly, school leaders would be wise to create meaningful policy for evaluation and ensure that the policy is implemented. To be most meaningful, policy needs to be written very carefully. One procedure worthy of consideration would involve the entire faculty. Brainstorming sessions could be conducted between the teachers and the principal to discover what the teachers believe is important regarding evaluation. The faculty may then work toward consensus building. When the faculty has thoroughly analyzed the data generated from brainstorming and consensus building, the principal could present the findings to the central office. The central office may want to be involved throughout the procedure. The board of education could then use the data to write
policy that would help make teacher evaluation more effective and thereby effectively improve instruction.

Interview Question Nine

How significant is the responsibility of the elementary school principal in establishing high but realistic learning standards and stating them publicly for all parents and students? As a result of the responses to interview question nine the following concept emerged: Schools need community support, and may gather some support by communicating school standards to the community. In communicating what is being taught, how it is being taught, and why it is being taught, the schools can gain community support. By establishing high but realistic learning standards and publicizing them for parents and students, schools show support for the students.

The superintendent/principals and the principal of the elementary schools did not respond to item nine of the interview schedule.

RESPONSES FROM PRINCIPALS OF OUTCOME-BASED SCHOOLS

All of the principals from outcome-based schools asserted that it was very important for the elementary school principal to take the responsibility of establishing high but realistic learning standards and to state them publicly for all parents and students.
One principal reported: "It is highly important that the principal state high learning standards to parents and students." Another principal stated: "Exit behaviors, that is, overall outcomes should be made known to the parents."

It was explained that exit behaviors or overall outcomes mean how a learner will be changed behaviorly as a result of learning. The principals of the outcome-based schools perceived that establishing learning standards and stating them publicly for parents and students was a responsibility of the elementary school principal. It should be noted that boards of education work with their superintendents in establishing learning standards and in stating the learning standards publicly for students and parents. The elementary school principal would then be responsible for his or her school striving to reach those standards, and take part in communicating the standards to his or her school community.

RESPONSES FROM SUPERINTENDENTS OF OUTCOME-BASED SCHOOLS

One superintendent made a significant point thus: "How we communicate goals is more important than what is stated in them and how they were written." and "There is a difference between what we say and where we are." On further probing the respondent explained that we should not just write and communicate learning standards, but that we should deliver instruction according to the standards. Again, it should be noted that establishment of learning
standards and publication of them to the community is a district level responsibility, but the elementary principal has the responsibility of fulfilling building level obligations.

RESPONSES FROM BOARD PRESIDENTS OF TRADITIONAL SCHOOLS

One board president stated: "It is important to establish the learning standards, but it is difficult for parents to understand goals and standards since they are not educators." Another board president stated: "It is important to know what the school is doing...what the school has set for their children...don't be content with mediocrity. A school should completely publicize that it is striving for better things."

The third board president expressed his perception regarding settings and publicizing learning standards thus:

"Look at the report cards and you will see how high and realistic your learning standards are. Social economic status doesn't lower achievement. How does the community perceive the value of an education? If the community lists education as a high priority, that makes the difference. Publicly stating our learning standards is required because Illinois makes us give the School Report Card. The principal has to have rapport with the parents and convince them that the school will do its job, but parents must do their part too."

When questioned about the reference to report cards showing high standards, the board president explained that
passing grades would indicate that students were reaching the high standards set, and that the standards were realistic.

Relevant to responsibility of the elementary principal in item nine of the interview schedule the first board president indicated the difficulty the principal may have in dealing with parents who may not understand what the principal is trying to communicate, but he recognized the importance of establishing learning standards. It should be noted that the primary responsibility for setting learning standards rests on boards of education and the superintendents employed to carry out board policies. The elementary principal is responsible for performing the role function at the building level.

The second board president emphasized the responsibility of the principal to let the community know what the school is striving to achieve.

The third board president indicated passing grades as a criterion for indicating attainment of standards and an indication that standards are realistic. The elementary principal was perceived as having the responsibility for students achieving the standards in his or her building.

**SUMMARY**

By law, the establishment of learning standards is a board responsibility. The aspect of realistic standards in this interview item refers to setting standards appropriate
to a local school, that is, standards that can be attained by the pupils of that particular local school.

Most of the interviewees ranked "establishing high but realistic learning standards and stating them publicly for all parents and students" as a highly significant responsibility of the elementary school principal.

Publicizing priority goals is of high significance according to two board presidents and of medium significance according to one board president. An elementary school principal is responsible for publicizing standards at the building level. The principal is also responsible for leading the teachers towards attainment of the standards by the students.

Analysis of the responses to interview question nine revealed that publicly stating high but realistic learning standards to the entire community was of the highest significance. How can this belief be applied? Once the learning standards have been created and agreed upon they should be thoroughly publicized. The elementary principal has the responsibility of publicizing the standards at the building level. By publicizing expected standards to the community support for the school is enhanced and another hallmark of effective schools established.

Keeping parents and students informed of this learning standards would make them aware of the expectations of the school. Reminding parents and students of expectations may
cause the students to more consciously strive to meet the expectations.

The parents would be more able to recognize achievement of learning standards if they have a clear understanding of the learning standards.

**Interview Question Ten**

How significant do you perceive the responsibility of the elementary school principal to be in arranging weekly discussions on instructional issues with faculty?

As a result of the responses to interview question ten the following concepts emerged: some respondents suggested daily meetings while others suggested that there was not enough time or need to hold weekly meetings. The principal should be the facilitator in these meetings and lead the discussions in how to improve areas of instruction through suggesting change. The principal can change the culture of the school through these meetings. Scheduling should be designed to allow teachers shared planning periods. Collegiality could be enhanced through discussion at these meetings. By regularly relating to staff the principal exercises leadership.

Superintendents/principals and the principal of traditional schools did not respond to item ten of the interview schedule.
RESPONSES FROM THE PRINCIPALS OF OUTCOME-BASED SCHOOLS

Principals from outcome-based schools indicated that they arrange frequent meetings for discussion of instructional issues. One principal stated: "Faculty meetings are good for problem solving situations, but discussion of instructional issues is done through our team meetings." A team meeting was described as a small group meeting consisting of two to five people. Another principal spoke of meetings of very short duration: "It is significant that our school has meetings like that every morning, that is, fifteen minute meetings." Another principal gave an indication of support for arranging weekly discussions on instructional issues: "Team members classes are scheduled so that they have planning time together."

Another principal stressed collegiality and effectiveness of meetings and stated: "Groups of four or five together with the administrator is collegial and most effective--not the whole faculty." The principals of the outcome-based schools perceived that the elementary school principal has the responsibility of arranging weekly discussions on instructional issues with the faculty.

RESPONSES FROM SUPERINTENDENTS OF OUTCOME-BASED SCHOOLS

The superintendents of outcome-based schools showed they had knowledge and understanding of the benefits derived from providing for frequent meetings to discuss
instructional issues. One superintendent stated: "We have principals who do this intentionally--the staff is afforded a time to talk about instruction--they otherwise wouldn't facilitate discussion with the staff...the principals ask how can we change things?" Another superintendent stated: "We need to meet at least weekly or even daily...knowledge is probably the most important factor for success."

RESPONSES FROM BOARD PRESIDENTS OF TRADITIONAL SCHOOLS

One board president stated:

"Weekly meeting to discuss instructional issues would not be necessary. Monthly or bi-monthly would be enough. Discussing instructional issues with the faculty at the beginning of the term, at the middle of the term, and at the end of the school term would be best, and the principal should ask three questions at these periods: 1. Where are we? 2. Where are we going? 3. How far did we get?"

Another board president stated: "Weekly discussing instructional issues with faculty is required in our school district. The principal runs the instructional meetings for his/her staff." and "Discussing instructional issues with the faculty should take place at least each week. It is part of the routine for getting input from the teachers in order to review the direction of the teachers in the classrooms."
The first board president perceived that the principal should not have the responsibility of arranging weekly discussions on instructional issues with the faculty, but held the perception that such discussions should be held monthly or bi-monthly. He believed that it would be best to conduct the discussions at the beginning, middle, and at the end of the school term. The second board president quoted did perceive the principal as having the responsibility of arranging weekly discussions on instructional issues with the staff. The responsibility of the principal was seen as necessary to determine the direction of the teachers in the classroom.

**SUMMARY**

Analysis of the responses to interview question ten revealed that all of the interviewees perceived meetings to discuss instructional matters to be of the highest significance in the responsibilities of an elementary school principal. One board president did not perceive the principal to have the responsibility of arranging the discussions every week.

Teachers discussing instructional issues with each other in teams of four would be more effective than the same discussions being conducted with an entire faculty. Administrators could plan these meetings to take place during the times that teachers are not providing
instruction. The teachers then would meet among themselves, for example, it may be advantageous to schedule meeting times according to grade levels. Scheduling would need to accommodate the meeting times. Frequency of the meetings may vary according to need. Priorities to be discussed at the meetings could be agreed upon by the teachers, and at times with the principal. In addition, administrators could plan an early dismissal day per week so that instructional issue meetings could occur. To put the latter idea into effect board approval would be necessary and financial implications would require consideration. If a school district decided that weekly discussion on instructional issues should be policy, then the elementary principal would have the responsibility for carrying out the policy at the building level.

SUMMARY OF INTERVIEWS

In summary, the respondents interviewed for this study displayed a high degree of congruity in their perceptions of the role of the elementary school principal. Principals have first hand knowledge of their school and know what personnel are required for the school to run efficiently. The team/player concept was emphasized by interviewees, and this is not surprising in view of current trends in collegiality, ownership, and consensus building.
Supervision by the principal is needed so that practical direction can be given to improve the instructional program. Improvement of the instructional program is seen as the purpose of classroom visitations. This is of particular interest in view of the fact that Illinois has mandated supervision and evaluation of teachers and Illinois requires that teachers be evaluated at least once every two years.

Staff development is seen as a significant vehicle for promoting the vision of the school, and so it should be aligned with that vision. The elementary school principal has the responsibility of implementing staff development at the building level.

The majority of the respondents held that the principal needs to work with teams for curriculum revision and staff development, and that the principal should utilize staff members who have expertise in these areas. It was also indicated that the elementary principal should have the responsibility of being chairperson of curriculum committees.

Evaluation of teachers to improve the instructional program is an absolutely necessary function of the elementary school principal. Through evaluation teachers strength their art and science of teaching. Review of the literature and responses of interviewees in this study indicate that for evaluation to be worthwhile there must be
communication between the principal and the teachers. Evaluation of teachers to improve the instructional program was perceived as a responsibility of the elementary school principal.

Frequent meetings wherein principals lead discussions on instructional issues facilitate the interpersonal communication which is needed to improve teaching and promotes a peer support structure which may make schooling more effective. Arranging discussions on instructional issues with the faculty was perceived as a responsibility of the elementary school principal.

SUMMARY OF CHAPTER 3

In general many of the respondents to the survey questionnaire, and the participants of the in-depth interviews showed little disparity relevant to their perceptions of the role of the elementary school principal. During the study it became apparent that school reform legislation in Illinois has greatly influenced the thinking of administrators and board presidents relevant to how they perceive the principal as instructional leader, and in the opinion of the researcher traditional schools and outcome-based schools, hold very similar perceptions of the role of the elementary school principal.

Table 1 revealed that sixty-five percent of the role functions of the elementary school principal listed in the
survey questionnaire were perceived by the respondents of outcome-based schools and traditional schools to be the primary responsibility of the principal. Table 1 also revealed that respondents from both school settings perceived thirty-five percent of the role functions listed in the survey questionnaire not to be the primary responsibility of the elementary school principal.

Table 2 revealed that board presidents perceive that elementary principal should have primary responsibility for the three role functions listed. Superintendents thought that somebody other than the principal should have primary responsibility for all three role functions. One may speculate that superintendents want to reserve primary responsibility for determining educational needs of the community to themselves, and perhaps they believe that arranging for substitute teachers would be a burden on the principal. Elementary principals indicated that only the latter mentioned role function should not be their primary responsibility and perhaps for the same reasons as the superintendents. Another possible factor influencing the perceptions of the board presidents could be that board presidents are not familiar with the day-to-day operation of schools and therefore do not have the same knowledge as superintendents and elementary principals. Some board presidents are very familiar with the operation of the school.
Table 3 revealed that board presidents perceive that elementary principals should have primary responsibility for nine of the ten role functions listed; superintendents perceived that seven of the role functions should be the primary responsibility of someone other than the elementary principal, and one could speculate that the nature of the role functions listed is such that the superintendents would want to reserve primary responsibility to themselves. The four role functions that elementary principals themselves indicated should not be their primary responsibility are role functions that the principals perceive could be performed by someone else. The expertise of a principal would not be required to perform the four role functions.

The role functions listed in Tables 4 and 5 are role functions that elementary principals of both traditional schools and outcome-based schools indicated should not be their primary responsibility. The principals responding to the survey questionnaire provided demographic data that may influence their perceptions of the role of the elementary school principal. Interestingly all of the functions listed in Table 4 are such that someone other than the principal could easily assume the primary responsibility. Table 5 lists only one role function, and one could speculate that the principals' perceptions of responsibility for directing staff development programs would indicate that directing of staff development is primarily a central office
responsibility. The pattern noted for Tables 2, 4, and 5, is also seen in Table 6.

It should be noted that although the principal is perceived by some respondents as not having primary responsibility for certain role functions the principal is ultimately responsible for all of the role functions at his or her building level, because the role of the principal depends upon the expectations of the particular school district in which the principal is employed. It is hoped that the findings of this study will point to role functions determined by respondents not to be the primary responsibility of the elementary school principal. Information will thus be provided for the exclusion of role functions from a job description designed to assist an elementary principal in becoming an effective leader.

At the conclusion of the in-depth interviews a high degree of congruity was noted among the participants relevant to their perceptions of the role of the elementary school principal. Although Phase 1 data of the study were given statistical analyses and Phase 2 was given a qualitative analysis, it appears that both phases indicated a high degree of congruence among the participants.

In summary, the results of the analysis of the survey data and the analysis of the interview data revealed that traditional school respondents and outcome-based school respondents do not disagree greatly on the primary
responsibilities of an elementary school principal relevant to role functions.

A job description is presented in Appendix E of this study. The job description was created from the results of the statistical and qualitative analysis.
CHAPTER IV

Conclusions, Recommendations, Suggestions for Further Study

Chapter IV presents the conclusions from statistical analyses of survey data, and a qualitative analysis of the interview data, and recommendations for further research.

Summary of the Study

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to determine characteristics of effective elementary school principals. A review of the literature was conducted with particular reference to role functions for which an elementary principal should take primary responsibility. The intent was to discover perceptions for the role of the elementary school principal held by board presidents, superintendents, and elementary school principals in traditional schools and outcome-based schools. Statistical analyses were performed on the data generated for the survey questionnaire, using frequency distributions, one-way ANOVA, two-way ANOVA, and the chi square. A qualitative analysis was performed on the data gathered from the in-depth interviews. The interviews were conducted to probe into the reasons respondents
consider the role functions contained in the interview schedule to be most crucial to the work of an effective elementary school principal.

Conclusions

I. Based on the analyses of the survey questionnaire which was answered by 112 respondents the following conclusions have been made.

1. Outcome-based schools and traditional schools differ within their respective groups in perceptions of role functions for which the elementary school principal has primary responsibility. Among sixty-one traditional school respondents statistically significant differences at the .01 level indicating disparity were noted in their perceptions of the following role functions:
   a) providing substitute teachers when needed.
   b) working with the board of education to determine the educational needs of the community.
   c) recommending policy for the board of education.
   d) designing a public relations program.
   e) convincing teachers of their own ownership in creating a safe, orderly climate for learning in the school.
The traditional school respondents agreed that the elementary school principals have primary responsibility for all other role functions listed in the survey questionnaire.

Among fifty-one outcome-based school respondents statistically significant differences at the .01 level indicating disparity were noted in their perceptions of the following role functions:

a) supervising non-professional personnel.
b) counselling certified and non-certified personnel.
c) directing staff development programs.
d) reviewing curriculum.
e) arranging student class schedules.
f) working with the board of education to determine the educational needs of the community.
g) planning for plant expansion and renovation

The outcome-based school respondents agreed that the elementary school principals have primary responsibility for all other role functions listed in the survey questionnaire.

To determine perceptions of the role of the elementary school principal held by respondents of traditional schools and outcome-based schools analyses of variance were performed on the survey data from both school settings. Relatively little difference was found in comparing the
perceptions of traditional school respondents with the perceptions of outcome-based school respondents.

2. According to the results of a two-way analysis of variance elementary school principals of traditional schools and outcome-based schools do not differ significantly in their perceptions of primary responsibility for the role functions listed in the survey questionnaire. The variables of years of experience and size of school were used in the two-way ANOVAS. Statistical significance indicating disparity among the principals was noted as follows: Principals with less than five years experience in schools with five hundred or more students perceived that principals should not have primary responsibility for directing staff development programs, advising teachers in diagnosing learning difficulties of pupils, arranging student class schedules, managing student personnel records, assisting teachers in creating effective remedial instruction plans, and managing pull-out instruction so it does not hamper regular instruction.

It was concluded that size of school and years of experience make little difference in the perceptions of elementary school principals of traditional schools and
outcome-based schools regarding primary responsibility for
the identified role functions.

3. Cross-tabulation revealed no significant
relationship between traditional school
respondent groups and outcome-based school
respondent groups relevant to their groups'
perceptions of primary responsibility for the
following role functions:
a) orienting newly hired certified personnel.
b) orienting newly hired non-professional
personnel.
c) supervising non-professional staff personnel.
d) directing staff development programs.
e) working with the board of education to
determine the educational needs of the
community.
f) recommending policy for the board of
eduction.
g) carrying out research programs within the
school.
h) improving time-on-task inhibiting
disciplinary problems.

Cross-tabulations revealed that there were some
differences between outcome-based school respondents and
traditional school respondents relevant to their perceptions
of the role of the elementary school principal. Among
traditional school respondents cross-tabulations indicated disparity in perceptions of role functions only for role function 25: working with the board of education to determine the educational needs of the community. Among outcome-based school respondents cross-tabulations indicated disparity in perceptions of role functions 2, 5, 6, 10, 26, 38, and 50 listed above. For all other role functions analyzed via cross-tabulation there was no statistical significance at the .001 level.

II. Based on the qualitative analysis of the interview data collected from thirteen interviewees of traditional schools and outcome-based schools in the states of Illinois, Indiana, and New York the following conclusions have been made:

1. Board presidents, superintendents, and elementary school principals of traditional schools and outcome-based schools agree that the principal should be involved in the hiring of professional staff personnel, and in the supervision of professional staff personnel.

2. Board presidents, superintendents, and elementary principals of traditional schools and outcome-based schools agree that the principal should focus on the instructional process during classroom observations, and
that the instructional program can be improved through teacher evaluation.

3. Both traditional school respondents and outcome-based school respondents agree on the importance of the elementary principal being involved in staff development; however, interviewing revealed that outcome-based school respondents are much more involved in this function than traditional school respondents.

4. Traditional school respondents and outcome-based school respondents agree that the principal should not have primary responsibility for reviewing curriculum, but rather he should call on the expertise of staff within the district.

5. Outcome-based schools place more importance on communicating with the community, making frequent classroom visits, improving instruction through teacher evaluation, and conducting weekly meetings to discuss instructional issues than traditional schools.
Recommendations

1. The basis for improving job descriptions for the elementary school principal should emphasize role functions that relate directly to instructional delivery rather than role functions that do not require the expertise of the principal.

2. Elementary principals need to strengthen their position as instructional leader through involvement in the hiring of professional staff personnel, and in the supervision of professional staff personnel.

3. Board presidents and superintendents must support the elementary school principal in his/her role as instructional leader by writing policy that requires principals to focus on the instructional process during classroom observations, and to improve the instructional program through a sound teacher evaluation program.

4. Boards of education should create policy to include superintendents and principals in writing job descriptions for elementary school principals. The role functions of the job description should emphasize instructional leadership and permit delegation of those role functions that do not require the expertise of the principal.
Suggestions for Further Study

1. Teachers, parents, and students were not included in this study. Further research which would include these groups would gather significant data needed to delineate the role of a most effective elementary school principal.

2. Board members other than board presidents were not included in this study. Inclusion of board members would give a clearer understanding of boards perceptions of the elementary school principalship, and garner more board support for the principalship.

3. Additional research is needed to compare the implementation of effective schools research findings in traditional schools and outcome-based schools.

4. A national study similar to this study would provide a broader data-base to be used in delineating the best job description for an effective elementary school principal.

5. A case study type evaluation of traditional schools and outcome-based schools would yield data to compare their effectiveness, in such areas as student achievement, school climate enhancement and involving the community in the operation of the schools.

6. Research to provide data comparing elementary school goals to local high school goals could facilitate the
implementation of Outcome-Based Education models to enhance articulation between the two levels of schools, and provide more effective education.

7. Research should be launched to establish measurable objectives to be used in evaluating the effectiveness of outcome-based schools. A well organized program for evaluation based on specific outcomes would provide information to win support from legislators and boards of education for the promotion of Outcome-Based Education.
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APPENDIX A
Dear,

I am conducting a research study for a doctoral dissertation regarding the role of the elementary school principal. This study is under the chairmanship of Dr. M.P. Heller, Professor of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, Loyola University of Chicago.

The purpose of this study is to determine the role of principal as perceived by board presidents, superintendents, and elementary school principals. Your input is extremely important.

Please complete the enclosed questionnaire according to the instructions, and kindly return it in the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope.

I know this is a busy time of the year for you, and I sincerely appreciate your help in this study. If possible please return the questionnaire in one week.

Cordially,

Denis P. Curran
Doctoral Candidate
Loyola University,
Chicago, Illinois.
The statements listed below have been identified as role functions executed by school administrators. Please read each statement and decide to what degree you believe each function should be the primary responsibility of an elementary school principal. Please circle only one response for each item. The symbols for the responses are defined as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COLUMN</th>
<th>RESPONSE</th>
<th>SYMBOL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Absolutely Should</td>
<td>(AS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Probably Should</td>
<td>(PS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>(NS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Probably Should Not</td>
<td>(PSN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Absolutely Should Not</td>
<td>(ASN)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Absolutely Should (AS) means that the principal should absolutely assume primary responsibility for performing the role function.

Probably Should (PS) means that the principal probably should assume primary responsibility for performing the role function.

Not Sure (NS) means that the principal or some other administrator should take primary responsibility for performing the role function.

Probably Should Not (PSN) means that some administrator other than the principal should probably assume the role function.

Absolutely Should Not (ASN) means that some administrator other than the principal should absolutely assume primary responsibility for performing the role function.

QUESTION: TO WHAT EXTENT DO YOU EXPECT A PRINCIPAL TO TAKE PRIMARY RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE ROLE FUNCTIONS DESCRIBED BELOW?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ROLE FUNCTION</th>
<th>EXPECTATION RESPONSES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Selecting professional staff personnel.</td>
<td>AS  PS  NS  PSN  ASN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activity Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Orienting newly hired certified personnel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Supervising certified staff personnel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Selecting non-certified personnel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Orienting newly hired non-certified personnel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Supervising non-professional personnel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Counseling certified and non-certified personnel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Evaluating certified staff personnel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Directing staff development programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Reviewing the curriculum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Assisting teachers in creating effective remedial instruction plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Providing substitute teachers when needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Arranging student class schedules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Directing the guidance program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Guiding the student activity program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Controlling pupil behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Managing student personnel records.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Managing staff personnel records.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Keeping records of census and pupil attendance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Designing student progress report procedures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Overseeing the health and safety program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Working with the board of education to determine the educational needs of the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Recommending policy for the board of education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Handling public relations between the school and the communications media.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Cooperating with PTA and other community groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Conferencing with parents and other members of the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Designing a public relations program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Managing the school lunch program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Inventorying supplies and equipment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Managing audio-visual activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Apportioning supplies and equipment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
35. Planning for plant expansion and renovation
36. Defining specification for supplies and equipment.
37. Supervising a program of plan maintenance.
38. Carrying out research Programs within the school
40. Making the school a safe place in which to work and learn.
41. Convincing teachers of their ownership in creating a safe, orderly climate for learning in the school.
42. Making frequent classroom visitations.
43. Focusing on the instructional process during classroom observation.
44. Improving the instructional program through teacher evaluation.
45. Establishing high but realistic learning standards as a priority goal of the school.
46. Publicly stating expected learning standards of a school to all students and parents.
47. Implementing clearly defined policy regarding grouping of students for instruction.
48. Providing a classroom climate that allows all students to learn.  AS PS NS PSN ASN
49. Encouraging heterogeneous grouping to prevent labeling. AS PS NS PSN ASN
50. Improving time-on-task by inhibiting disciplinary problems. AS PS NS PSN ASN
51. Managing pull-out instruction so it does not hamper regular instruction. AS PS NS PSN ASN
52. Acting as instructional leader. AS PS NS PSN ASN
53. Planning on-going staff development plans for faculty. AS PS NS PSN ASN
54. Conferencing with teachers on their accountability for student progress. AS PS NS PSN ASN
55. Weekly discussing instructional issues with faculty. AS PS NS PSN ASN
56. Using faculty meetings primarily to focus on instructional matters. AS PS NS PSN ASN
57. Providing meaningful instructional leadership AS PS NS PSN ASN
58. Publicly stating the priority goals of the school to the total community. AS PS NS PSN ASN
59. Scheduling standardized testing each year. AS PS NS PSN ASN
60. Using test results to revise the instructional program. AS PS NS PSN ASN
If you would like a summary of the responses to this opinion inventory please indicate below where the summary should sent.

Name _____________________________________________

Address ____________________________________________

I have been a superintendent [ ], board president [ ], principal [ ]

Less than 5 years. [ ]
More than 5 years. [ ]

What is the size of your school? Please check one.
   Less than 500 students. [ ]
   More than 500 students. [ ]
APPENDIX C
August 9, 1988

Dear

You kindly completed a survey questionnaire that was sent out in the spring of this year. Could you please show your kindness once more by consenting to a follow-up interview on the same topic, i.e. the role of the elementary school principal.

Please find enclosed a list of the questions that will be asked. The interview should last approximately fifteen minutes. I will call you for an appointment. Your participation in this interview is greatly appreciated. Please be assured of anonymity. Thank you!

Sincerely,

Denis P. Curran
Doctoral Candidate
Loyola of Chicago
INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

The following items are perceived as responsibilities of elementary school principals. Please rate each item relevant to significance as you personally perceive it:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low 1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Hiring professional staff personnel.  
2. Supervising professional staff personnel.  
3. Directing on-going staff development plans for the faculty.  
4. Reviewing the curriculum.  
5. Communicating with the entire community regarding the priority goals of the school.  
7. Focusing on the instructional process during classroom observations.  
8. Improving the instructional program through teacher evaluation.  
9. Establishing high but realistic learning standards and publicly stating them to all students and parents.  
10. Weekly discussing instructional issues with faculty.
JOB DESCRIPTION FOR AN ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPAL

I. According to the analyses of this study the following role functions should be included in the job description of an elementary school principal:

Performance Responsibilities:

A. As supervisor,
   1. Selecting professional staff personnel
   2. Supervising certified staff personnel
   3. Evaluating certified staff personnel
   4. Evaluating non-certified personnel

B. As building administrator,
   1. Controlling pupil behavior
   2. Handling public relations between the school and the communications media
   3. Cooperating with PTA and other community groups
   4. Conferencing with parents and other members of the community
   5. Publicly stating the priority goals of the school to the total community

C. As instructional leader,
   1. Making the school a safe place in which to work and learn
   2. Convincing teachers of their ownership in creating
a safe, orderly climate for learning in the school

3. Making frequent classroom visitations

4. Focusing on the instructional process during classroom observation

5. Improving the instructional program through teacher evaluation

6. Establishing high but realistic learning standards as a priority goal of the school

7. Publicly stating expected learning standards of a school to all students and parents

8. Implementing clearly defined policy regarding grouping of students for instruction

9. Providing a classroom climate that allows all students to learn

10. Encouraging heterogeneous grouping to prevent labeling

11. Improving time-on-task by inhibiting disciplinary problems

12. Acting as instructional leader

13. Planning on-going staff development plans for faculty

14. Conferencing with teachers on their accountability for student progress

15. Weekly discussing instructional issues with faculty

16. Using faculty meetings primarily to focus on
instructional matters

17. Providing meaningful instructional leadership
18. Scheduling standardized testing each year
19. Using test results to revise the instructional program

II. The following role functions should be delegated but supervised by the principal:

A. As instructional leader,
   1. Directing staff development programs
   2. Reviewing the curriculum
   3. Advising teachers in diagnosing learning difficulties of pupils
   4. Assisting teachers in creating effective remedial instruction plans
   5. Arranging student class schedules
   6. Carrying out research programs within the school
   7. Managing pull-out instruction so it does not hamper regular instruction
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