1990

Tasks for the Implementation and Administration of State Funded Bilingual Education Programs in Selected Elementary Chicago Public Schools

Olga Villalba
Loyola University Chicago

TASKS FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION AND ADMINISTRATION OF STATE FUNDED BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN SELECTED ELEMENTARY CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS

by

Olga Villalba

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

Doctor of Philosophy

May

1990

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author is deeply grateful to her advisor, Dr. Max Bailey and the members of the committee: Dr. Phillip Carlin, Dr. Melvin P. Heller and Dr. Jack Kavanagh, for their guidance and support throughout the years.

To the elementary school principals in Districts Five, Six and Eight who so graciously lended their cooperation to this study, the author expresses her deepest thanks. The author is particularly indebted to Mr. Pedro Rosa, who so generously gave of his time to assist in the statistical aspects of this study.

She is very grateful to Valerie Collier, who patiently typed and retyped these pages.

Above all, the author wishes to thank her husband, Noel Rosado, who so lovingly supported her throughout the years with his patience, understanding and enthusiasm, so this work could be completed.

Finally, the author dedicates this work to her mother, Mrs. Ernestina Arana, whose love and respect for education encouraged the author to reach this goal.

VITA

The author, Mrs. Olga Villalba, is the daughter of the late Ralph Villalba and Mrs. Ernestina Arana. She was born in Santurce, Puerto Rico in 1945.

Her elementary education was obtained in Hatillo, Puerto Rico, and her secondary education at the Maria Candilla de Martinez in Arecibo, Puerto Rico, where she graduated in 1963.

In May, 1967, she received a Bachelor of Arts Degree at the University of Puerto Rico, Rio Piedras, Puerto Rico.

In 1969, she came to Chicago as an exchange teacher. She taught both the elementary and high school levels. In 1970, she was granted a scholarship to complete a Masters Degree in Spanish at Loyola University, Water Tower Campus. She also completed a Masters Degree in Reading at Loyola in 1977.

In 1980, she was assigned to a district position, as a state funded bilingual coordinator serving District Six and Eleven.

At present, she is an Interim Principal. She is a member and has held offices in many professional and civic organizations.

She is married to Mr. Noel Rosado.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CONTENTS OF APPENDICES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Bilingual education programs have been mandated by state law in Illinois since 1973. The programs are of transitional nature, meaning that there is time alloted for the target students to make the transition from instruction in the native language to instruction in an all-English instructional environment. The Chicago Public School System has a large number of limited English proficient students (LEPS) who have been identified as in need of receiving the services of a bilingual program. In every school in which there are twenty or more students from the same language background, a bilingual program must be established. The school principal is directly responsible for the administration of the instructional programs in his/her building, including bilingual programs. As many other government funded programs do, the state funded bilingual programs provide rules and regulations for the implementation of the programs by the school administrators. As a result, there are specific tasks that an administrator should perform so as to be in compliance. A review of the literature indicates that Arizona, California, Colorado, Florida, Michigan, and Oklahoma

provide their school administrators with policy and procedures for the implementation of the bilingual education programs. Also these manuals or handbooks specify tasks to be performed by the administrators in implementing the rules. At present, there is a handbook for administrators being prepared in Chicago for the implementation of bilingual education programs by school administrators in the Department of Multilingual Education. Past implementation of the bilingual education program was based on the state rules. Administrators were, and still are, assisted by stated funded district bilingual coordinators. The professional literature and research mentions administrative tasks for the implementation of the bilingual education programs. As already mentioned, Chicago Public School administrators do not have at present a manual specifying the administrative tasks to be performed for the implementation of the bilingual education programs. Nevertheless, they are directly responsible for their administration.

In 1973, the Illinois General assembly mandated the establishment of transitional bilingual education programs in Illinois schools, to be effective July 1, 1976.[1] This was in response to the high numbers of limited-English proficient students present at the schools and to the

---

[1]Illinois, Revised Statutes (1973), Chapter 122, Art. 14C.

direct involvement of parents and community members, who, aware of the trends in the nation towards the establishment of educational programs to meet the distinctive needs of the minorities, were actively lobbying for equal educational opportunities for their children.

Some form of bilingual education programs existed in the country previous to all this. Anderson and Boyer[2] cite the works of Dr. Kloss (1942, 1963) on the historical background of bilingual education.

Before World War I (1839-1880), German was used as a language of instruction, French was used in Louisiana, and Spanish in New Mexico, from 1848 in public schools.

During 1880 to 1917, German-English bilingual schools were developed in Cincinnati, Indianapolis, Baltimore, New Ulm, Minnesota, and many rural places. Norwegian, Czech, Italian, Polish and Dutch were also occasionally taught.

In the years between World War I and World War II, bilingual education was virtually eliminated.

Anderson and Boyer[3] see the rebirth of bilingual schooling in Miami, in 1963. The Dade County Public Schools in Florida established the first bilingual education program in the U.S. since World War I. The

---

[2]Theodore Anderson and Mildred Boyer, "Bilingual Schooling: An Historical Sampling," ed. Francisco Cordasco, Bilingual Schooling in the United States (New York: McMillan, 1976), p. 2.

[3]Ibid., 5.

program was initiated in an effort to meet the educational needs of the Cuban children.

In 1964, two programs were started in Texas. The federal government played a key role in the development of bilingual education as a vehicle for providing equal educational opportunities for language minority children.

In 1964, The Civil Rights Act of 1964[4] banned discrimination based on race, color or national origin. It established a national basis of support for providing special educational services to meet the needs of students with limited English language ability. It stressed that all children must have equal educational opportunities. It encouraged additional federal and state legislation which promoted bilingual education as a desirable instructional approach, and in 1968, Bilingual Education Act as Title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA),[5] made funds available to local school districts to develop and implement bilingual programs and paved the way for states to assume greater responsibility for enacting permissive and mandatory legislation and for funding bilingual education programs. In 1970, a Memorandum from the Department of Health Education and Welfare, Office of Civil

---

[4]42 U.S.C. 2000 (c), Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title VII.

[5]Bilingual Education - 20 U.S.C. 880 (b), Bilingual Education Act of 1974.

Rights,[6] required school districts receiving federal funds to provide assistance to meet the needs of language minority students. In 1972, Massachusetts became the first state to pass a law mandating bilingual education in any school district with twenty or more students of the same non-English speaking background. Illinois followed in 1973. In 1974, in the Lau vs. Nichols Supreme Court Decision,[7] the Court ruled that school districts' failure to provide a program to meet the linguistic needs of the students denied them a meaningful opportunity to participate in the school's education program and thus violated the 1964 Civil Rights Act. This decision upheld the right of students with limited abilities in the English language to educational programs designed to meet their language needs and placed the responsibility of addressing their needs on school districts. However, eventhough the "Lau remedies" strongly endorsed bilingual education, it did not mandate it and left the ultimate decision as to the specific type of assistance to the school districts.

In 1980, the Department of Education proposed more specific methodological approaches but were never formally adopted.

---

[6]Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Identity of Discrimination and Denial of Services on the Basis of National Origin (May 25th Memo - 35th Federal Register, 11565, 1970.

[7]Lau v. Nichols, 438 f. 2d 791 (9th Circ. 1973).

Most of the literature on bilingual education programs deal with aspects of the program such as: languages of instruction, methods and techniques of language and second language acquisition, program models, parent component, effectiveness of the educational program, teacher and staff development, etc., but not much attention has been given to the actual administration of the program.[8] At present, there are no studies made in Illinois dealing with the administration of bilingual education programs, as revealed by the literature research search made.

In Illinois, the school districts have to submit an application for funding to the State Office of Bilingual Education yearly to get monies allocated for the state funded bilingual programs. These monies are to supplement, not supplant, the local effort.

In Chicago, the Department of Multilingual Education is the local agency that, through the Board of Education, submits an application for the monies, and provides the individual twenty elementary school districts and the three high school districts, with the technical assistance in allocating monies for staffing the programs, and for materials and supplies. Technical assistance at the local level is provided through state funded coordinators at some

---

[8]Flor Ida Ortiz, "The Administration of Bilingual Education Programs," Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Convention, San Francisco, California, April, 1979.

eight districts with the largest number of target students.

The school principal is responsible for the implementation of the local school bilingual education program. John Renfrew Stevenson writes: "The addition of these categorically funded projects has created new administration and curriculum problems for the school principal. He is responsible for administering these special programs in addition to the regular school program. He must be knowledgeable of the specific rules and regulations governing the use of money provided for the program."[9]

Article 14C of the State Rules and Regulations[10] defines the parameters of what is bilingual education, having in common with other state regulations, and following the Lau Remedies, the following components:

1. Identification and assessment of Limited English Proficient Students (LEPS)
2. Transitional Bilingual Education Programs

A.Instruction in the native language until the student is ready to effectively progress using only English.

B.A strong English as a Second Language (ESL)

---

[9]John Renfrew Stevenson, "The Contribution of Selected Administrative Factors to the Success of the Innovative Educational Programs in Bilingual Navajo Indian Schools" (D.Ed. Dissertation, Northern Arizona University, 1979), 3.

[10]Illinois, Revised Statutes (1973), Chapter 122, Art. 14C.

component.

C.Use of books and materials in English and in native language.

D.The teaching of the culture of the country of origin.

E.Bilingual Personnel

3. Annual Testing of Students

4. Staff Development

5. Parent and Community Participation

6. Expenditures Report

The implementation of the bilingual education programs in Illinois is based on these guidelines.

According to Flor Ida Ortiz,[11] the administration of bilingual education programs is generally structured in two different ways:

1. A director within the school district solely responsible for bilingual education, with specialists housed, either at a central office or a school site, reporting to him/her, the teachers being responsible to both the specialists and the director for the bilingual education component of the program. Those specialists and teachers housed in school sites are usually being evaluated by the school principal.

2. A special project unit with an associate

---

[11]Ortiz, p. 3.

superintendent or director housed at the central office. In most cases, this position is assisted by coordinators housed in specific sites or at a central office.

She also poses that the primary reason for instituting such positions is: "to ensure adherence to the legal interpretations and federal and state guidelines regarding mandated bilingual instruction. The person's task is to provide written guidelines and interpretations to other administrators, specialists, and teachers."[12]

At present, in the Chicago Public School System, the Department of Multilingual Education is structured as described in number 2: an assistant superintendent heads the unit, assisted by central and district bilingual coordinators, and he is responsible for the overall implementation and enforcement of the state rules and regulations dealing with bilingual education in Chicago.

Technical assistance is in way of a manual or handbook for the administrators to properly implement the program. Chicago is in the process of printing one, therefore, the principals implement the guidelines assisted by the district bilingual coordinators or central office personnel.

---

[12]Ibid., p. 4.

Statement of the Problem

The purposes of the study were: to identify and analyze the tasks for the implementation and administration of bilingual education programs present in the professional literature and research; to identify and analyze the tasks actually performed and delegated to others; to identify and analyze the relationship between the ranking of how principals spend their time on various tasks and the ranking of principals as to the importance of those tasks for the implementation and administration of bilingual education programs; to identify and analyze problems experienced by selected Chicago Public School Principals in implementing and administering bilingual education programs.

Following are the research questions used as a guide for the study:

1. According to the professional literature and research, what are the tasks recommended for the administration of bilingual education programs?

2. What tasks do principals perform and what tasks do they delegate to others?

3. What is the relationship between the ranking of how principals spend their time on various tasks and the ranking by principals as to the importance of those tasks for the implementation and administration of bilingual education programs?

4. What are the problems experienced by selected Chicago Public School Principals in implementing and administering bilingual education programs derived from the study?

Methods and Procedures Used in the Study

A review of the professional literature and research was conducted. A list of tasks for the administration of bilingual education programs suggested in the survey was compiled.

Instrumentation

Two instruments to gather data, designed by the researcher, were used: a mailed questionnaire and an interview. The mailed questionnaire was designed to obtain information about the tasks presently performed by selected elementary school principals in administering a bilingual education program in the Chicago Public Schools. The interview was designed to clarify data obtained from the questionnaire, to provide an opportunity to elaborate on certain information that needed further exploration, and to clarify misinterpretations.[13]

In order to validate the questionnaire and assess its reliability, a pilot study was conducted with elementary school principals administering bilingual education programs but not participating in the study from other

---

[13]John W. Best, Research in Education (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1981), 165.

school districts. Responses, as well as recommendations were elicited from the participants in regards to clarity of purpose, clarity of directions and items, and appropriateness of the instrument. The same procedure was followed for the interview. Revisions were made and improvements were incorporated, according to the recommendations and suggestions made by the principals in the pilot study.

Population Studied

The subjects in the study were 58 selected elementary school principals in the three largest school districts in Chicago that were identified by the Department of Multilingual Education as the ones housing the largest numbers of bilingual education programs in Spanish. After following the protocol for distribution in the school system, the questionnaires were mailed out to the selected principals to be completed voluntarily and anonymously. Out of the fifty-eight elementary school principals who received the instrument, forty-three completed it and mailed it back. Twelve principals volunteered for the interview by returning the request form for the interview attached to a letter of consent provided for this purpose.

Limitations of the Study

The study was limited to the investigation of the administrative tasks being performed by selected elementary school principals administering transitional bilingual

education programs in three school districts identified as housing the largest number of bilingual education programs in the Chicago Public Schools. The bilingual education programs in these districts are for target students of Hispanic descent, being funded by the State, as per Article 14C of the Rules and Regulations (1976). Programatic aspects, the effectiveness of the bilingual education programs and the role of the principal were not considered in the study.

Both instruments, the principals' questionnaire and the interview, were designed by the researcher. They were examined by two specialists in constructing questionnaires and interviews and two statisticians. The type of data gathered were mainly descriptive, and the analysis of the data was also descriptive.

The following section provides definitions of terms as used in the study.

Definitions

Bilingual Education - Instruction in two languages, enabling the person to function in another language in addition to his/her native language, with or without equal proficiency.

Transitional Bilingual Program - Basic subject matter courses are taught in the native language until the student acquires sufficient knowledge of English to participate successfully in a regular classroom. Instruction in the

native language is phased out gradually and full English instruction is gradually phased in. An English as a Second Language (ESL) component is usually part of the transitional bilingual program.

Limited English Proficient Students - Students of non-English background whose aural comprehension, speaking, reading, or writing proficiency in English is below the average English proficient level of students of the same age and/or grade whose first or home language is English.

Task - A specific amount of labor or study imposed by authority or required by duty or necessity.

Administrative Task(s) - Those more specific types of activities that must occur in the schools in order to arrange for the proper education of the students.

Summary

The purposes of the study were: to identify and analyze the tasks for the implementation and administration of bilingual education programs present in the professional literature and research; to identify and analyze the tasks actually performed and delegated to others; to identify and analyze the relationship between the ranking of how principals spend their time on various tasks and the ranking of principals as to the importance of those tasks for the implementation and administration of bilingual education programs; to identify and analyze problems experienced by selected Chicago Public School Principals in

implementing and administering bilingual education programs.

Chapter I offers an overview of the problem, the purposes of the study, the methods and procedures used in the study, a discussion of the instruments used, the population studied, the limitations of the study, and a definition of terms.

Chapter II will include a review of the professional literature and research dealing with the theory of administration, the tasks for the general administration of the school, and the tasks for the administration of bilingual education programs.

In Chapter III, a description of the procedures used, the subjects of the investigation, and the process by which the data for the study were obtained is offered. A thorough description of the instruments used in the study, and the manner in which they were used is included. Also Chapter III will present an analysis and discussion of the results obtained.

Chapter IV will offer the conclusions, implications, and the recommendations resulting from the study.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE AND RESEARCH

INTRODUCTION

This chapter of the study concentrated on the review of the professional literature and research in the areas considered to be pertinent to the purposes of the study: to review and analyze the administrative tasks present in the professional literature and research for the general administration of schools, and to review and analyze the administrative tasks present in the professional literature and research for the administration of bilingual education programs.

This chapter is organized according to the following: history and development of administration in general; educational administration in particular; theories of administration; tasks for the administration of schools and tasks for the administration of bilingual education programs.

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVES OF ADMINISTRATION

Administration has been with man in one way or another for a long time. The warriors who set to conquer the existing lands had to manage both their men and resources in order to be successful. The Greeks, Romans, and the

Egyptians administered their empires, solving all kinds of problems along the way.

It came to the point that man had to create specialized institutions, government, militia, church, schools, etc., to attain specific goals.[1] Knezevich sees administration as an integral part of an organized society, and the need for administration, "has been in evidence whenever there were complex tasks to be performed, and two or more people were involved.[2] The survival of organizations is dependent on the quality of the administrative services available.

The development of administration dealt with the mobilization of the efforts of a number of people towards the achievement of a common goal. It is considered to be as old as the history of mankind.[3] Saxe wrote that: "Administration was needed to arrange things and people in ways that accomplished the goals of the system."[4] Administration is concerned with the smooth operation of an organization and it involves the processes which help the organization operate its mechanisms for achieving its

---

[1]Stephen J. Knezevich, Administration of Public Education (New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1975), 3.

[2]Ibid.

[3]Ronald Campbell, Edwin Bridges, and Raphael O. Nystrand, Introduction to Educational Administration (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1977), 86.

[4]Richard W. Saxe, Educational Administration Today: An Introduction (Ohio: University of Toledo, 1980), 5.

goals.[5] Since ancient times, classical and medieval writers saw administration as "action oriented", which is considered today to be an executive dimension, and an emphasis that still is found in the field.[6]

In order to understand the concept of administration, one must acquire a "sense" of its development. "Historical emphasis" and its contributors were reported by Campbell.[7] Frederick Taylor and Henry Fayol are the representative writers of the "Jobs Analysis Emphasis". 'Taylor's Principles of Scientific Management' gave way to the beginnings of the scientific management movement. Since then, Taylor is considered to be the 'father' of this movement, followed by Henry Fayol, whose famous elements of management: planning, organizing, command, coordinate, control, made a great impact on the field of administration. Both men were concerned with industry, and both were stressing organizational processes, working for the attainment of increased efficiency of industry. Both believed that the processes involved in production could be analyzed and studied scientifically. Both writers tended to ignore the individual as such. These writers were followed by Luther Gulik, who is said to have expanded on

---

[5]Robert Owens, Organizational Behavior in Schools (New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1970), 127.

[6]Knezevich, P. 4.

[7]Campbell, pp. 87-94.

the functions mentioned by Fayol. Gulik posed the question, now famous, of: what is the work of the chief executive? His answer was: "POSDCORB," or seven administrative procedures: planning, organizing, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting, and budgeting. A second "emphasis", the 'Human Relations' approach was the work of Mary Parker-Follet, whose "Creative Experience" written in 1924, presented the importance of the building and maintenance of human relations in any enterprise, through what she called "coordination" of peoples' ideas, viewpoints, and factors which are involved in a situation. Campbell goes on to present that Elton Mayo followed in on Parker-Follet's footsteps, supplying the empirical data to support the aspect of human relations in administration, through his famous experiments at the Hawthorne Plant of the Western Electric Company, near Chicago, from 1923 to 1932.[8] These experiments helped to point out the importance of inner motivations, outside of outer ones, such as wages and working conditions that were significant to the overall goal: attainment of production increases.

Following the 'Human Relations Movement', the relation of administration to the behavioral sciences is attributed to the works of Chester Barnard. In 1937, he prepared a series of lectures for the Lowell Institute of Boston, that later became his book, "The Functions of the Executive," in

---

[8]Ibid.

which he presented his concept of formal and informal organizations. He stressed the need for a theory to explain behavior. He introduced the concept of "effectiveness": the achievement of the organization goals, and "efficiency": which deals with the feeling of satisfaction a worker derives from membership in an organization. A second contributor to this "emphasis" was Herbert A. Simon, with his book, "Administrative Behavior" (1945). He presented a set of concepts and vocabulary for describing an organization, using the behavioral sciences, and the behavior of people in the organization. Later, Max Weber provided a "starting point" for present day behavioral scientists, with his work, published in 1947, "The Theory of Social and Economic Organizations," which presented the conceptions of organizations as social systems that interact with, and depend upon, their environment.[9] A good summary of what he calls "eras", are presented by Owens.[10]

---

[9]Owens, pp. 7-8.

[10]Ibid., p. 28.

ANTECEDENTS OF THE BEHAVIORAL THEORY

Approximate Time-Period	Labels Applied to the Theory	Representative Concepts
1900 - 1930	Classical Theory	Line & Staff Span of Control Unity of Command
1930 - 1950	Human Relations Theory	Morale Group Dynamics Participate Supervision
1950 - 1970	Behavioral Theory	Role Reference Groups Leader Behavior

HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

As educational institutions grew more complex, the need to formally study the administration of public education became apparent. Called a "phenomenon of the twentieth century," the study and research in educational administration in both public and private institutions is relatively "new" and "distinctively American."[11] The rapid development of first, the urban, and later, rural school districts, produced more complex administrative units. School superintendents were first established in the cities of Buffalo and Louisville in 1837, St. Louis and Providence in 1839. Principal teachers were designated in Cincinnati

[11]Knezevich, p. 4.

in 1938, and in Quincy School in Boston in 1847, in which a full-time supervising principal was designated. By 1859, there was one supervising principal in every school in St. Louis.[12]

Early scholars such as Cubberly, Strayer, Reavis, Hart, Reeder, Bobbitt, Sears, and others, provided some of the earliest literature and research in educational administration, approaching the field from the standpoint of 'job analysis', observing what the administrators were doing, and suggesting ways to improve upon their performance, in close similarities with Taylor's scientific management.[13]

The development of educational administration paralleled those in the broad field of administration. The works of Raymond E. Callahan, dealing with an analysis of how the schools, from 1910 to 1930, responded to the 'cult of efficiency', are seen as evidence of the influence had on the schools by the scientific management movement.[14] Also, the emphasis on human relations supplied by Parker-Follet and Mayo were reflected on the 'democratic administration movement', and the more recent emphasis on the behavioral sciences in administration through the works of Barnard and others, reflected in educational

---

[12]Ibid., p. 381.

[13]Campbell, pp. 97-98.

[14]Hoy and Miskel, p. 10.

administration, were noted in the writings found in the Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, published in 1964.[15]

Writers that were noted for their contributions into the 'democratic administration' movement were: Yauch, 'Improving Human Relations in School Administration' (1949); Moehlman, 'School Administration' (1951); Koopman, Miel and Misner, "Democracy in School Administration; (1943); this later work is considered to be the front runner of the democratic administration movement. It is said that much of the democratic period of administration remains in today's thinking.[16] Also, the works of Jacobs Getzel and Egon Guba are seen as very influential to educational administration in the behavioral sciences movement. A table summarizing the contributions of these and other writers from 1910 to 1960 is the work of Saxe's:[17]

---

[15]Campbell, p. 99.

[16] Saxe, p. 110.

[17]Ibid., p. 115.

CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF GENERAL AND EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION, 1910-1960

Time	Type of Administration: General	Educational
1910	Task orientation--Scientific administration	
	Frederick Taylor	Franklin Bobbitt
	Henri Fayol	Frank Spaulding
1930	People orientation--Democratic-participative administration	
	Mary Parker Follett	Wilbur Yauch
	Elton Mayo	G. Robert Koopman
1950	Behavioral science orientation[a]	
	Chester Barnard	Jacob Getzels
	Herbert Simon	Egon Guba

[a]Barnard's famous work, The Functions of the Executive, was published in 1938, but did not become influential until much later.

A number of specific events were considered to be very influential to the development of educational administration.[18]

1. The National Conference of Professors of Education (NCPEA). It originated in New York in 1947, from the convention of the American Association of School Administration. It helped to explore ideas, and to synthesize available research. As a result, in 1959, the book, "Administrative Behavior in Education" was published. Its significance rested in bringing out the lack of theory-oriented research in the field of educational administration.

2. The Cooperative Program in Educational

[18]Campbell, pp. 99-100.

Administration, funded by the W.K. Kellogg Foundation. From 1949 to 1959, more than seven million was donated for the study and improvement of educational administration. Eight education centers were established with this purpose.

3. University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA). In 1956, representatives from thirty-three universities organized the UCEA, located at first at the California University. It stimulated the development of theory and research, as well as improvements in the pre- and in-service training of school administrators, and the disseminating of research, new ideas, and practices. It publishes a journal, 'The Educational and Administration Quarterly,' which presents the latest findings on educational administration research.

The late 60s and 70s are seen as showing the failure of the theory-based movement to provide for a useful prescription for managing the schools. Many outside forces considered 'pressures' over the school system were identified to be as follows: effort to desegregate schools, communities struggling for control of the schools, militant teacher unions, demands made by compensatory programs for education, etc. Findings such as education organizations being not hierarchical and efficient, but "ambiguous in intention, chaotic in design, and defined internally through their interactions with an uncertain,

unpredictable external environment,"[19] brought about as a result, a more open-systems view of education administration. Scholars then, directed their attention to "the people, the people the principal works for, with, and against, in performing his or her functions."[20] This led to an improved recognition of the importance of the school exchange with its environment, and an appreciation of education's organizational complexity.

Although this movement is still under development, it is described as being instrumental in creating an improved system analysis of education, based on these propositions: the school system and its environment are linked together in necessary interaction; the world of the educational administrator is for more complex than it has been perceived, as it is characterized by loosely, coupled, chaotic, unpredictable and fragmented elements.[21]

The development of the 'contingency theory', which poses that contingencies are situational forces that surround the administrator, demanding variable and flexible responses, has played an important role in understanding that there are no specific or best ways for designing organizations, jobs, or tasks, but that specific situations

---

[19]Van Cleve Morris and others, Principals in Action: The Reality of Managing Schools (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1984), 11.

[20]Ibid., p. 11.

[21]Ibid., p. 12.

require specific choices or decisions, being, at that moment, the best for the situation. The competent administrator can be said to be those who are skilled in conflict management; able to provide direction in uncertain situations, and able to balance competing interests.[22]

The preceding sections presented a selected literature review of the history and development of General Administration and its theories and a selected review of the history and development of Educational Administration and its theories.

The following section will provide the results of the analysis and review of the tasks for the administration of schools present in the professional literature.

ADMINISTRATIVE TASKS PRESENT IN THE LITERATURE

The purpose of this section is to present what writers say are the tasks for the administration of schools. Before theories were devised and labeled, "there were administrative tasks and administrators to perform them."[23]

The central purpose of administration, in any organization, is the coordination of efforts of those working in the organization to achieve its goals. In educational organizations, the goals have to do with the enhancement of teaching and learning, and all activities of the administrator should be geared towards achieving this

---

[22]Ibid.

[23]Saxe, p. 121.

goal. The task approach to administration is not characterized by theory, but the organization of tasks into operational areas is a "taxonomy."[24]

Campbell[25] groups the administrative tasks into six: 1) school community relations, 2) curriculum and instruction, 3) pupil personnel, 4) staff personnel, 5) physical facilities, 6) finance, and business management. Although the major responsibility for performing these tasks lie in the administrator, some are achieved with the assistance of others in the organization, and even outside of it.

Miller, Madden and Kincheloe[26] describe nine tasks that "must occur in the schools in order to arrange for the proper education of the students":[27] 1) pupil personnel, 2) the program of instruction, 3) staffing a school system, 4) staff relations, 5) auxiliary services, 6) school housing, 7) finance, 8) fiscal management, and a measurement and evaluation. These tasks are to be faced by everyone in the organization, and must be the concern of all three levels of administration: board, administration, and teachers.

---

[24]Campbell, p. 16.

[25]Ibid.

[26] Van Miller, George R. Madden, and James B. Kincheloe, The Public Administration of American School Systems (New York: MacMillan Co., 1972), 103.

[27]Ibid.

Miklos[28] poses that the conceptualization of educational administration in task areas "permit a more specific definition of the roles and responsibilities of administrators and supervision in administration."[29] He analyzes school administration in terms of processes and task areas, which are complimentary to each other. He poses that a task area is a category comprised of specific activities to be performed in order for the schools to achieve their purposes and goes on to mention six: 1) School Program, 2) Pupil Personnel, 3) Staff Personnel, 4) Community Relations, 5) Physical Facilities, and 6) Management.

Gorton[30] also analyzes administration along the same lines as Miklos. He presents seven administrative tasks based on synthesis of several studies concerned with identifying the major activities of school administrators: 1) Staff Personnel, 2) Pupil Personnel, 3) Community-School Leadership, 4) Instruction and Curriculum Development, 5) School Finance and Business Management, 6) School Plant, and 7) General Tasks.

"Hundreds of studies have been conducted regarding the

---

[28]E. Miklos, Approaches to School Administration. Paper prepared for the Education Division of the Commenwealth Secretariat, January, 1975.

[29]Ibid., pp. 23-25.

[30]Richard A. Gorton, School Administration: Challenge and Opportunity for Leadership (Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown Co., 1976), 43-45.

tasks that principals actually perform, and thousands of articles have been written concerning the tasks that they ideally should perform."[31] There is still some disagreement concerning the nature and boundaries of the major functional categories of the principal's role.[32] 'Functional' is defined as what one does or should do as a principal. This focuses on the tasks and activities in which a principal must be competent in order to be effective.[33]

For Lipham and Hoeh, Jr.,[34] the following are the tasks that principals perform in schools:

1) Instructional program,

2) Staff personnel,

3) Student personnel,

4) Financial resources,

5) School community relationships.

Each task comprises other subtasks:

1) Assessment of needs, statement of objectives, planning and

implementing instructional change, evaluating program outcomes;

---

[31]Hoeh Lipham, Jr., The Principalship: Foundations and Functions, 10.

[32]Ibid., p. 15.

[33]Ibid., pp. 11-15.

[34]Ibid., p. 118.

2) recruiting, selecting, training, supervising, evaluating,

teachers and staff;

3) student guidance, discipline, freedoms, due process;

4) planning, programming, budgeting, purchasing, materials and

supplies, supervising plant construction and maintenance;

5) operating, supervising school lunch.

Research has contributed largely to the topic. One of the programs sponsored by the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, the Southern States Cooperative Program in Educational Administration, identified the following as critical task areas in school administration.[35]

CRITICAL TASK AREA: INSTRUCTION AND CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT

1. Providing for the formulation of curriculum objectives.
2. Providing for the determination of curriculum content and organization.
3. Relating the desired curriculum to available time, physical facilities, and personnel.
4. Providing materials, resources, and equipment for the instructional program.
5. Providing for the supervision of instruction.
6. Providing for in-service education of instructional personnel.

CRITICAL TASK AREA: PUPIL PERSONNEL

1. Initiating and maintaining a system of child accounting and attendance.
2. Instituting measures for the orientation of pupils.

---

[35]Ibid., pp. 119-120.

3. Providing counseling services.
4. Providing health services.
5. Providing for individual inventory services.
6. Arranging systematic procedures for the continual assessment and interpretation of pupil growth.
7. Establishing means of dealing with pupil irregularities.

CRITICAL TASK AREA: STAFF PERSONNEL

1. Providing for the recruitment of staff personnel.
2. Selecting and assigning staff personnel.
3. Developing a system of staff personnel records.
4. Stimulating and providing opportunities for professional growth of staff personnel.

CRITICAL TASK AREA: COMMUNITY-SCHOOL LEADERSHIP

1. Determining the educational services the school renders and how such services are conditioned by community forces.
2. Helping to develop and implement plans for the improvement of community life.

CRITICAL TASK AREA: SCHOOL PLANT AND SCHOOL TRANSPORTATION

1. Developing an efficient program of operation and maintenance of the physical plant.
2. Providing for the safety of pupils, personnel, and equipment.

CRITICAL TASK AREA: ORGANIZATION AND STRUCTURE

1. Developing a staff organization as a means of implementing the educational objectives of the school program.
2. Organizing lay and professional groups for participation in educational planning and other educational activities.

CRITICAL TASK AREA: SCHOOL FINANCE AND BUSINESS MANAGEMENT

1. Preparing the school budget.
2. Accounting for school monies.
3. Accounting for school property.

Administration is not "just anything that an administrator does."[36] The early elementary school

---

[36]Knezevich, p. 10.

principals performed clerical work or functions such as record keeping and reporting. As time went by, these responsibilities were expanded to include the selection of teachers and assistants. Today, the main function of the principal is to administer all aspects of the school. These administrative activities should not be confused with clerical chores. Leadership is considered to be the most important function, as it stimulates other people to perform to their highest level.[37]

The preoccupation with the kind of work that a principal does has been present all through history of the principalship, but it has rarely been subjected to systematic descriptive analysis.[38]

An analysis of the tasks of two elementary school principals, and the time spent on the tasks was conducted by Peterson.[39] He wanted to find out how principals actually worked in the schools. He observed and noted the work of each principal for over twenty hours for several weeks. His main findings were that the time used by the principals was characterized by activities of short duration, highly varied in function, changing with great frequency during the day. A great proportion of their time

---

[37]Ibid., p. 384.

[38]K.D. Peterson, "The Principal's Tasks," Administration Notebook 8 (1977-78):1-4.

[39]Ibid.

was spent working with discipline problems, and with teachers who had non-instructional needs (over 25%). Also, principals were found to not be involved in the classroom. Clerical duties, imposed by the bureaucracy, consumed a significant proportion of their time (over 12%).

In a survey of Iowa's six hundred and forty public elementary school principals done by Sweeney and Vittengl,[40] the following were the tasks ranked as most important ones by the principals:

Ranking of Job Responsibilities

	Rank 1	2	3	Overall Ranking
Supervision/Evaluation	230	89	59	1
Building Management	94	59	61	2
Curriculum Development	35	89	77	3
School-Community relations	11	36	105	4
Student achievement	21	65	35	5
Student behavior	18	49	37	6
Personnel management	15	23	34	7
Morale building	10	26	25	8

N=451 Rank: 1 = most important; 2 = second most important; 3 = third most important

'Supervision,' and 'Teacher Evaluation' were ranked as the most important tasks, followed by 'Building Management,' and 'Curriculum Development.' For these principals, 'School-Community Relations,' and 'Student Achievement' were seen as more important than controlling

---

[40] Jim Sweeney and Bob Vittengl, "What Makes a Principal Tick," Principal 3 (January 1987):54.

'Student Behavior.' 'Morale Building' was considered to be the least important of all tasks.

In Illinois, the principals are responsible for the administration of the schools, for providing the instructional leadership necessary for the planning, operation, and evaluation of the educational program of their assigned attendance center.[41]

The Rules of the Board of Education for Chicago[42] state almost the same: that the principals are charged with the organization, supervision, administration and discipline in their schools. Specific tasks were compiled by the Board to serve as guide for candidates applying for the Chicago Principal's Exam, and are the following:[43]

1. Organize and supervise schedules, assignments, programs, records, and school procedures.
2. Train, supervise and evaluate teachers and staff.
3. Develop and evaluate new and special programs.
4. Manage records, accounts and school closing procedures.
5. Comply with teacher contract regulations and grievance procedures.
6. Provide counsel and guidance for teachers and

---

[41] Illinois Office of Education, The School Code of Illinois (1977), Sec. 10-21, 4a.

[42] Chicago, Illinois, Rules - Chicago Board of Education (1988), Sec. 6-12.

[43] Ibid.

staff.

7. Supervise curriculum development, related programs and materials.

8. Communicate with community groups and organizations.

An analysis of the list showed that there are common elements between these tasks and those mentioned in the literature and research:

Chicago Board of Education	Professional Literature and Research
Train, supervise and evaluate teachers/staff	Staff Personnel
Manage records, accounts and school closing procedures	Manage records Fiscal Management
Supervise curriculum development related programs and materials	Curriculum and Instruction
Develop and evaluate new and special programs	Curriculum and Instruction
Communicate with community groups and organizations	School-Community Relations

The focus of this section was on what the professional literature writers identified as the tasks for the administration of schools.

On the next section, we will deal with the tasks for the administration of schools identified by selected researchers doing studies on the subject.

Administrative Tasks Present in Research Studies

Porter-Gehrie, Crowson, Hurwitz and Morris[44] conducted a study in Illinois to gather data on the principals' perception and usage of the administrative discretion within the framework of the organizational constraints. They wanted to find out the amount of discretionary authority, if any, had by the principals in selected Chicago Public Schools.

The principals were observed during twelve days. The observers joined the principal in all the functions and activities during that time: interactions with superiors, teachers, pupils, parents, dealings with daily crisis, phone conversations, routine tasks, paper work, etc., and also, the responses to these demands had by the principals. Interviews with teachers, staff, and an examination of all pertinent school reports were made by the researchers. The data collected through the observations included the amount of time spent on each event, sequence of events, the exact wording and paraphrase used by the principals and others, during the interactions. Interviews with the principals were conducted after the day's interactions.

The following were some of the most important findings:[45]

---

[44]Cynthia Porter Gehrie and others, The Principalship: Report on Ethnographic Study of School Administration in Chicago, 5-25, 1978, ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 150702.

[45] Ibid., pp. 25-30.

1. The principal's use of time emerged as a focus for study. Many of the tasks were compiled in three minutes or less, through conversations with teachers, staff, fellow principals, and others. Also, the effects of these 'quick' exchanges on establishing and maintaining long term policy trends within the school need to be analyzed. There is a need to analyze the nature of these tasks as compared to others which must be completed over large periods of time.

2. The principals seem to stick to tasks until their completion. They expressed frustration when tasks couldn't be immediately completed. Also, they consciously exposed themselves to situations in which new tasks were likely to emerge.

3. As new trends in management were introduced, they created new problems for the principals in their relations with their staff. Principals were expected to solve any disputes or conflicts arising from problems between certified and non-certified personnel at their schools, also, staff reduction created staff morale problems, as teachers left the school, creating a conflict for the principal. The principal must implement policies which reduce staff, while keeping up the trust and confidence of the teachers. The standardization of curricula system-wide created new problems and different responses by the principals. Also, the transfers of principals due to integration created problems. It seemed that principals who were appointed by the central administration were more receptive to the central administration, and those principals who were selected through community involvement, put the community and the staff relations above their relations with central administration.

4. The data collected showed that principals were able to remove staff considered to be unsatisfactory, contrary to belief that they cannot remove unsatisfactory tenured teachers from their school.

5. The system serves to work more from interpersonal interaction than from written directives, contrary to the image of principals as paper-pushers.

6. A principal-to-principal network seemed to compensate from the structural isolation inherent

in a loosely-coupled system.

A study geared to bridge the gap of knowledge about the job dimensions of the principalship was conducted by Salley, McPherson and Baehr.[46] It had six major goals: 1) to describe the basic functions of the principal's jobs; 2) to describe the varying conditions under which principals work; 3) to develop training programs to help principals work more effectively under the varying conditions; 4) to develop job clarification programs to help principals reach agreement with supervisors and colleagues on what functions are most important in a particular setting; 5) to establish validated procedures for the selection of school principal's jobs performance. One of the premises of the study was that the definition of the jobs would vary with the differing conditions of operation, with the ethnic composition of the staff and of the student body, and with the personal background and experience of the principal.

Both a pilot and a national study were conducted. The pilot study's preliminary results were corroborated by the national study. An instrument called 'Job Function Inventory' (JFI) for School Principals was developed and sent out to seven states.

The three major findings of this study were: 1) the

---

[46]Columbus Salley, R. Bruce McPherson, and Melanie E. Baehr, "What Principals Do: A Preliminary Analysis," in The Principal in the Metropolitan Schools, ed. Erickson and Reller (McCutcheon Press, 1979), 22-39.

type and size of the school accounted for the greater number of differentiations in the way principals described their jobs. Following were the socio-economic status and ethnic composition of student body and teaching staff; 2) Personal characteristics of the principal produced the fewest differentiations, although there were some based on race and sex; 3) age and years in present position of principal made no significant differentiations, 4) principals of smaller schools were more involved with students and their problems, student safety, and in the utilization of specialized staff than those in larger schools; 5) principals of larger schools resembled managers in other institutions in dealing with staffing and union issues, and in dealing with policy levels with personnel issues; 6) to certain extent, principals are captive of their environments. This finding poses some questions into the role of the principal as a change agent.[47]

In a study done to examine the work behavior of the elementary school principal as compared with that of the secondary school principal, Kmetz and Willlower[48] observed five elementary school principals from two northeastern states for one week each. The observers made use of the structured observation method, noting all the activities,

---

[47] Ibid., pp. 31-34.

[48] John T. Kmetz and Donald J. Willower, "Elementary School Principals Work Behavior," Educational Administration Quarterly (Fall 1982):62-77.

except when confidential matters were dealt with, their location, time and observation. The observers met with the principal to discuss and clarify the data. At the end of the week of the observation, an exit interview with the principal was conducted for the same purpose.

Four basic records were compiled: Chronological, Correspondence, Contact and Analysis of Purpose. The categories of activities were as follows: desk work, phone calls, scheduled meetings, unscheduled meetings, exchanges, monitoring, tours, trips, observing, personal, announcing, teaching, and support chores.

A summary of the major findings pertinent to this section of the chapter follows:[49]

1) The principals worked an average of 41.7 hours per week, they engaged in a total of 3,058 activities averaging 611.6 each per week, and 122.3 each per day.

2) The principals spent 32.5% of their time in short, unscheduled meetings which occurred spontaneously. This is more time spent here than in any other of the activities observed. Eighteen percent of this time went for 'desk work.' An average of 10% was spent in scheduled meetings. These activities accounted for over 60% of the principals' time. "Phone calls" took 8% of their time. The earliest portion of the day was the busiest.

3) The principals' activities were often interrupted,

---

[49]Ibid., p. 72.

resulting in the principal doing two things at once; about 38% of all the activities were either interrupted or were themselves interruptions. These activities were: monitoring, scheduled meetings and desk work.

4) Principals spent two-thirds of their time talking with people. More verbal than written contacts were initiated, in a face-to-face action. More contacts were made with teachers. Giving or receiving information were the common purpose.

5) Maintenance activities: dealing with staff, pupil personnel service, school plant, public relations, health and safety, took 38.6% of their time and accounted for 53.7% of their activities.

6) School Programs: instruction and curriculum, occupied 27.1% of the principals' time and 12.3% of their activities, with nearly equal amount of time going into each subdivision.

7) Pupil control: discipline of students, monitoring, touring for maintaining discipline, took 23.6% of their time, and 24.4% of their activities.

Overall, the principals' work included a high volume of work; they preferred verbal contacts over written ones; they were drawn to tasks that could be quickly handled, not letting work pile up; and they devoted a great amount of their work to solving unexpected situations and its consequences; this suggesting that their work is

unpredictable and the work days were not rigidly organized. Also, this seems to suggest that the events controlled the principals, planning and anticipating the activities in which they were involved, or would be, in the future.

Some key concerns were raised in regard to the lack of information on the quality of the administrative action. It was not clear if the alloted or spent time was sufficient for the tasks at hand. It was not clear if the contacts had with superiors meant that the principals were getting directions from them, although they kept in daily contact with their superiors.

In a research study for a doctoral dissertation made by Renner,[50] using the ethnographic research approach, six suburban elementary school principals from Oklahoma City were observed. The researcher spent five workdays with each principal, although not consecutively. Interviews with each principal were conducted to obtain data on the principals' background and work environment. Interviews with staff and students were conducted also. Interviews were conducted at the third day of observation with principals to clarify data obtained. All data was comparatively analyzed for the development of a model of work-content (kind of work), and work characteristics (performance of work). As a result, fourteen similarities

---

[50]Beverly E. Renner, "Elementary Principals' Work Life - They do What?," Education 107 (Winter 1986):173-177.

in 'work content', and ten in 'work characteristics' emerged. The differences in degrees resulted due to differences in leadership styles, physical conditions, activity preferences, district and school needs, community expectations and staff's basic personalities. Those impacting the degrees of differences were district and school needs (affected by size and wealth), and community expectations (affected by socio-economic status).

Some of the findings, which were considered to be pertinent for this section, were:[51]

1) the majority of the time of all the principals was devoted to managerial activities and like managers, they got things accomplished through people, were concerned with production and operations, performed Fayol's managerial functions - planning, organizing, commanding, coordinating, and controlling, and performed some non-managerial tasks (extra principal duties, excess paper work, public relations functions, and professional growth).

Renner presented the grouping of the principals' work activities or tasks, under Fayol's managerial functions:[52]

Function	Activities
(1) Planning	Interpreted districts' philosophies, goals, objectives, policies, and procedures to their staffs and

[51]Ibid.

[52]Ibid., p. 176.

	communities to help assist in their proper implementation. Used district-wide philosophies, goals, objectives, policies, and procedures to guide them in working with their staffs and communities in the development of their schools' specific goals and objectives as well as the strategies for their implementation. Exchanged ideas, expertise, and resources with their central administrators and principals.
(2) Organizing	Managed resources providing for the appropriate and optimum use.
(3) Commanding	Directed the execution of every school activity. Provided instructional supervision.
(4) Coordinating	Managed their schools' material, human, financial, environmental, and temporal resources.
(5) Controlling	Furnished assertive authority supporting their schools' rules and norms.

A study done in Illinois by Daugirdas,[53] dealing with what writers identified as managerial areas of responsibilities and corresponding functions, investigated if professional negotiations agreements defined and limited the principals' performance in these functions. The researcher identified the list of tasks considered to be important, by the Southern States Cooperative Program on Educational Administration already presented in this study

---

[53]Therese Nicole Daugirdas, "An Analysis of the Managerial Functions of the Elementary School Principal as Reflected in the Professional Literature and as Stated in the Professional Negotiations Agreements of Selected Districts," (Ed.D. Dissertation, Loyola University, 1979).

in the section dealing with the analysis of the administrative tasks presented in the literature in education administration, as presented by Lipham and Hoeh, Jr.: Instruction and Curriculum, Pupil Personnel, Staff personnel, Community-School Leadership, School Plant and School Transportation, Organization and Structure and School Finance and Business Management.

An analysis of what the current writers identified as managerial functions was made. The critical task area list was used as a basis for analyzing a selected sample of professional agreements and it was used as a model for identifying and evaluating the extent that a sample of professional negotiations agreements defined or limited the principals' managerial functions. Also, the literature on the effects of professional negotiations agreements on the principalship was reviewed to see whether or not recent studies indicated that such agreements do limit the principals' role. Twenty-five interviews were held in districts whose agreements were identified as being restrictive were held to find out the tactics employed by the principals to exercise options and to avoid restrictions of the agreements.

The findings were summarized and dealt only with data considered to be pertinent to the purpose of this section:[54]

---

[54]Ibid., pp. 150-152.

1) 25% of the professional negotiations agreements did not contain statements relevant to the critical task areas of responsibilities.

Selection of members for curriculum and inservice committees, academic freedom, frequency and length of faculty meetings.

2) The greatest restrictions were in 1) staff personnel, 2) instruction and curriculum, 3) pupil personnel, and 4) organization and structure.

3) Restriction on teacher involvement in parents' complaints, procedures to remove students from class by teacher.

4) Evaluation of staff evident in specific planning, organizing, and implementing an evaluation tool.

In Illinois, Rossi[55] conducted a study of the principalship in order to provide data on a wide range of functional areas, and to find out whether there were statistically significant differences between principals relative to their sex, age, region, community type, job security, position prior to the principalship, number of years as a principal, and number of years of experience in education.

Two hundred public school principals were sent a questionnaire; one hundred sixty-five responded. The

---

[55]Harry P. Rossi, Jr., "The Role and Functions of the Elementary School Principals in Illinois," (Ed.D. Dissertation, Loyola University of Chicago, 1985).

instrument was modeled after an instrument developed by the National Association of Elementary School Principals. The nature of the study is basically a descriptive survey research, graphically described later.

The findings summarized were those considered to be pertinent to this section of the study by this researcher:[56]

1) 33.1% of the principals worked between 47 and 50 hours per week. One half indicated that they worked between 44 or 50 hours per week and 19.7 worked 40 hours or less per week. 49.7 stated that they spent one night per week on school selected activities, 25.5% spent two nights per week, and 11.5 spent three nights per week, 4.8% spent four nights per week, and 8.5% spent no evenings on school business.

2) 58.5% of the principals spent the greatest amount of time on the organization and management of their schools, 4.5% spent the greatest amount of time in pupil guidance and adjustment. 9.1% spent the greatest amount of time solving teacher problems, only 4.8% spent their greatest time on program development and curriculum.

Ranked in order of greatest amount spent on the task, the following were the highest four functions: 1) organization and management, 2) pupil guidance, and adjustment, 3) solving teacher problems, and 4) working

---

[56]Ibid., pp. 88-91.

with teachers on improving instruction.

3) 67.9% of the principals indicated that they would like to spend more time working with teachers on improving education, and 4.8% would like to spend more time in working with teachers to improve instruction, and solving the teachers' problems.[57]

Summary

In this section of the second chapter, the results of the review of the professional literature and research in the areas of general administration, educational administration, theories, and tasks discussed by the writers were presented. In the next section the results of the analysis of the professional literature and research on the tasks in the implementation and administration of bilingual education programs will be discussed.

Administration of Bilingual Programs

This section of Chapter II presents the results of the analysis and review of the professional literature in the areas of implementation and administration of bilingual education programs. A review of the literature was conducted through searches at libraries, ERIC and BEBA. The purpose was to find what the professional literature identifies as the tasks for the administration of bilingual education programs.

One of the findings was that, although there are many

---

[57]Ibid.

writings on bilingual education, the vast majority addressed areas such as: curriculum and instruction, the use of the first and second language in the program, staff development, parent involvement, and program evaluation. Very few of the writings addressed the administration of the program, and none was found to specifically address the tasks for the administration of the program.

Most of the writings found for this section used words like: 'categories,' 'duties,' 'responsibilities,' 'competencies,' and 'functions' of the principal. They were included in this section because they were what the literature on the subject considered to be authorities.

Administrative Tasks Present in the Literature

Garcia[58] writes about the true basic responsibilities and tasks of the management unit of a bilingual education program: establishing and maintaining the legitimacy of the program, providing inservice training and other staff development activities, performing routine administrative matters, being highly visible within the school, in the advisory group, and within the community served by the program.

An article by Blanco[59] poses that most of the

---

[58]Ricardo Garcia, "Learning in Two Languages," Phi Delta Kappa Education Foundation (1976):46-47.

[59]George Blanco, "The Educational Perspective," Bilingual Education Current Perspectives 4 (Arlington, Virginia: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1977):27-28.

literature on bilingual education contains much information about the components of the bilingual education program, but that the duties and responsibilities of the director and administrator are implied. He lists the following as responsibilities of the administrator:

1. Implement the basic policy established by the school board.

2. Plan, with the teaching staff, the bilingual program.

3. Propose improvements in the program.

4. Recruit bilingual teachers, teacher aides, specialists in curriculum design, materials development, and evaluation.

5. Coordinate the preparation of materials based on the lore of the target group.

6. Serve as liaison with the news media and the community to disseminate information about the bilingual program.

7. Coordinate the parental involvement effort.

8. Provide an effective in-service program for the staff.

9. Keep abreast of the latest development in bilingual education through research and professional meetings.

10. Keep superiors and the school board abreast of the status of the bilingual program.

11. Assist in the supervision and evaluation of the bilingual teaching personnel.

12. Serve as a public relations person with the campus principals.

Valverde writes that "little serious attention is given to defining the responsibilities of the program administrators and supervisors."[60] For him, the following list represents the principal's major areas of responsibilities in a bilingual program:[61]

I. Administration

A. Suggest to director alteration of district policy based on sound rationale or data from program evaluation.

B. Implement policy as interpreted by director and staff.

C. Tailor program design to school situation.

D. Cooperate in evaluation of program at school.

E. Schedule teachers, pupils, and resources according to program objectives and goals.

F. Submit financial needs to director annually and upon request.

---

[60]Leonard A. Valverde, "Instructional Leadership for Bicultural Programs: Role Responsibilities and Relationships," Education and Urban Society 10 (1978):337-346.

[61]Ibid.

G. Formulate and submit program progress reports to director.

II. Supervision

A. With teachers, establish school objectives compatible with district goals and plan school program for coming year.

B. Formulate an ongoing staff evaluation plan directed at staff improvement.

C. With school teachers and district office supervisory staff, establish selection criteria and process for employment of program staff.

D. Participate in the screening and selection of instructional staff for school program.

E. Organize and participate in classroom observations.

F. Take part in evaluating instructional material developed for the bicultural program at the school.

III. Instructional

A. Organize and sponsor a school/community council which will assist in monitoring the bicultural program, volunteer in program activities, and disseminate information about the program in the general community.

B. Take an active part in all phases of the in-

service programs sponsored by the district.

C. Attend national, state, and local conferences, institutes, and seminars offered by professional associations or universities.

D. If necessary, enroll in postsecondary course work in order to upgrade skills or eliminate deficiencies in the area of administering bicultural education programs or gaining new knowledge of biculturalism.

In another article by Valverde,[62] he poses that instructional leaders must design bilingual programs so as to accomplish two goals: make educational institutions sensitive to cultural differences among students, and assure that educational institutions promote cultural diversity. Valverde presents some of the tasks that instructional leaders need to address if bilingual programs are to be successful; curriculum development, developing learning resources, staffing for instruction, organizing for instruction, utilizing support services, providing staff development, and community participation.

Aguilar[63] argues that the principal plays an important

---

[62]Leonard A. Valverde, "Supervision of Instruction in Bilingual Education Programs," Bilingual Education for Latinos (1979):65-80.

[63]J.V. Aguilar, "The Building Principal's Role in Bilingual Education Program," Journal of Teacher Education 30 (May-June 1979):26-28.

role as does a teacher in bilingual programs. He states that principals need to know the minority community, its language and culture, its value system, and the people's educational desire for their children. A principal must be supportive of the educational program desired by the community, and should help it to see existing needs which the current program does not meet. Major responsibilities and tasks of the principal have to do with: the instructional portion of the program, selection of staff who possess a positive and constructive attitude toward bilingual education, justification of major budget requests for staff activities and material purchases which will enhance the bilingual program, establishment of a parent advisory group representative of the community, and he/she must provide the reinforcement and the atmosphere that allows for creativity.

A literature review on competencies for principals of bilingual education community schools was made by Valverde.[64] It indicated that categories useful to principals responsible for leading bilingual programs be generated in the following areas: change, conflict resolution, human relations, community involvement, instructional staff selection and development,

---

[64]Valverde, "A Literature Review: Competencies for Principals of Bilingual Community Schools," Paper presented at the Ninth Annual International Bilingual Bicultural Conference, Anaheim, California, April 1980, ERIC ED 207198.

comprehensive planning, and cultural acquisition. A major finding is that all the writings addressing the principal agree that the principal is the most influential in making or destroying an instructional program.

Bilingual education programs are a result of federal, state and court guidelines and policy. The administrators of bilingual programs must see that the program exist within a school district, and that they contain the specified elements in those guidelines.[65]

The components of the Lau v. Nichols court decision, and the Task Force Remedies are summarized by Estupinian,[66] which served to outline the other bilingual education federal and state pieces of legislation or policies that were followed around the country:

1. Identification and classification of the students to be served.

2. Achievement testing to determine those students in greatest need or the underachievers.

3. Language proficiency testing.

4. Instruction in English as a second language.

5. Using the primary language of the students for instruction in the content areas.

---

[65]Ortiz, p. 6.

[66]Rafael Estupinian, "Obstacles in the Administration of Bilingual Programs," Paper presented at the AMAE State Annual Conference, 4 October 1979, ERIC Reproduction Services, ED 171853.

6. Individualized learning programs for those students identified as underachievers due to linguistic obstacles.

Ortiz[67] describes a field study to collect data on how and by whom bilingual education programs were administered in Southern California. Twelve school districts were observed for one year, with both large and small number of bilingual programs, urban, and no-urban, in which Spanish was the language having the largest number of student population. Administrators, teachers and aides were interviewed. Written documents, such as policies, guidelines, school reports, proposals, and schedules were compiled and analyzed.

Most of the programs observed had more than one bilingual education program funded and regulated by one or more agencies: Title VII, Bilingual Education Act, California AB 132 and AB 2284, and local provisions. The primary components most common to all the programs were:

1. Means of identification and assessment of students participating in the program

2. Instructional program(s) adopted to serve the students

3. Program evaluation

As a result of these, part of the administrator's duties and tasks were:

---

[67]Ortiz, pp. 4-7.

1. To select and administer instruments for the identification and selection of students for the program.

2. To make programmatic decisions, and implement and support the program of instruction.

3. To evaluate program effectiveness through students' progress.

4. To establish parent advisory committees.

5. To establish communication with support personnel, and district personnel.

6. To select and train staff.

7. To prepare reports for funding agencies.

As the implementation of the program is dependent on guidelines and policies, the administrator "interprets the guidelines and directs the implementation process."[68]

Following this position, and for these purposes, this researcher found that states like Arizona, California, Colorado, Florida, Michigan and Oklahoma provide their bilingual program administrator with policy manuals or handbooks to assist them in administering the program. Following are some selected samples.

A comprehensive public policy analysis of bilingual education in California by Alexander and Nava[69] was designed to meet the needs of the local school districts'

---

[68]Ortiz, p. 7.

[69]David J. Alexander and Alfonso Nava, "Public Policy Analysis of Bilingual Education in California" (San Francisco: R & E Research Associates, 1976), photocopied.

administrators and school board members. The first objective of the guide was to extend the administrator's understanding of the rationale for bilingual education, and to assist them in assessing their district's needs. A historical analysis of education in California, the state's educational needs, comparison of teaching methods and models, legal and legislative realities of education, and analysis of federal and state programs were presented for that purpose. The second objective was to analyze the policy alternatives for local school districts that each of these areas suggested. The third objective was to present a specific set of policy recommendations, based upon the information and the analysis presented.

Cooper[70] offered suggestions for managing district and school bilingual programs. Section I focused on instructional and administrative aspects of the district plan: dealing with personnel, funding, materials and supplies, and in investigating what consortium services were available. Section II discussed the organization of successful administration systems. Section III offered a check list as a way of a tool for a mid-year self-check for program administrators. Section IV gave advice on the administration of the program, and Section V offered time-

---

[70]Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Management Guide for Bilingual Supervisory Personnel - San Jose Unified School District, California, by Curtis Cooper. (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1978).

saving tips.

A guide for the administrators of bilingual programs in Detroit, Michigan, was prepared by Valbuena.[71] For him, the implementation of bilingual programs is a challenge to local administrators and staff. The guide provided background on the legal mandate for bilingual education, it discussed the identification and selection of target students, reviewed issues pertinent to the selection and maintenance of qualified bilingual personnel, it covered parent and community participation, and it offered a list of the resource personnel available.

One of the most comprehensive manuals for bilingual education program administrators found by this researcher in her search of material for this section, was prepared by Goonen, Angulo and Velez[72] in Florida, prepared as part of a special training project for administrators at the Florida International University, Miami, Florida, under a Title VII grant. The guide is composed of fifteen sections, for a total of 190 pages. The first seven sections deal with the historical data of bilingual education in the U.S., legislation and policies, needs and

---

[71]Felix Valbuena, and others, Guide to the Administration of Bilingual Bicultural Programs in Detroit Public Schools (Detroit, Michigan: Michigan State Department of Education, Detroit Division of Education Services, 1978), 1-68, ERIC ED 210398.

[72]Norma Goonen, Susan B. Angulo, and Millie Velez, Bilingual Education: Florida Administrators' Manual (Miami, Florida, April 1983), Eric ED 265231.

problems of the limited English speaking students in the nation, multicultural aspects of the target population of Hispanic, Indochinese, and Haitian descent which are living in the State of Florida. Sections 8 to 15 refer to administrative practices, such as: staff selection and training, evaluation of staff, human relations, curriculum and materials, school and community relations, myths and facts about bilingual education, and key vocabulary in the different languages represented in the programs for the use of the administrators.

In Chicago, the Department of Multilingual Education is in the process of printing a handbook for the principals, teachers and other staff involved in the implementation of the program. From a draft copy, this researcher extracted, for this section of the study, the following list of tasks for the administration of the bilingual program in Chicago, following the state guidelines that are summarized in the draft:[73]

1. Identify limited English-proficient students
2. Place students in an appropriate bilingual program
3. Select an organizational model (self contained room, pull-out, etc.)
4. Identify staff and facilities

---

[73]Chicago Public Schools, Implementation Handbook: Bilingual Education Programs in the Elementary Schools (Board of Education, 1988), 99.

5. Identify appropriate curriculum and instructional materials
6. Begin instruction
7. Provide staff orientation and/or inservice training
8. Form a bilingual parent advisory council
9. Evaluate students' progress
10. Update students' instructional categories at the end of the school year

Some common elements with the tasks already presented in the literature are the following:

1. Identification, selection and placement of students in the program
2. Recruitment, selection and training of staff
3. Forming of the parent advisory body
4. Evaluation of students' progress

The next section will focus on the professional research (studies, dissertations, etc.), which discuss the tasks for the administration of the bilingual education programs.

As with the previous research of the literature findings pointed out, the use of terms utilized by the writers to describe what does the administrator or principal do to administer the bilingual program, proved to be problematic for this researcher, as most of the writers

used 'functions' instead of 'tasks' for that purpose. Nevertheless, this researcher included the writings available, as they were the few ones discussing the subject.

Administrative Tasks in the Professional Research

Sanchez and Cali[74] undertook a comparative study of two positions: bilingual education administrators and principals to determine the functions of each position in the bilingual education program. The original study was conducted in 1974, to determine the role and administrative functions of the elementary school principal, being sponsored by the Office of Education Performance Review of the State of New York.

Through the use of a survey instrument, a questionnaire which consisted of three parts: Organization and Demographic Data, Time Allocations to Functions Performed, and Personal and Professional Demographic Data, two hundred twenty-five Title VII directors were surveyed. Both the administrators and the principals were asked to indicate the percent of time their respective roles required them to actually spend performing the major functions of each role, to list the percentage of time they believed should ideally be needed to perform each major function, and to indicate the five procedures which

---

[74]Gilbert Sanchez and Alfred Cali, A Comparative Study of the Roles and Functions of School Principals and Bilingual Administrators, 1977, ERIC ED 137940.

actually took most of their time in the performance of each major function. For the purpose of this section, the researcher reported only the data gathered in the principal's study.

The functions performed, and the actual and ideal allocated time for each function were summarized in the following table:[75]

Function-Task	Actual % of Time Spent	Ideal % of Time Spent
1. Curriculum and Program Development	14.6	21.1
2. Instructional Supervision	19.1	26.3
3. Non-Teaching Staff Supervision	5.4	3.9
4. Professional Staff Recruitment and Training	5.1	6.5
5. Discipline and Building Control	19.0	8.1
6. Business and Budget Management	9.1	5.9
7. Scheduling and Coordinating Facilities Use	6.6	4.4
8. Interaction with Community Groups	6.4	7.3
9. Self-Improvement and Professional Activities	4.3	6.2
10. District-wide Administrator Duties	5.1	3.0
11. Negotiations	.8	.4
12. Other	---	---

According to the results of the survey, the principals spent more time on:

1. Instructional Supervision - 19.1%
2. Discipline and Building Control - 19.0%
3. Curriculum and Program Development - 14.6%

---

[75]Ibid., p. 47.

Although a great percentage of their time was actually spent on discipline and building control (19.0%), the principals expressed that they would ideally like to spend only 8%, or half of what they actually spent, on this function. The principals would like to spend more time in:

1. Instructional Supervision - 26.3%
2. Curriculum and Program Development - 21.1%[76]

The use of other terms such as: 'management' and administrative 'practices' were utilized in a dissertation done by Rothfarb[77] in Florida. Her study examined current administrative practices in selected bilingual education programs, compared them to systems and bilingual education theories, and proposed a model of systems management functions, to be considered by administrators as they plan, implement, and evaluate bilingual education programs.

Two instruments were developed by Rothfarb to gather the data: a four part questionnaire asking specifically about the project, personal and professional data of the project management, management practices, and project place in the organizational structure, and a project-objective achievement rating scale. Also, telephone interviews, and the collection of sample administrative documents and case

---

[76]Ibid.

[77]Sylvia Hassan Rothfarb, "Systems Management Model for Planning, Implementation and Evaluation of Transitional Bilingual Education Programs in Florida" (Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Miami, 1980).

study data were conducted and analyzed, using descriptive statistics and narrative descriptions.

A total of twenty-four administrative practices in planning, implementing, and evaluating the bilingual education program were reported as adopted by the school district. They specifically concerned: physical plant changes, instructional techniques, language assessment instruments and procedures, hiring bilingual personnel, and community and school communications and relations.[78]

In a study conducted to analyze the changes occurred in the role of the principal after their involvement in a bilingual bicultural program, Medina-Torres[79] listed the functions of administering bilingual education programs. A questionnaire was mailed to ninety-six elementary school principals in districts having federal and/or state bilingual programs in Los Angeles County. The data were analyzed descriptively. The questionnaire was divided in three sections: 1. general information on respondent; 2. indication of percent of time spent on major duties three years ago, and at present after their involvement in bilingual education, and 3. the role perceptions had three years ago, and at present, after their involvement in

---

[78]Ibid., p. 168.

[79]Hortensia Medina-Torres, "Impact of the Bilingual Bicultural Education Program on the Self-Perceived Role of the Elementary School Principal in Southern California" (Ed.D. Dissertation, University of Southern California, 1980).

bilingual education. Also, the principals were asked to list the three most significant changes in the principal's role since becoming involved in bilingual programs.

As part of the duties/tasks of the principal, the questionnaire listed the following ones in Section 2, the Time Study:[80]

1. teaching students
2. clerical tasks
3. administration (efforts directed at operating the school according to established policies and regulations)
4. supervision (improving instruction through observation and evaluation of teachers, providing inservice for teachers)
5. curriculum development
6. community work (establishing councils and community relations)
7. self-improvement activities.

In Section 2, Medina-Torres compiled a list of roles that the principals performed:[81]

1. Acting Towards Certified Staff
2. Acting Towards Pupils
3. Acting Towards Profession
4. Acting Towards Community

---

[80]Ibid., p. 138.

[81]Ibid., p. 139.

section, the researcher found some of the tasks that were previously identified in the professional literature and research for the administration of bilingual programs, following the influence of federal and state guidelines. A summary of the similarities between these two sources follows:

Medina-Torres' 'Roles'	Tasks/Present in the Professional Literature and Research
Role 1: Acting Towards Certified Staff	Recruitment and Training of Teachers
Conducts and evaluates interviews with prospective employee	
Provides for training and experience in innovative education and methodologies	
Role 2: Acting Towards Pupils	Assessment and Placement of Students
Assess students for eligibility in school program and assess progress in program	Assessment of Students' Progress
Role 3: Acting Towards Profession	
Determines when and what types of programs must be instituted and required	Program Selection and Implementation
Allocates financial resources on the basis of need	Managing Allocated Funds (Budget)
Provides materials adequate for accomplishing programs' goals and objectives	Provide Adequate Materials
Develops an adequate evaluation design	Program Evaluation
Participates in courses at an institution of higher education	Upgrade Skills in Areas of the Administration of Bilingual Education Programs
Participates in pre-service and in-service training	

Participates in pre-service and in-service training workshops	Upgrade Skills in Areas of the Administration of Bilingual Education Programs
Role 4: Acting Towards Community	
Establishes committees through which the community can participate in planning, implementing, and evaluating the program	Form Bilingual Parent Advisory Bodies
Devotes a major portion of time to public relations for the school	Human Relations

Some of the findings of her study which were found to be pertinent to the subject discussed in this section were:[82]

1. The principals devoted a greater percentage of their work week in the areas of administration, clerical tasks, community work, and supervision as a result of their involvement in the bilingual program, as compared with three years earlier. Fifty percent (50%) of their work week was spent in administration and supervision.

2. The principals expressed that they would like to devote a greater percentage of their time in increasing teacher participation in the decision-making process, and in the administration of the program; in assessing student's placement and progress in the program; in knowing more about the legislative mandates and their implications for decision making, and in devoting greater time to public

---

[82]Ibid., pp. 109-113.

relations for the school.

3. The principals with less experience devoted and spent more time in administration, and in community work than those with more experience as administrators.

4. The principals identified the most significant changes in their roles as a result of their involvement in the bilingual program as being in the areas of staff inservice and supervision, program implementation, and in community relations.

Problems in Implementing and Administering Bilingual Education Programs

The literature and research have identified some problems had by the administrators of bilingual education programs in implementing and administering the program.

In their study of the roles and responsibilities of school principals in bilingual administration, Sanchez and Cali[83] identified the following problems in the implementation and administration of bilingual education programs.

> ... lack of skills necessary for administering programs;
> ... lack of understanding of bilingual goals on the part of the "regular" staff and fellow administrators;
> ... lack of commitment by the school board, superintendent and community leaders;
> ... tendency to have bilingual program viewed as a temporary special project;
> ... lack of sufficient support staff and bilingual personnel at the administrative level;

---

[83]Sanchez and Cali, p. 43.

... coordinators are spread too thin, they have very little authority and mounds of responsibility, can't meet objectives;
... pulling teachers out of the classroom and putting them into administration without management background;
... administrators who see their buildings as a private castle and are threatened by a special program.

In an article describing a project to implement changes in a school district by offering bilingual education programs on a voluntary basis, Teitelbaum[84] found that in many school districts there were a shortage of qualified bilingual teachers and a need to recruit, rather than retrain, teachers and that there existed "the perception that bilingual programs require additional expenditures."[85] He added that many school districts not only lack policies that specify goals, but also lacks guidelines on how to achieve them. There is a lack of coordinated efforts between bilingual and non-bilingual education program, and even within the bilingual program itself, especially in coordinating the native language and the English language components.[86] He also goes on to mention that the bilingual programs suffer from fragmentation or separation from the non-bilingual

---

[84]Teitelbaum, Herbert and others. "Changing Schools. The Language Minority Student in the 80's." (Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington, D.C., 1982), 12.

[85]Ibid.

[86]Ibid., p. 23.

programs. The bilingual education program is seen as "add-on" programs, and as a consequence, both bilingual teachers and the students are isolated from services, resources and support systems of the district as wholes, and the bilingual curriculum is not synchronized with the district-wide one. He offered that this fragmentation can be minimized if "the curriculum scope and sequence of the bilingual program are coordinated with that of the regular or non-bilingual program."[87]

Fragmentation, or program marginality was also discussed by Stein,[88] who found that classes were held under staircases or in broom closets. Estupinian[89] and Ortiz[90], wrote that "the most persisting problem is that of institutionalizing the program within the school district,"[91] and Bixler, Marquez,[92] found that parents, teachers and other interest groups have played a marginal role in the planning and introduction of the bilingual education program, as a result, the implementation of the

---

[87]Ibid, p. 26.

[88]Stein, Colman. Sink or Swim. The Politics of Bilingual Education, p. 112.

[89]Estupinian, p. 7.

[90]Ortiz, p. 5.

[91]Ibid.

[92]Bixler, Marquez. "The Introduction of Bilingual Education Programs: A Collaborative Approach." Education, Vol. 105, No. 4, 443-447.

program has met with resistance from diverse groups.

For Goonen,[93] the lack of qualified personnel is "one of the most pressing problems facing bilingual education today," and Stein sees that "bilingual education has always limped on one leg because of the teacher shortage."[94]

Ortiz[95] found that there was a "shortage of qualified bilingual teachers specifically trained for bilingual classrooms." The need for training teachers to work in a bilingual setting was seen by Stein,[96] and Perez.[97]

Other problems mentioned by Teitelbaum[98] deal with the entry and exit criteria for students in the bilingual programs, which are in part, due to the lack of non-existing or unclear goals for the program. As a result, some students are included in the program when they are not in need and some continue in the program even though they are ready to exit. Estupinian[99] sums this by saying that "there are no meaningful criteria for student transition out of the primary language instruction into the English

---

[93]Goonen, p. 193.

[94]Stein, p. 130.

[95]Ortiz, p. 5.

[96]Stein, p. 112.

[97]Perez, Ernest, Perspectives on Management and Education, p. 1.

[98]Teitelbaum, p. 26.

[99]Estupinian, p. 7.

language program."

Problems with program funding were discussed by Teitelbaum,[100] who reported that there was "the perception bilingual programs require additional expenditures," by Stein,[101] which found that there was a near total reliance on federal funding which was combined with scarcity of both local and state money--and by Stevenson,[102] who found that many times the funding of the program was approved late in the year thus affecting its proper implementation and that the funding amount was changed many times during the year, usually being decreased by 10% or more.

Other problems were then stemmed by the lack of proper funding. The lack of materials and supplies were reported by Teitelbaum,[103] Ortiz,[104] and Stevenson,[105] who found that the slow way in which some funding agencies processed the purchasing of materials and supplies delayed the receiving of such by the school programs.

Also, the instructional component of English as a Second Language (ESL) was found by Teitelbaum[106] to be

---

[100]Teitelbaum, p. 12.

[101]Stein, p. 130.

[102]Stevenson, p. 130.

[103]Teitelbaum, p. 26.

[104]Ortiz, pp. 4 and 6.

[105]Stevenson, p. 13.

[106]Teitelbaum, p. 28.

receiving little attention. Teachers were not formally trained to teach the subject and the programs were not functioning as per guidelines. Stein[107] writes: that half of all U.S. teachers have taught Limited English Proficient Students (LEPS), even though only a small fraction had any professional preparation. The same holds true for ESL teachers.[108] He goes to report that of these teachers, only a 10% had even one course in teaching English to non-native speakers and only 6% had any course work in ESL.

Teitelbaum[109] found that many problems common to most school districts were associated with program evaluation. He saw a lack of attention to the outcomes of the program, limitations in the availability of assessment measures to determine students' progress and the lack of adequate time to make proper program modifications after the evaluation. Estupinian[110] poses that one of the major problems had by administrators of bilingual programs is the "relative inability to produce a meaningful product-process evaluation."[111]

Summary

Chapter II presented an overview of the results of the

---

[107]Stein, p. 112.

[108]Ibid.

[109]Teitelbaum, p. 42.

[110]Estupinian, p. 7.

[111]Ibid.

review and analysis of the professional literature and research pertinent to the focus of the study: the tasks for the administration of the schools, and the tasks for the administration of bilingual education programs in the schools.

The chapter was organized as follows: a historical review of the development of general administration and of school administration; the tasks for the administration of schools as discussed in the professional literature and research; the tasks for the administration of bilingual education programs as presented in the professional literature and research in the subject; and a summary of the chapter.

In brief, as a result of the review and analysis of the writings on the subject of tasks for the administration of schools, a list of the most mentioned in the writings was compiled. These are the tasks to be performed by principals in the administration of their schools:

1. Curriculum and Instruction
2. Pupil Personnel
3. Staff Personnel
4. School Finance/Fiscal Management
5. School Community Relations
6. Physical Facilities
7. Transportation

Some of these tasks are comprised of sub-tasks. A

comprehensive list of tasks for the administration of schools was compiled by researchers participating in the Southern States Cooperative Program in Educational Administration sponsored by the Kellog Foundation. The list is reflective of the tasks mentioned by other writers and researchers.

In the area of tasks for the administration of bilingual education programs, the researcher found that not much has been written on the subject. The writings which dealt with the topic did not refer specifically to tasks, but to 'functions', 'duties', etc. Nevertheless, the available data was included, as they were the only one addressing the subject of administration of the bilingual programs. The tasks seemed to origin from the legal and government documents. Federal, state and local rules, guidelines and policies stated the tasks that an administrator or principal has to comply with for the implementation and administration of the bilingual education program. This was evident in the professional literature and research.

As with the tasks for the administration of schools, the researcher found that there were some tasks mentioned throughout the writings. The following ones were the most common ones being present in the writings:

1. Identification, selection and placement of students

2. Recruitment, selection, and training of staff personnel

3. Program models

4. Curriculum and instruction

5. Forming parents advisory bodies

6. Evaluation (program, students)

7. Funding/budget management

8. Record keeping (reports to funding agency)

In Chicago, the Board of Education, through the Department of Multilingual Education, has been working on a manual for the implementation and administration of the bilingual education programs. A list of tasks to be performed by the principals was listed on page 99. The list follows the state guidelines and policies for the implementation of the programs in the state of Illinois. This follows what was found to be the practice described in the professional literature and research dealing with the administration of bilingual education programs.

In the following chapter, Chapter III, the writer will present a description of the instruments used, the subjects of the study, the process by which the data were obtained and the data obtained.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

INTRODUCTION

The research was guided by four questions. Research Question No. 1 was addressed in Chapter II, The Review of the Professional Literature and Research.

1. According to the professional literature and research, what are the tasks recommended for the implementation and administration of bilingual education programs?

2. What tasks do principals perform and what tasks do they delegate to others?

3. What is the relationship between the ranking of how principals spend their time on various tasks and the ranking by principals as to the importance of those tasks for the implementation and administration of bilingual education programs?

4. What are the problems experienced by selected Chicago Public School Principals in implementing and administering bilingual education programs?

Chapter III presents the data gathered to answer research questions two through four. The following section describes the instruments used in the collection of the

data.

COLLECTION OF DATA

Instruments Used

The data were gathered by two instruments: a questionnaire and a follow-up interview. Both instruments were constructed by the researcher. They were examined by two specialists in constructing questionnaires and interviews and by two statisticians. As the data gathered were mainly descriptive and so was the analysis, face validity was assumed to be sufficient.

The questionnaire was designed to obtain information about the tasks actually being performed by selected Chicago elementary school principals in selected districts in administering the bilingual education programs at their schools. The interviews were designed to clarify data obtained from the questionnaire and to probe further during the face-to-face interview so as to verify and/or obtain more data. Both instruments were piloted in districts which were not participating in the survey. Revisions to both instruments were made according to the respondents' contributions and recommendations.

The Principals' Questionnaire

The questionnaire (see Appendix B) consisted of four parts: Part I gathered personal and professional background information, such as sex of the respondents; if bilingual; number of years as a principal; number of years

administering a bilingual education program; type, size and organization of school; size of bilingual program; funding sources; and participation in training sessions of inservices in bilingual education.

Part II listed ten tasks that were based on the prototype list derived from the review and analysis of the professional literature and research for the administration of bilingual education programs, and on the list of tasks presented in the draft of the handbook for the implementation and administration of bilingual education programs being prepared by the Department of Multilingual Education in the Chicago Public Schools which were identified for the implementation and administration of the bilingual programs in Chicago. The principals were asked to rank the tasks according to the time spent on each from the most time spent to the least time spent in Section A. In Section B, they were asked to rank the tasks according to the importance had, or given to each task by the principals in the implementation and administration of the bilingual education programs at their schools.

In Part III, the principals were asked to list the specific problems they had encountered in the implementation and administration of the bilingual programs at their schools; to give recommendations, and to write down any comments regarding program implementation and administration.

After following the protocol imposed by the Department of Research and Evaluation in the Chicago Board of Education (see Appendix A), fifty-eight questionnaires were mailed out to selected elementary school principals in three districts identified by the Department of Multilingual Education as housing the largest number of bilingual education programs for Limited-English Proficient Students (LEPS) of Spanish language background. The respondents were to be anonymous and the responses were to be on a voluntary basis. Out of fifty-eight, forty-three questionnaires were returned. Twelve principals volunteered for the follow-up interview.

The Follow-Up Interview

The follow-up interview was designed to clarify data from the questionnaire, to extract further information not previously obtained by the questionnaire, and to provide the opportunity for a greater depth of response from the principals. Best[1] writes that people are more willing to talk than to write, and that, after establishing a degree of rapport with the subject, the interviewer can obtain certain information that the subject might be reluctant to put in writing. Also, the interview provides for a clearer explanation of the purposes of the investigation, to ensure for anonymity and confidentiality of responses, direct

---

[1]John W. Best, Research in Education (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1981), 164.

clarification of misinterpretations of the questions, and the stimulation of the subject to great insight into his/her own experiences, thereby providing the investigator with the opportunity to explore important areas not anticipated in the original plan of investigation.[2]

A structured Interview Guide (see Appendix C) was used with the principal during the scheduled interview. The form consisted of three parts. Part I contained the same information as did Part I of the Questionnaire: general professional and personal background information, so as to serve as verification of the data gathered. Part II referred to the tasks for the implementation and administration of the bilingual program, and it consisted of four subparts: A, B, C, and D. In subpart A, the principals were asked to clarify how many tasks were actually being performed or being delegated by them. In case of delegation of the task, they were asked to list the staff members to whom it was delegated. Also, the principals were asked to mention the type of assistance received, and from whom, in the implementation and administration of the bilingual program, and the sources, documents, etc. used to assist them as principal, in the implementation and administration of the program.

The results of Part II of the questionnaire, the Time Study, were presented to the principals in Subpart B of the

---

[2]Ibid., 165.

Interview Guide and the principals were asked to express their opinions as to the reasons why some tasks were ranked to be more important than others, and why it appeared that they spent more time in some tasks than in others. Their responses were then noted. In Subpart C of the Interview Guide, a list of fifteen problems identified by some principals in the questionnaire, and compiled from the professional literature and research as most common in the implementation and administration of bilingual education programs, were provided. The principals were asked to identify those problems which had been encountered by them in the implementation and administration of the bilingual education program at their schools. In Subpart D of the Interview Guide, the principals were to mention any recommendations they could offer for the implementation and administration of the program. Although the principals were asked to do this in the questionnaire, this section had to be included again so as to probe further for data, as most of them did not write down any recommendations.

Part III of the Interview Guide provided the opportunity to offer comments regarding program implementation and administration. This section was included in the interview for the same purpose and reason as in Subpart D above: most principals did not write anything down on the questionnaire.

The interviews were scheduled through phone

conversations with the twelve principals who volunteered. The face-to-face interview took from fifteen to thirty minutes.

PRESENTATION OF DATA

The preceding section dealt with the collection of the data and the instruments used. In this section, the research questions No. 2, 3, and 4 are presented.

Research Question No. 2

What tasks do principals perform and what tasks do they delegate to others?

The review of the professional literature and research discussed already in Chapter II, identified common tasks for the administration of bilingual education programs, which are derived from federal, state and local rules, policies and guidelines (see pp. 57-58). The following were identified as the most common tasks:

1. Identification, selection and placement of students
2. Recruitment, selection and training of staff personnel
3. Program models selection
4. Curriculum and instruction
5. Forming parent advisory bodies
6. Evaluation of students
7. Evaluation of programs
8. Funding - Budget management

9. Record keeping activities (reports, etc. to funding agency)

In Illinois, the bilingual education programs are implemented as per Article 14C of the Rules and Regulations for Bilingual Education Programs. These rules require the following:[3]

1. Identification and placement of students
2. Recruitment and hiring of bilingual teachers
3. Staff development programs for bilingual teachers
4. Annual testing of students (progress evaluation)
5. Parent/community participation
6. Budget expenditures report

The Chicago Board of Education, through the Department of Multilingual Education, has been working on an implementation and administration manual for the bilingual education programs. From the draft, the following tasks were extracted:[4]

1. Identify Limited-English Proficient Students (LEPS)
2. Place identified students in appropriate bilingual program
3. Select an organizational model

---

[3]Illinois, Revised Statutes (1973), Chapter 122, Art. 14C.

[4]Chicago Public Schools, Implementation Handbook: Bilingual Education Programs in the Elementary Schools (Board of Education, 1988), 99.

4. Identify staff and facilities
5. Identify appropriate curriculum and instructional materials
6. Begin instruction
7. Provide staff orientation and/or inservice training
8. Form a bilingual advisory parent committee
9. Evaluate student progress
10. Update student instructional category at the end of the year

These tasks are derived from the state rules for the implementation and administration of the state funded bilingual education programs. Also, Part III of the questionnaire, the Time Study, was comprised of these tasks, so as to verify performance as per guidelines by the respondents in the study.

In order to answer Research Question No. 2, an analysis of those tasks actually being performed and those delegated to others by selected Chicago Elementary School Principals for the implementation and administration of the bilingual education programs was conducted. The data for the tasks actually being performed and those delegated to others were derived from the interviews.

The data gathered through the interview phase showed that principals performed and/or delegated tasks No. 1 through 10. Three principals said that they performed Task

#1: Identify Limited-English Proficient Students (LEPS) using the Multilingual Data Form and nine said that they delegated this task. Four principals said that they performed Task #2: Place identified students in an appropriate bilingual program, and eight said they delegated this task. All twelve principals interviewed responded that they performed Task #3: Select an organizational model, and two also said that they delegated this task. Their explanation to this was that this task was performed by them in a team approach, being assisted by those members of the team: teachers, bilingual lead teachers, other administrative staff like assistant principal, counselor, etc. Their approach would be to lead, have input, delegate and then oversee and/or review the performance of the task by the team. Eleven principals said that they performed Task #4: Identify staff and facilities, and one said that he/she delegated this task.

For Task #5: Identify appropriate curriculum and instructional materials, six principals responded that they performed it, and ten of the interviewed responded that this task was done by them using the same team approach already described. For this task, other specific staff like reading and math resource teachers were brought into the team, as well as the district's central resource personnel.

Eventhough Task #6: Begin instruction, was not

performed by the principal as it was the teacher's main responsibility, six principals responded that they performed this task because it was the principal's responsibility to oversee that the instructional program be in place and working since the beginning of the school year. Ten principals said that they delegated this task to the teachers. Because four principals responded that they both performed and delegated this task out of the twelve interviewed, the tally came up to sixteen principals.

For Task #7: Provide staff orientation and/or in-service training, the results were that nine principals answered that they performed this task, and nine responded that they delegated it. Seven principals responded to both performing and delegating this task, as it was done using the team work approach.

Ten principals said that they performed Task #8: Form a bilingual advisory parent committee, and four said that they delegated it. Two principals in the group said that they did both as they initiated the task, and then delegated it.

Six principals responded that they performed Task #9: Evaluate student progress, and ten said that they delegated it. Five principals responded that they did both perform and delegate the task using the administrative team approach.

For Task #10: Update students' instructional

categories at the end of the year using the Bilingual Information Form (BIF), two principals expressed that they performed it and twelve responded that they also delegated this task. Two principals answered that they did both perform and delegate the task, as this one was initiated by them, it was delegated to others and then it was later reviewed by the principals.

Following are the tasks and the number of principals who said that they performed and delegated the task:

TABLE 1

TASKS REPORTED TO BE PERFORMED AND DELEGATED BY PRINCIPALS

Task #	Performed	Delegated	Both
1 (Identify LEPS)	3	9	1
2 (Place ...)	4	8	1
3 (Select ...)	12	2	2
4 (Identify Staff)	11	1	0
5 (Identify Curriculum)	6	10	4
6 (Begin Instruction)	6	10	4
7 (Provide Staff Orientation)	9	9	7
8 (Form advisory...)	10	4	2
9 (Evaluate ...)	6	10	5
10 (Update ...)	2	12	2

Task #1, the identification of the limited-English proficient students and #2, placing identified students in the bilingual program were ranked by the principals as ones in which they spent the most time on (ranked as #2 and #1 respectively). The data from the interviews reported on

Table 1 show that the majority of the principals interviewed delegated these tasks.

All the principals interviewed reported that they performed Task #3, selecting an organizational model, yet, this task was ranked almost at the end of the rating scale (#9) in Time Spent on Task.

For Task #4, the identification of staff and facilities, the great majority of principals interviewed reported that they performed this task, but it was ranked as one in which some time was spent (ranked as #6 in Time Spent).

The majority of the principals interviewed delegated Task #5, the identification of appropriate curriculum and materials, but when ranking this task as per time spent, it was ranked as one in which the principals in this sample spent more time (ranked #4).

Most principals expressed that they both performed and delegated Task #7, providing staff inservices and/or training, yet this task was ranked as one in which they spent some time on (ranked #5 in Time Spent).

A great majority of the principals expressed that they performed Task #8, forming a parent advisory committee, as per data shown in Table 1, but this task was ranked by the principals as one in which they spent less time on (ranked #7 in Time Spent) as compared with the other tasks.

Again, the majority of the principals interviewed

expressed that they delegated Task #9, evaluating student progress and close to half of these principals responded that they both performed and delegated this task. The results of the ranking of the tasks by Time Spent shows that this task was ranked by the principals very highly (as #3) as compared with the ranking for the other seven tasks.

Only two of the tasks (#6 and #10) were found to be consistent with the results of the rankings by Time Spent and its performance and/or delegation by the principals who were interviewed.

It appears that this sample of principals performed some managerial/administrative tasks identified by writers in both educational administration and bilingual education program administration professional literature and research, as illustrated by the reported performance by principals of Tasks #3, 4, 5, 7, 8 and 9. A comparison follows:

Tasks in Literature/Research	Task Performed
- staff selection and training	#4 and 7
- curriculum and materials	#5
- coordination of environmental resources	#3
- school-community relations	#8
- evaluation	#9
- select and administer instruments for the identification and selection of students	#1, 2

These tasks are also important for the implementation and administration of bilingual education programs as per these writers.

Research Question No. 3

What is the relationship between the ranking of how principals spend their time on various tasks and the ranking by principals as to the importance of those tasks for the implementation and administration of bilingual education programs?

In order to answer this research question, the principals were asked to complete Part III of the Principals' Questionnaire. In this section of the survey, a list of eleven tasks for the implementation and administration of the bilingual education programs, which were compiled from the draft of the handbook for implementation of the state funded bilingual programs in Chicago being prepared by the Department of Multilingual Education, was presented to the respondents. These tasks were also common to those mentioned and identified for the implementation and administration of bilingual education programs in the review of the professional literature and research. The following are the tasks:

1. Identify Limited-English Proficient Students (LEPS) using the Multilingual Data Form
2. Place identified students in an appropriate bilingual program

3. Select an organizational model (self-contained, etc.)
4. Identify staff and facilities
5. Identify appropriate curriculum and instructional materials
6. Begin instruction
7. Provide staff orientation and/or in-service training
8. Form a bilingual advisory parent committee
9. Evaluate student progress
10. Update students' instructional categories at the end of the year using the Bilingual Information Form (BIF)
11. Other/Additional task

The principals were asked to rank the tasks according to the amount of time spent on each one, from the most (#1) to the least (#11), and to rank them according to the importance given to the task, from the most important (#1), to the least important (#11).

The data from the forty-three questionnaires received were analyzed by computer, using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) Release 3.1 for IBM VM/CMS. For this part of the survey, the responses were ranked according to time spent on task and the importance given to each. Twenty-two tables resulted (11 tasks x 2) and can be found on Appendix D.

A composite showing the final ranking of the 11 tasks by Time Spent and Importance of Task was obtained using the same computer program as above. The composite of the ranks by Time Spent and Importance showed that 39 respondents or 91% of the principals, answered all the items at a given time. The findings are as follows:

Time Spent on Task

In general, the principals reported that, in terms of time spent, the tasks of identifying and placing Limited-English Proficient Students (LEPS) in the bilingual education programs, and evaluating student progress required more time than the other tasks on the questionnaire. They reported that they spent the least time in beginning instruction, selecting organizational models, and in updating the student's instructional category at the end of the school year and in other tasks not identified, as shown in Table 2A below.

TABLE 2A

TASKS ACTUALLY BEING PERFORMED BY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS RANKED BY TIME SPENT ON TASK

Task	Rank Order	Mean*
Place identified students in appropriate bilingual program	1	3.7695
Identify Limited-English Proficient Students (LEPS) using the Multilingual Data Form	2	4.5500
Evaluate student progress	3	4.5610
Identify appropriate curriculum and instructional materials	4	4.5952
Provide staff orientation and/or inservice training	5	4.6905
Identify staff and facilities	6	6.0976
Form a bilingual advisory parent committee	7	6.2683
Begin instruction	8	6.3077
Select an organizational model	9	6.7317
Update student instructional category at the end of the year using the Bilingual Information Form (BIF)	10	7.3333
Other/Additional Tasks	11	10.5714

*The mean of the sum of the product of the rank value X the frequency (number of principals).

Importance of Task

According to the principals, those tasks ranked as most important were: placing and identifying students in the bilingual program, and identifying appropriate

curriculum and materials for the instructional component of the bilingual program. Those tasks ranked as the least important were: evaluating student progress, updating the student's instructional category at the end of the school year, forming a bilingual advisory parent committee, and other tasks not identified. Table 2B illustrates these findings.

Comparison of Time Spent to Importance of Tasks

According to the findings summarized in Table 2, the elementary school principals ranked placing and identifying students in the bilingual education programs as #1 and #2 in Time Spent, and they rated these two tasks as being also #1 and #2 in Importance. Although some tasks like identifying staff and facilities, beginning instruction, and selecting an organizational model were ranked high in Importance, the principals seemed not to spend that much time performing them (ranked as sixth, eighth, ninth on Time Spent). Although the principals ranked evaluating student progress as #3 on Time Spent, they did not consider this task to be very important, as they ranked it as #8 in Importance Given. Also, forming an advisory parent committee was one task which the elementary school principals appeared to rank low (#7 on Time Spent), and it was also considered to be one of the very least important ones (ranked #10 on Importance).

TABLE 2B

TASKS ACTUALLY BEING PERFORMED BY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS RANKED BY IMPORTANCE GIVEN TO TASK

Task	Rank Order	Mean*
Place identified students in appropriate bilingual program	1	2.8684
Identify Limited-English Proficient Students (LEPS) using the Multilingual Data Form	2	2.9000
Identify appropriate curriculum and instructional materials	3	4.6750
Identify staff and facilities	4	4.8718
Begin instruction	5	5.3333
Select an organizational model	6	5.5128
Provide staff orientation and/or inservice training	7	5.6000
Evaluate student progress	8	6.1316
Update student instructional category at the end of the year using the Bilingual Information Form (BIF)	9	7.6250
Form a bilingual advisory committee committee	10	8.8182
Other/Additional Tasks	11	10.5909

*The mean of the sum of the product of the rank value X the frequency (number of principals).

A comparison of the overall results of the rankings of the tasks for the administration of the bilingual education programs by Time Spent, and by Importance Given

to the Task is shown in Table 3.

TABLE 3

TASKS ACTUALLY BEING PERFORMED BY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS RANKED BY TIME SPENT ON TASK AND BY IMPORTANCE GIVEN TO TASK

Task	Time Spent Rank (Most to Least) (1 - 10)	Importance Rank (Most to Least) (1 - 10)
Place identified students in appropriate bilingual programs	1	1
Identify Limited-English Proficient Students (LEPS) using Multilingual Data Form (MDF)	2	2
Evaluate student progress	3	8
Identify appropriate curriculum and instructional materials	4	3
Provide staff orientation	5	7
Identify staff and facilities	6	4
Form bilingual advisory parent committee	7	10
Begin instruction	8	5
Select an organizational model	9	6
Update student instructional category at the end of the school year using the Bilingual Information Form (BIF)	10	9
Other/Additional Tasks	11	11

In order to verify if any relationship existed between the two variables Time Spent and Importance, a correlation analysis was performed using the Spearman rank order coefficient of correlation, to be tested using the .05 level of significance. The following formula was applied:[5]

$$p = 1 - \frac{6 \quad D^2}{N\,(N^2 - 1)}$$

where D = the difference between paired ranks

D^2 = the sum of the squared differences between ranks

N = number of paired ranks

In order to test whether the rank order correlations were significantly different from one another, a Fisher's Z transformation was utilized.[6]

Six variables were chosen from the demographic data to test if there were any relationship between them and the Time Spent and Importance rankings:

1. Sex
2. Bilingual-Non-bilingual
3. Years of experience as a principal
4. Years of experience as a principal administering a bilingual education program

---

[5]Best, pp. 246-47.

[6]McNemar, Quinn, Psychological Statistics (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc, 1969), 504.

5. Size of the total school population

6. Size of the bilingual education program population

The following section presents the results of the analysis of the data.

Sex

As shown in Table 4, the correlation between time spent and importance of the tasks indicated a Rho of .75, which is significant at the .05 level. There were twenty-four (56%) males and nineteen (44%) females in this sample. All together, there is a somewhat high coefficient of correlation than when analyzed separately.

TABLE 4

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE RANK ORDER OF TASKS BY TIME SPENT AND IMPORTANCE

Task	Time Spent Rank (Most to Least) (1 - 10)	Mean*	Importance Rank (Most to Least) (1 - 10)	Mean*
Place identified students in appropriate bilingual programs	1	3.795	1	2.8684
Identify Limited-English Proficient Students (LEPS) using Multilingual Data Form (MDF)	2	4.5500	2	2.9000
Evaluate student progress	3	4.5610	8	6.1316
Identify appropriate curriculum and instructional materials	4	4.5952	3	4.6750
Provide staff orientation	5	4.6905	7	5.6000
Identify staff and facilities	6	6.0976	4	4.8718
Form bilingual advisory parent committee	7	6.2683	10	8.8182
Begin instruction	8	6.3077	5	5.3333
Select an organizational model	9	6.7317	6	5.5128
Update student instructional category at the end of the school year using the Bilingual Information Form (BIF)	10	7.3333	9	7.6250
Other/Additional Tasks	11	10.5714	11	10.5909

*The mean of the sum of the product of the rank value X the frequency (number of principals).
rho = .7545
Significance at the .05 level.

TABLE 5

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE RANK ORDER OF TASKS BY TIME SPENT AND IMPORTANCE AND SEX - COMPARISON OF MALE AND FEMALE

Male	Female
n = 24	n = 19
rho - .82	rho - .43
significance = Z* = 2.10	

*Denotes a significant difference between the r's, using Fisher's Z transformation at = .05

As shown in Table 5, male principals had a higher correlation between time spent and importance of the tasks than did the females. Males had a Rho of .82 and females had a Rho of .43. This suggests that these male principals were more likely to spend time on a task according to the importance they attach to the task than were the female principals in the study.

Bilingual-Non-Bilingual

Out of forty-three principals, thirty-two or 74% expressed that they were not bilingual. Eleven or 26% expressed that they spoke another language, or were bilingual.

According to the data in Table 6, those principals who were bilingual had a higher correlation coefficient than did the non-bilingual principals. Bilingual principals had a Rho of .65 and non-bilingual principals had a Rho of .46.

Therefore, the bilingual principals seemed to spend time more in concert with the importance they attached to the tasks than did the non-bilingual principals.

TABLE 6

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE RANK ORDER OF TASKS BY TIME SPENT AND IMPORTANCE AND BILINGUAL-NON-BILINGUAL

Bilingual	Non-Bilingual
n = 11	n = 32
rho - .65	rho - .46
significance = Z* = .70	

*Denotes no significant difference between the r's, using Fisher's Z - transformation at = .05

Years of Experience as a Principal

Twenty or 47% of the principals had from one to twelve years of experience when the survey was completed. Twenty-one or 49% had thirteen or more, and two gave no answer. The data shown in Table 7 indicate that the principals with thirteen or more years of experience had a slightly higher correlation between time spent and importance of tasks than did those principals with twelve or less years of experience. Principals in the thirteen or more years of experience had a Rho of .32 and principals with twelve or less years of experience had a Rho of .18. This seems to indicate that the principals with thirteen or more years of experience seemed to spend time on a task, according to the

importance given to the tasks more in accordance than did the principals with twelve or less years of experience.

TABLE 7

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE RANKING ORDER OF THE ELEVEN TASKS BY TIME SPENT AND IMPORTANCE AND YEARS OF EXPERIENCE AS PRINCIPAL

Group	
1 to 12 Years	13 or More Years
n = 20	n = 21
rho = .18	rho = .32
Significance Z* = -.45	

*Denotes no significant difference between the r's, using Fisher's Z - transformation at = .05

Years of Experience as a Principal Administering a Bilingual Education Program

Twenty-four or 56% of the principals had ten or more years of experience administering a bilingual education program. Sixteen or 37% had less than ten years, and three or 7% did not answer this item.

As shown in Table 8, those principals having ten or more years of experience administering a bilingual education program had a higher correlation between time spent and importance of the tasks than did the principals with one to nine years of experience. Those with ten or more years of experience had a Rho of .84 and those principals with one to nine years of experience had a Rho

of .39. This seems to indicate that these principals with ten or more years of experience were more likely to spend time on a task according to the importance of the task than were the principals with one to nine years of experience administering a bilingual education program.

TABLE 8

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE RANKING ORDER OF THE ELEVEN TASKS BY TIME SPENT AND IMPORTANCE AND YEARS OF EXPERIENCE AS PRINCIPAL ADMINISTERING A BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAM

Group	
1 to 9 Years	10 or More Years
n = 16	n = 24
rho = .39	rho = .84
Significance Z* = 2.29	

*Denotes no significant difference between the r's, using Fisher's Z - transformation at = .05

Size of Total Student Population

Twenty-two or 51% of the principals administered schools with a total student population of 801 or more. Eighteen or 42% administered schools with less than 800, and three or 7% of the principals did not complete this item.

According to the data on Table 9, those principals in schools having 801 students or more had a higher correlation coefficient than those principals in schools

having less than 801 students. Principals whose total school population was 801 students or more had a Rho of .61 and those with less than 801 had a Rho of .52. Therefore, principals with schools with a total population of 801 or more students seemed to spend time on a task according to the importance given more in agreement than those principals with schools having 800 students or less.

TABLE 9

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE RANKING ORDER OF THE ELEVEN TASKS BY TIME SPENT AND IMPORTANCE AND SIZE OF THE TOTAL SCHOOL POPULATION

Group	
1 to 800 students	801 or more students
n = 18	n = 22
rho = .52	rho = .61
Significance Z* = 1.10	

*Denotes no significant difference between the r's, using Fisher's Z - transformation at = .05

Size of Bilingual Education Program Student Population

Twenty-two or 51% of the principals in this sample responded that they administered bilingual education programs servicing from one to 250 students. Seventeen or 40% had more than 251 students and four or 9% did not complete this item. The data on Table 10 shows that principals administering bilingual education programs with 251 students or more had a higher coefficient of

correlation than those principals with 250 students or less. The principals with 251 students or more in the bilingual program had a Rho of .75 and those principals with 250 students or less had a Rho of .46. This indicates that the principals administering a bilingual program with 251 students or more seemed to spend time on a task according to the importance attached to the task than those principals with 250 students or less.

TABLE 10

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE RANK ORDER OF THE ELEVEN TASKS BY TIME SPENT AND IMPORTANCE AND THE SIZE OF THE BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAM STUDENT POPULATION

Group	
1 to 250 students	251 or more students
n = 22	n = 17
rho = .46	rho = .75
Significance Z* = 1.76	

*Denotes no significant difference between the r's, using Fisher's Z - transformation at = .05

A brief analysis of the results of the coefficient of correlation by sex showed that males seemed to rank the tasks by Time and Importance of Task more in agreement than did the females but no significant difference at the .05 level was found between the ranking of tasks by time and importance and sex using the Fisher's Z transformation formula.

Bilingual principals seemed to be more in agreement than non-bilingual when ranking the tasks by Time Spent and Importance of Task, but no significant difference at the .05 level was found between the two groups when comparing the ranking of the tasks by time spent and importance of task.

Principals having thirteen or more years of experience as administrators seemed to agree more in the ranking of the tasks by time spent and importance of task than did those with less years of experience. No significant difference at the .05 level between the two groups was found.

Again, those principals having ten or more years of experience administering a bilingual education program seemed to agree more in the ranking of the tasks by time spent and importance of task than did those with less experience, but no significant difference at the .05 level was found between the two groups when ranking the tasks by time spent and by importance of task.

Although principals administering schools with a large number of students (801 or more) appeared to be showing a slightly higher degree of correlation or agreement when ranking the tasks by time and importance than did those principals with smaller number of students, no significant difference at the .05 level was found between the two groups.

Principals administering large bilingual education programs (251 students or more) seemed to agree more in the ranking of the tasks by time spent and importance than did those with smaller programs. No significant difference at the .05 level was found between the two groups.

This section dealt with the results of the analysis of the relationship between Time Spent on Task and Importance of Task and six variables obtained from the demographic data.

On the following section, the results of the test used to determine the statistical significance of the correlation coefficient analysis will be discussed.

The purpose of the section was to analyze if there were any significant differences at the .05 level of significance between the rankings of the two variables, Time Spent on Tasks and Importance Given to Task, and the six factors from the demographic data already used.

A Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed Ranks test was used, using the computer program Crunch Interactive Statistical Package (CRIPS) using the following formula:[7]

$$Z = \frac{T - \frac{N\,(N + 1)}{4}}{\sqrt{\frac{N\,(N + 1)\,(2N + 1)}{24}}}$$

where N = number of pairs ranked = tasks

---

[7]Best, p. 298.

T = sum of the ranks of the smaller of the like-signed ranks.

Sex

The test of significance was applied to see if there were any significant differences between the means of the ranking of the tasks by time spent and importance by sex. When the two groups, male and female were analyzed no significant difference at the .05 level was found between the two. It can be assumed that sex made no significant difference when ranking the tasks by time spent and importance. A significant coefficient of correlation was found at the .05 level when comparing the rankings of the tasks by time spent and importance by sex. It seems that although there was a significant relationship between the two groups, when tested it was found to be not significant at the .05 level.

If Bilingual

When the principals were identified and grouped as being bilingual or not, the test of significance was applied to test if a significant difference at the .05 level between the two groups was present. No significant difference at the .05 level was found between the means of the two groups. It seems that being bilingual or not made significant difference when ranking the tasks by time spent and importance.

Years of Experience as a Principal

The principals in this sample were grouped by the number of years of experience as principal: less than 12 and more than 13 years of experience. When the means of both groups were compared, no significant difference at the .05 level was found. It can be assumed that the number of years of experience had by these principals made no significant difference when ranking the tasks by time spent and importance.

Years of Experience Administering a Bilingual Education Program

Two groups, one with nine years or less and the other, with ten or more years of experience administering bilingual education programs, were analyzed to test if any significant difference between the means existed at the .05 level.

It was found that no significant difference at the .05 level existed between the means of the two groups. It can be concluded that the number of years of experience had in the administration of bilingual education programs made no difference for these principals when ranking the tasks by time spent and importance.

Size of Total Population

The principals in this sample were grouped according to the number of students enrolled in their schools or size of the total school population (including the bilingual).

Two groups emerged: one with 800 students or less, and the other, with more than 801 students. When the means of the two groups were compared to find if any significant difference at the .05 level existed between the means, it was found that there was no sigificant difference at the .05 level. It can be assumed that the size of the total school population or number of students had by principal in school made no significant difference when ranking the tasks by time spent and importance.

Bilingual Education Program School Population

In order to analyze if there was any significant difference between the ranking of the tasks by time spent and importance and the size of the bilingual education program, administered by the principals in this sample, two groups, one with 250 students or less, and the other with more than 251, were made. It was found that no significant difference at the .05 level existed between the means of these groups when ranking the tasks by time spent and importance. It can be concluded that the size of the bilingual education program administered by the principals made no significant difference at the .05 level in the ranking of the tasks by time spent and importance.

In summary, according to the data obtained there was no significant difference at the .05 level between the rankings of the eleven tasks by Time Spent on Task and Importance of Task and six factors from the demographic

data (see Appendix D):

1. Sex
2. If Bilingual
3. Years of Experience as a Principal
4. Years of Experience Administering a Bilingual Education Program
5. Total School Population
6. Bilingual Education Program School Population

Research Question No. 4

What are the problems experienced by selected Chicago Elementary School Principals in administering bilingual education programs?

Data for this research question were gathered primarily during the interview phase of the study. Some respondents to the survey listed problems, but the majority left this section blank, thus raising the necessity to gather the data during the interviews.

The majority of the principals interviewed (ten out of twelve) expressed that there was a great need for support services for the Limited English Proficient Students (LEPS). By this they meant: "services from the special education diagnostic teams"; "more teacher aides"; "more teachers to meet individual needs"; and "more English as a Second Language teachers."

The lack of bilingual teachers was also mentioned by the majority of the principals interviewed (eight out of

twelve). As the state rules and regulations states specific qualifications for bilingual teachers such as a valid transitional bilingual education Certificate issued by the State Examiners as evidence that the teacher: a) possess basic communicative skills in English; and b) is competent to teach language arts and/or content courses in a target language other than English[8] has made it very difficult to recruit bilingual teachers. This affects staffing and program organization, and the effectiveness of the program suffers as a result. Bilingual classrooms are being staffed with non-bilingual teachers, which creates other problems such as being out of compliance with the state guidelines. This finding is supported by what the professional literature and research writers mentioned to be problems encountered by administrators. Teitelbaum,[9] Goonen,[10] Stein,[11] Ortiz[12] and Perez[13] discussed the great

---

[8]State Rules and Regulations, p. 31.

[9]Teitelbaum, Herbert and others, "Changing Schools. The Language Minority Student in the 80's." (Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington, D.C., 1982), 12.

[10]Goonen, Norman, Angulo, Susan B., and Velez, Millie, Bilingual Education: Florida Administrators' Manual (Miami, Florida, April 1983), Eric ED 265231.

[11]Stein, Colman, Sink or Swim. The Politics of Bilingual Education, p. 112.

[12]Ortiz, Flor Ida, "The Administration of Bilingual Education Programs," Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Convention, San Francisco, California, April 1979.

need for bilingual teachers, and Stein[14] and Perez[15] went further by stating that teachers needed to be re-trained to work as bilingual teachers in order to alleviate the shortage of bilingual teachers.

One of the problems described as "critical" by the principals was the need for more funding for the state bilingual programs or the "lack of sufficient funding". Without enough monies, materials and supplies cannot be purchased for all subject matters and for all the students participating in the program who vary in levels of English proficiency. As a result, there are not enough books or supplies available and certain subject matters like Math or Social Studies are taught in the native language, but with books in English. Also, support staff like teacher's aides, are either not sufficiently provided, or not provided at all.

Consequently, the instructional program cannot comply with the state guidelines and programs are given audit exceptions by the state. Some principals expressed that they used more monies from the general school budget to try to provide for enough materials and supplies for the bilingual program. Sometimes this resulted in going

---

[13]Perez, Ernest, Perspectives on Management and Education.

[14]Stein.

[15]Perez.

without some needed materials in the non-bilingual program. This goes along with what was reported in the professional literature and research by Teitelbaum,[16] Stein[17] and Stevenson.[18] The lack of materials and supplies was also found to be a problem in bilingual education programs by Teitelbaum,[19] Stevenson[20] and Ortiz.[21]

The movement of students out of the school, or rate of transiency, was also a problem encountered by the principals administering a bilingual education program. The principals mentioned that there was a lack of consistency in policy interpretations regarding the implementation of the program. Policies dealing with the assessment and placement of students in the program, the exit criteria and some aspects of the instructional program were not clear and they were difficult to implement and to follow. Also, they expressed that conflicting information from the district level and the central office posed dilemmas in the organization and implementation of the

---

[16]Teitelbaum.

[17]Stein.

[18]Stevenson.

[19]Teitelbaum.

[20]Stevenson, John R., "The Contribution of Selected Administrative Factors to the Success of the Innovative Educational Programs in Bilingual Navajo Indian Schools," D.Ed. Dissertation, Northern Arizona University, 1979.

[21]Ortiz.

policies, resulting in gray areas in which they have to use their decision making powers. This was also found to be the case, in many school districts across the nation, by Teitelbaum,[22] who reported that there was a lack of specific goals and policies, and that, in cases where there were policies, there were no clear directions or guidelines as to how to achieve the desired or expected goals. Sanchez and Cali[23] also reported that there was a lack of understanding by administrators, teachers and staff personnel of the goals of the bilingual education program.

Also, for these principals, the amount of paperwork and/or record keeping dealing with the bilingual program was a problem (assessment of new students, updating the categories, testing for progress/achievement in both languages, reports, etc.).

The evaluation component also posed a problem. The students have to be evaluated in both their native language and in English and there are no tests available to choose from, consequently, the evaluation component can't be implemented as required by policy. Writers like Estupinian[24] and Teitelbaum[25] found that this was a problem

---

[22]Teitelbaum.

[23]Sanchez, Gilbert and Cali, Alfred, "A Comparative Study of the Roles and Functions of School Principals and Bilingual Administrators," 1977, EDIC ED 137940.

[24]Estupinian, Rafael, "Obstacles in the Administration of Bilingual Programs," Paper presented at the AMAE State Annual Conference, 4 October 1979, ERIC Reproduction

encountered by administrators in many bilingual programs, due to the lack of attention given to the expected outcomes of the program, and the lack of available instruments to assess student's progress.

Some principals felt that in order to better administer the program, inservices and/or training for administrators and teachers were needed. They cited the lack of these as a problem as "you cannot implement it if you don't know about it." This would be very helpful for all, but especially for new principals or those first timers in bilingual education. Sanchez and Cali[26] found that most administrators of bilingual education programs suffered from a lack of skills necessary for administering the program and from a lack of understanding of its goals. Also, they reported that many teachers were being pulled from the classrooms and were put in administrative positions without a management background.

The lack of appropriate physical facilities was also seen as a problem. Most of the schools are old buildings which, at present, suffer from overcrowding. Consequently, some programs are housed in stair landings, basements, mobile units, and, in the case of the pull-out models, in closets and even bathrooms. Clearly, these environments

---

Services, ED 171853.

[25]Teitelbaum.

[26]Sanchez and Cali.

are not conducive to learning and they result in audit discrepancies. Along these lines, Stein[27] found that in many schools, bilingual education classes were being held under staircases or in broom closets.

The lack of materials and supplies was also mentioned as a problem, not only as a result of the lack of sufficient funding but because of the difficulty in finding materials for native language arts and subject matters in the native language of the students. In the review of the professional literature and research, Teitelbaum,[28] Ortiz[29] and Stevenson[30] reported the lack of materials and supplies as a problem had by administrators of bilingual education programs.

Some of the principals interviewed (four) expressed the lack of interest and/or support of the parents for the program as a problem, stemming mainly from the low parent attendance in school meetings.

Also, very few principals mentioned having difficulty coordinating and integrating (meshing) the bilingual education and the all English program demands.

Other problems mentioned by a minority of the principals seemed to deal with the instructional aspect of

---

[27]Stein.

[28]Teitelbaum.

[29]Ortiz.

[30]Stevenson.

the program, like the difficulty in implementing and following specific, differentiated curriculum guidelines which asks for native language instruction, and English as a second language based on the language category placement of the students. This is very difficult to implement when there are not enough students per language category placement and grades, which creates split grades, placing up to three different language categories in the same class, making it very difficult to follow guidelines, and affecting the end result, which is the progress of the students in the program. Also, the lack of an English as a Second Language program support system was seen as a problem affecting the implementation of the program as per state guidelines.

The principals are responsible for implementing the English as a Second Language component of the bilingual education program, but they expressed that there is a need for a system-wide curriculum and record keeping system which will assist them with the proper implementation of this component of the bilingual education program. Most schools buy commercial materials when monies are available and that is what they follow. The English as a Second Language component of the bilingual education program was discussed by Teitelbaum[31] and Stein.[32] They found that

---

[31]Teitelbaum.

[32]Stein.

this component received little attention by the administrators; teachers were not trained to teach the subject, and consequently, the bilingual education programs were not implemented as per guidelines.

A problem affecting program organization and implementation was the insufficient number of students in the intermediate and upper grades, which caused split grades, affecting not only state guidelines, but sometimes, union agreements. The lack of teacher aides was also mentioned as a problem affecting the bilingual education instructional program, as they are used in the classroom many times in assisting classroom teacher as instructional aides. Finally, the lack of support services for those students exiting the bilingual education program, the lack of flexibility in policies and rules, the lack of English proficiency in teachers and the lack of time for tasks were mentioned as problems encountered by some principals.

Following is a summary of the problems mentioned in the interviews by the principals, ordered/ranked according to the total number of principals tallied who mentioned each as a problem had or encountered. (There were 12 interviewees.)

Problem	No. of Principals
1. Lack of support services for the Limited-English Proficient Students (LEPS)	10
2. Lack of bilingual teachers	8

3.	Lack of sufficient funding for the program	7
4.	Transiency of students	7
5.	Lack of consistency in policy interpretations regarding the implementation of the program (student assessment and placement, exit criteria, instructional program, etc.)	6
6.	Too much paper work/record keeping dealing with the bilingual program	6
7.	Lack of tests (Spanish Language Arts, English as a Second Language, etc.)	5
8.	Lack of training and/or inservice for administrators and teachers	5
9.	Lack of proper physical facilities	5
10.	Lack of materials and supplies	4
11.	Lack of interest and/or support from parents	4
12.	Difficulty of meshing bilingual and all-English program demands	4
13.	Instructional program components	2
14.	Lack of an English as a Second Language program support system	2
15.	Insufficient number of students in the Immediate and Upper grades cause to have split grades organization	2
16.	Lack of support services for students exiting the bilingual program	1
17.	Lack of flexibility in policies and rules	1
18.	Lack of teacher aides	1
19.	Lack of time for tasks	1
20.	Lack of English-proficiency in teachers	1

None of the respondents to the questionnaire and to

the interview expressed the lack of district support and/or commitment for the program as a problem or concern. When asked about this, they all felt that the district personnel supported their efforts for implementation and administration of the bilingual education programs. In summary, these findings go along with what the literature and research have found to be problems had by administrators of bilingual education programs in implementing and administering the program.

Using the most common tasks for the implementation of bilingual education and administration programs identified in the professional literature as summarized by Valverde[33] and others, that principals need to address so as to effectively implement and administer the bilingual education program at their schools, a comparison between those tasks and the problems encountered by selected elementary Chicago Public school principals was made to ascertain in which of the tasks were the problems encountered by principals.

Tasks	Problems
curriculum development	- lack of bilingual education personnel (teachers, aides, etc.) - lack of materials and supplies in general - lack of materials in native language of students - lack of sufficient funds - lack of clear guidelines and

[33]Valverde.

	policy - lack of English as a second language (ESL) personnel (teachers, aides) - lack of resource personnel
developing learning resources	- lack of funds - lack of appropriate instructional materials supplies - lack of resource personnel (special education, vocational, other)
selection/staffing for instruction	- principals unable to select staff - lack of bilingual education teachers and staff - lack of space
organizing for instruction	- lack of bilingual education teachers - lack of space - different languages and levels in classroom - split grades - not enough students per grade - lack of evaluation/testing materials and personnel
provide staff development	- lack of resource personnel - lack of funding - inexperienced principals need training
utilize support services	- lack of support personnel services/special education, vocational, other) - lack of funding for private resource hiring
community participation	- for some principals, lack of interest and involvement in parent advisory committees - lack of parental involvement in school affairs
physical plant	- old buildings - lack of space - lack of funding to upkeep support, or acquire new ones

It seems that these selected elementary Chicago Public

School principals are encountering a lot of problems which according to the data gathered, appear to hinder the effective implementation and administration of bilingual education programs in their schools. Still, they are responsible for implementing and administering the programs.

SUMMARY

Chapter III presented data gathered to answer questions which related to the tasks that selected Chicago Public School Principals are performing and which tasks are they delegating for the implementation and administration of state funded bilingual education programs; the relationship between the ranking of time spent on these tasks and the ranking by principals as to the importance of the tasks and the problems experienced by the principals in implementing and administering bilingual education programs.

Chapter IV addresses the summary of results, conclusions, recommendations and further implications of the study.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

SUMMARY

Bilingual education programs for Limited English Proficient Students (LEPS) have been mandated in Illinois since 1973. There are a great number of such students in the Chicago Public School system. The school principal is responsible for the implementation and administration of bilingual education programs.

The research study intended to ascertain the specific tasks that selected Chicago Public School Elementary Principals were performing for the implementation and administration of bilingual education programs at their schools.

The following questions served as guides for the research study.

1. According to the professional literature and research, what are the tasks recommended for the administration of bilingual education programs?

2. What tasks do principals perform and what tasks do they delegate to others?

3. What is the relationship between the ranking of how principals spend their time on various tasks and the

ranking by principals as to the importance of those tasks for the implementation and administration of bilingual education programs?

4. What are the problems experienced by selected Chicago Public School Principals in administering bilingual education programs?

In order to accomplish this goal, a review of the professional literature and research on the subject of administration of bilingual education programs was conducted and a list of tasks present in the literature and research was compiled.

A survey consisting of a written questionnaire and a personal interview was conducted in three selected elementary school districts identified as the ones housing the largest number of Spanish-speaking Limited English-Proficient Students (LEPS). All 58 principals in these districts were sent the instrument. Forty-three responded. Twelve principals volunteered for the interview.

The data collected were entered in a computer and analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) and the Crunch Interactive Statistical Package (CRIPS). The Spearman Rank order coefficient of correlation test of significance at the .05 level was used. Also, the Wilcoxon Signed-Rank test was utilized to test the statistical significance of differences between the rankings of the tasks and six variables from the

demographic data.

The results, guided by the research questions, were reported in Chapters II and III.

CONCLUSIONS

The following conclusions were derived from the analysis of the data collected in the study. These conclusions relate only to Chicago Elementary Public School Principals administering state funded bilingual education programs for Spanish-speaking Limited English Proficient Students (LEPS)

Research Question No. 1 - According to the professional literature and research, what are the tasks recommended for the implementation and administration of bilingual education programs?

Major Conclusions

1. According to the data collected from the review of the professional literature and research, the tasks recommended for the administration of bilingual education programs were derived from federal, state and local guidelines, rules and policies.

2. The most common tasks present in the professional literature and research for the administration of bilingual education programs were:

Identification, selection, and placement of students

Recruitment, selection and training of staff personnel

Program models selection

Curriculum and instruction

Forming parent-advisory bodies

Evaluation of students

Evaluation of programs

Fundings Budget management

Record keeping activities (reports, etc. to funding agencies)

3. It was found that in Illinois that the tasks were also derived from state and local rules, policies and guidelines and were found to be very similar to these in the review of the professional literature and research:

Identify Limited-English Proficient Students (LEPS) using the Multilingual Data Form

Place identified students in an appropriate bilingual program

Select an organizational model (self-contained, etc.)

Identify staff facilities

Identify appropriate curriculum and instructional materials

Begin instruction

Provide staff orientation and/or inservice training

Form a bilingual advisory parent committee

Evaluate student progress

Update student instructional categories at the end of the year using the Bilingual Information Form (BIF)

Other/Additional task

4. Selected elementary Chicago Public School principals were found to be spending time on these tasks for the implementation and administration of state funded bilingual education programs at their schools. Consequently, it can be concluded that these principals are implementing and administering the bilingual education program at their schools as per guidelines.

Minor Conclusions

1. There is no comprehensive administrative manual or guide available at the time of this research for use by the elementary Chicago Public School principals in the schools housing bilingual education programs which identify or include among other things, the tasks for the implementation and administration of state-funded bilingual education program.

Research Question No. 2 - What tasks do principals perform and what tasks do they delegate to others?

Major Conclusions

1. The principals in the study ranked placing and identifying students in the program, and evaluating students progress as the tasks on which more time was spent. This could be attributed to the moderate to high rate of transciency of students. Everytime students transfer in or out of the program, these tasks are needed to be performed.

2. Principals ranked tasks such as beginning instruction, selecting an organizational model, and updating the instructional categories at the end of the year as ones in which they spent less time. Although principals are responsible for the instructional program, they do not perform actual instruction, as it is the teachers' responsibility to do so. Organizational models are set in place when a principal takes over a school. Only when there is a need to make changes to meet the diverse instructional needs of the students, do principals perform this task. The task of updating the students' instructional categories is done at the end of year in preparation for next year's organizational and instructional changes. The principals in the study did not rank identifying and selecting staff, as tasks in which they spent time on, as this is done by the Department of Personnel in the central office, but they considered this task to be important, and most commented during the interviews that they would like to have the opportunity to select their teachers.

3. The tasks ranked high in importance by the principals were: placing and identifying students, and identifying appropriate curriculum and instructional materials. It can be concluded that the implementation of the instructional program appeared to be a priority for these principals. The principals ranked tasks such as

evaluating the student's progress, updating the students' instructional categories at the end of the year and forming the bilingual advisory committee as the least important task. Although the evaluation of students' progress is a task that takes time to perform, for the principals in the study, this task was reported during the interview as being not too important for them as administrators because it was performed directly by the teachers. The tasks of updating the students' instructional categories and forming the advisory committee are tasks that are performed once. As such, they do not take too much time, and as a consequence, it can be inferred that these tasks were not considered to be high priorities by the principals in the study.

4. Delegation of tasks played an important role on the time spent on task and on the importance of the task. As principals expressed during the interview that they prioritized their tasks, they delegated much of them.

5. Tasks that were performed by the principals rather than delegated to someone else, were: selection of organizational models, identification of staff and facilities, providing staff orientation and/or inservice training and forming the bilingual advisory committee. Tasks that were most often delegated by the principals were: identification and placement of students in the program, identification of appropriate curriculum and materials, beginning instruction, evaluation of students'

progress and updating the students' instructional categories.

Minor Conclusions

1. Principals in this study expressed during the interview that some tasks were performed in an administrative team situation. The principals, together with teachers, counselors, or other administrative personnel would perform tasks such as the identification of curriculum and instructional materials, staff orientation and/or inservice training.

2. Tasks were delegated to bilingual teachers, counselors, assistant principals, lead bilingual teachers, and chairman of committees, so as to provide the principals with time to perform other duties.

3. The principals in the study expressed in the interviews that they received assistance from a district coordinator. These resource persons were viewed as the experts on the subject and the principals saw their services as needed to implement the program as per state and local guidelines.

4. Principals with less experience seeked assistance from more experienced principals in their district. More experienced principals consulted with each other when in doubt or unsure about new information or new programs.

5. The principals used state rules and local guidelines as sources of information on the implementation

and administration of the bilingual education program at their school. Also, test data and research were used. Other sources of information were conferences attended, services provided by the bilingual coordinator, books, publications and teachers at their school.

Research Question No. 3 - What is the relationship between the ranking of how principals spend their time on various tasks and the ranking by principals as to the importance of those tasks for the implementation and administration of bilingual education programs?

Relationship Between the Ranking of the Eleven Tasks by Time Spent and Importance of Tasks and Sex of the Respondent

A significant difference at the .05 level was found between time spent on task and importance of task and sex of the respondents. The male principals in this study had a higher coefficient of correlation between time spent on task and importance of task than did the female principals, suggesting that male principals were more likely to spend time on tasks according to the importance they attached to the task than were the female principals. It might be concluded that the gender of the principals influenced the ranking of the tasks by time spent and importance of the task.

Bilingual-Nonbilingual

Eventhough the bilingual principals in this study

seemed to spend time more in concert with the importance they attached to the tasks than did the nonbilingual ones, there was no significant difference at the .05 level between the bilingual and the nonbilingual principals. This seems to indicate that being bilingual makes no difference in the ranking of the eleven tasks by time spent on task and importance of task.

Years of Experience as a Principal

Principals in this study with thirteen or more years of experience seemed to spend time on task according to the importance of the task more in accordance than did those with twelve or less years of experience. Nevertheless, there was no significance difference at the .05 level between the ranking of the eleven tasks by time spent on task and importance of task and the years of experience as a principal. This may indicate that the years of experience as a principal made no difference when ranking the eleven tasks by time spent and importance.

Years of Experience Administering Bilingual Education Programs

Principals in this study with ten or more years of experience administering a bilingual education program were more likely to spend time on task according to the importance of the task than those principals with nine or less years of experience. There was no significant difference at the .05 level between the ranking of the

eleven tasks by time spent on task and importance of task and years of experience as a principal administering a bilingual education program. This might suggest that the years of experience administering bilingual education programs made no difference in the ranking of the eleven tasks by time spent and importance.

Size of Total School Student Population

Principals in this study administering schools with a total student population of 801 of more seemed to spend time on task according to the importance of the task more in agreement than those principals having 800 students or less in their building. There was no significant difference at the .05 level between the ranking of the eleven tasks by time spent and importance of task and the size of the total school population. Suggestions that the size of the total school population made no difference when ranking the eleven tasks by time spent and importance.

Size of Bilingual Education Program Student Population

Those principals administering a bilingual education program with a bilingual student population of 251 or more seemed to spend time on task according to the importance attached to the task more in agreement than those principals administering bilingual education programs with 250 students or less.

There was no significant difference at the .05 level between the ranking of the eleven tasks by time spent and

importance of task and the size of the bilingual education program student population. This might indicate that the size of the bilingual education program student population made no significant difference in the ranking by the principals of the eleven tasks by time spent and importance.

Research Question No. 4 - What are the problems experienced by selected Chicago Public School Principals in implementing and administering bilingual education programs?

Major Conclusions

1. The following problems derived from the study, were considered to be the most common ones in the interview:

Lack of support services (specialized, etc.) for the Limited-English Proficient students

Lack of bilingual teachers

Lack of sufficient funding

Student transiency

Lack of consistency in policy interpretation

Too much paperwork

Lack of test instruments

Lack of inservices

Lack of proper physical facilities

Lack of materials and supplies

Lack of interest and support from parents

Difficulty with integrating bilingual and non-bilingual program demands

Difficulty with implementation of program components

Lack of English as a Second Language (ESL) program support

Low numbers in Intermediate/Upper grades affecting program organization.

No problems with the support services from the district were expressed.

2. These problems were found to fall under tasks identified in the professional literature's research such as curriculum development, development of learning resources, selection of staff, organizing for instruction, staff development/training, use of resources and/or support services, physical plant, and school/community involvement.

Implications Derived from the Study

The following recommendations were made by the principals in the study during the interview for the implementation and administration of bilingual education programs:

To have system-wide testing of students to compare progress

To provide programs for over-age illiterate students in native language

To provide programs and models to meet the needs of intermediate/upper grade students which are few in

number

To promote for more funding for the program

Maintenance bilingual programs are needed to become really/fully bilingual students

To provide for more teacher aides so as to provide for assistance the different instructional needs

To provide for inservices to administer the law: "can't implement it don't know."

To increase services of bilingual diagnostic teams (special education)

The principal must have the oppportunity to select the teachers

To provide for more clear, definite guidelines for the exit criteria of students

To reduce class size

To provide for more bilingual teachers that are fluent in both English/Spanish

To provide for a bilingual lead teacher

To provide all-day kindergarten programs

To improve parental involvement and provide for more parent training

To involve parents, teachers and students in the decision making process (and administrative team)

To provide for more computer labs for students.

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM THE STUDY

1. As the principals interviewed expressed that the

main sources of information used for the implementation and administration of the bilingual education program were state and local rules, policies and guidelines, they could benefit from a complete manual for the implementation and administration of state funded bilingual education programs. Following are suggested topics for inclusion:

the philosophy of the program,

clear guidelines and criteria for identification,

selection and placement of students in the program,

citeria for movement within and out of the program,

available curriculum and materials,

organizational models,

available resource personnel,

list of specific tasks for program implementation and administration,

problem-solving techniques,

procedures for forming parent advisory bodies

2. Better training programs should be developed by state and other higher learning institutions for administrators of bilingual education programs in Chicago.

3. The Chicago Public School System must provide better training and inservice programs for principals, teachers, and parents involved in bilingual education programs on an on-going basis.

4. To facilitate their transition into the administration of the programs, new principals and/or those

principals having no previous experience in administering bilingual education programs should be receiving intensive training in the following areas:

philosophy of bilingual education,

rules and policies,

curriculum and instruction,

culture and folklore of the target population,

tasks for the implementation and administration of the program

5. Principals administering bilingual education programs should be provided with the latest research data on the implementation and administration of the program.

6. The opportunity to select the bilingual education teachers should be given to the principals.

7. More bilingual staff at the local school level should be provided to assist the principals in the implementation and administration of the programs.

8. A support system for new and/or less experienced principals administering bilingual education programs should be instituted in the Chicago Public School System. More experienced principals could be assigned to assist in problem solving the new or less-experienced ones within the district.

9. More funding is needed to properly implement and administer the bilingual education programs in the Chicago Public School System.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE STUDY

1. A similar research study should be conducted at the high school level in the Chicago Public School System.

2. Research should be conducted on other government funded bilingual education programs such as Title VII, Refugee, Immigrant, etc. to ascertain the tasks for the implementation and administration of those programs in the Chicago Public School System.

3. A comparative research study should be conducted which focuses on the similarities and differences in the tasks for the implementation and administration of non-bilingual programs and bilingual education programs in Chicago Public Schools.

4. A replication of this study should be conducted in five to ten years in order to ascertain changes in the tasks for the implementation and administration of state bilingual programs in Chicago Elementary Public Schools.

5. A research study to ascertain the tasks for the implementation and administration of state-funded bilingual education programs in other urban, suburban and rural districts in Illinois should be conducted.

6. A study of the impact of the current school reform movement on the tasks for the implementation and administration of bilingual education programs in Chicago Public Schools should be undertaken.

7. A comparative research study should be conducted

in Chicago Public Schools to determine the similarities and differences in the tasks for the implementation and administration of bilingual education programs in smaller elementary school districts in Chicago Elementary Public Schools.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

J.V. Aguilar. "The Building Principal's Role in Bilingual Education Programs. Journal of Teacher Education 30 (May-June 1979): 26-28.

David J. Alexander and Alfonso Nava. "Public Policy Analysis of Bilingual Education in California." (San Francisco: R & E Research Associates, 1976), photocopies.

Marquez Bixler. "The Introduction of Bilingual Education Programs: A Collaborative Approach." Education 105:443-447.

Theodore Anderson and Mildred Boyer. "Bilingual Schooling: An Historical Sampling." In Bilingual Schooling in the United States, ed. Francisco Cordasco. New York: Macmillan, 1976, 2.

John W. Best. Research in Education. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1981.

Bilingual Act of 1974, Bilingual Education - 20 USC 880 (b).

George Blanco. "The Educational Perspective." Bilingual Education Current Perspectives 4 (Arlington, Virginia: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1977), 27-28.

Ronald Campbell, Edwin Bridges, and Raphael J. Nystrand. Introduction to Educational Administration. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1977.

Chicago, Illinois, Rules - Chicago Board of Education, (1988), Sec. 6-12.

Chicago Public Schools, Implementation Handbook: Bilingual Education Programs in the Elementary Schools (Board of Education, 1988), 99.

Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 USC - 2000 (c), Title VII.

Therese Nicole Daugirdas. "An Analysis of the Managerial Functions of the Elementary School Principal as Reflected in the Professional Literature and as Stated in the Professional Negotiations Agreements of Selected Districts." Ed.D. Dissertation, Loyola University of Chicago, 1979.

Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Identify of Discrimination and Denial of Services on the Basis of National Origin (May 25th Memo - 35 Fed Reg, 11565, 1970).

Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Management Guide for Bilingual Supervisory Personnel. San Jose Unified School District, California, by Curtis Cooper. (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1978).

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Identity of Discrimination and Denial of Services on the Basis of National Origin (May 25th Memo - 35th Federal Register, 11565, 1970.

Rafael Estupinian. "Obstacles in the Administration of Bilingual Programs." Paper presented at the AMAE State Annual Conference, 4 October 1979, ERIC Reproduction Services, ED 171 853.

Ricardo Garcia. "Learning in Two Languages." Phi Delta Kappa Education Foundation (1976): 46-47.

Cynthia Porter Gehric and others. The Principalship: Report on Ethnographic Study of School Administration in Chicago, 5-25, 1978. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 150702.

Norma Goonen, Susan B. Angulo, and Millie Velez. Bilingual Education; Florida Administration Manual. (Miami, Florida, April, 1983), ERIC ED 265 231.

Richard A. Gorton. School Administration: Challenge and Opportunity for Leadership. Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown Co., 1976.

Wayne K. Hoy and Cecil G. Miskel. Educational Administration: Theory, Research and Practice. New York: Random House, 1982.

Illinois Office of Education, The School Code of Illinois, (1977), Sec. 10-21-4a.

Illinois Revised Statutes (1973), Ch. 122, Art. 146.

John T. Knetz and Donald J. Williams. "Elementary School Principals Work Behavior." Educational Administration Quarterly, (Fall 1982): 62-77.

Stephen J. Knezevich. Administration of Public Education. New York: Harper and Row Publisehrs, 1975.

Lau v. Nichols, 438 f.2d 791 (9th Circ. 1973).

Hoeh Lipham, Jr. The Principalship: Foundations and Functions, 10.

Quinn McNemar. Psychological Statistics. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc, 1969.

Hortensia Medina-Torres. "Impact of the Bilingual-Bicultural Education Program on the Self-Perceived Role of the Elementary School Principal in Southern California." Ed.D. Dissertation, University of Southern California, 1980.

E. Miklos. "Approaches to School Administration." Paper presented for the Educational Division of the Commonwealth Secretariat, January, 1975.

Van Miller, George R. Madden, and James B. Kincheloe. The Public Administration of American School Systems. New York: Macmillan Co., 1972.

Van Cleve Morris and others. Principals in Action: Reality of Managing Schools. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Pub. Co., 1984.

Flor Ida Ortiz, "The Administration of Bilingual Education Programs." Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Convention, San Francisco, California, April, 1979.

Robert Owens. Organizational Behavior in Schools. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1980.

Ernest Perez. Perspectives on Management and Education.

K.D. Peterson. "The Principal's Tasks." Administration Notebook 8 (1977-78): 14.

Cynthia Porter-Gehrie and others. The Principalship: Report on an Ethnographic Study of School Administration in Chicago, 5-25, 1978, ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 150 702.

Beverly C. Renner. "Elementary Principals' Work Life - They do What?" Education 107 (Winter 1986): 173-77.

Harry P. Rossi, Jr. "The Role and Functions of the Elementary School Principals in Illinois." Ed.D. Dissertation, Loyola University of Chicago, 1985.

Sylvia Hassan Rothfarb. "Systems Manoz Model for Planning Implementation, and Evaluation of Transitional Bilingual Education Programs in Florida." Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Miami, 1980.

Columbus Salley, R. Bruce McPherson, and Melanie E. Baehr. "What Principals Do: A Preliminary Analysis." In Principal in the Metropolitan Schools, ed. Erickson and Reller. McCutchen Press, 1979.

Gilbert Sanchez and Alfred Cali. A Comparative Study of the Roles and Functions of School Principals and Bilingual Administrators, 1977, ERIC ED 137-940.

Richard W. Saxe. Educational Administration Today: An Introduction. Ohio: University of Toledo, 1980.

Colman Stein. Sink or Swim. The Politics of Bilingual Education.

John R. Stevenson. "The Contribution of Selected Administrative Factors to the Success of the Innovative Educational Programs in Bilingual Navajo Indian Schools." D.Ed. Dissertation, Northern Arizona University, 1979.

Jim Sweeney and Bob Vittengl. "What Makes a Principal Tick." Principal 3 (January 1987):54.

Herbert Teitelbaum and others. "Changing Schools. The Language Minority Student in the 80's." (Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington, D.C., 1982).

Felix Valbuena and others. Guide to the Administration of Bilingual-Bicultural Programs in Detroit Public Schools. (Detroit, Michigan: Michigan State Department of Education, Detroit Division of Educational Services, 1978), 1-68, ERIC ED 210 398.

Leonard A. Valverde. "Instructional Leadership for Bicultural Programs: Role Responsibilities and Relationships." Education and Urban Society 10 (1978): 337-46.

_____. "Supervision of Instruction in Bilingual Education Program." Bilingual Education for Latinos (1979): 65-80.

_____. "A Literature Review: Competencies for Principals of Bilingual Community Schools." Paper presented at the North Annual International Bilingual-Bicultural Conference, Anaheim, California, April, 1980, ERIC ED 207 198.

APPENDIX A

SPECIAL PROJECT REQUEST--CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS

SUMMARY INFORMATION

Project Title_____

_____

Purpose _____

_____

Time TOTAL_____ START_____ END_____

Sponsor _____
UNIVERSITY, ORGANIZATION, AGENCY, ETC.

Approval _____
INSTRUCTOR, CHAIRMAN, SUPERVISOR, DIRECTORS, AUTHORIZATION

Funding _____
GRANT, AWARD, FOUNDATION, ETC.

PROCEDURES: (Explain in detail the procedures to be used — if necessary attach additional copy)

Location: (Schools, Offices, etc. — if necessary attach listing)

Instruments: (Specify and attach sample)

_____ QUESTIONNAIRE _____ TESTS _____ INTERVIEW _____ OTHER

IDENTIFICATION

Name_____

Present Position_____

Reason for Study_____

Home Address_____ Home Phone_____

_____

Business Address_____ Bus. Phone_____

_____

Signature_____ Date_____

102

Department of Research and Evaluation

SPECIAL PROJECTS

Guidelines and Procedures

Special Projects to be conducted in the Chicago public schools should conform to the systemwide goals and objectives adopted by the Board of Education and, in general, should not:

- be disruptive to the program of instruction
- contain advertising or bias
- involve using pupils to distribute announcements or other materials
- involve the privacy of pupils, parents or teachers with respect to religion, race, socioeconomic status, political opinions or other personal matters
- require the use or release of school test data
- require access to school records
- require the release of pupils', parents', or teachers' names and/or addresses
- require pupils or teachers to complete questionnaire, inventories, or tests
- be too time consuming for staff or children

Requests for special projects are to be submitted on the Special Request form available from:

Charlene W. Godwin
Department of Research and Evaluation
1819 West Pershing Road, 5W (n)
Chicago, Illinois 60609

Return the application form (original and first two copies) to Ms. Godwin, along with an abstract of your proposal (thesis, dissertation project) indicating its purpose, methodology, and expected outcome/value. Requests should be submitted early enough to allow for review and processing which usually requires a minimum of six to eight weeks.

The review of the request will be coordinated through the Department of Research and Evaluation with the appropriate staff responsible for the specific areas related to the special project. After the request has been reviewed a written response indicating approval or disapproval will be provided.

You are NOT to contact the prospective schools until approval is received.

CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Manford Byrd
General Superintendent of Schools

1819 West Pershing Road • Chicago, Illinois 60609 • Telephone 1-312/890-3710

Joseph W. Lee
Deputy Superintendent of Schools

February 25, 1988

Dear Principal:

This is to inform you about the implementation of a research study entitled: "Administration Tasks in the Implementation of Bilingual Education Programs." This research study is to be conducted by Ms. Olga Villalba, a doctoral candidate at the College of Education, Administration and Supervision, Loyola University. The main focus of the study is to analyze the similarities and differences between the tasks for the administration of bilingual education programs present in the literature, and the task for the administration of bilingual education program actually performed by Chicago Public School principals.

The protocol includes and is limited to the following activities:

- School principals of the selected sites (as per application) will complete a four-part questionnaire, "Examining Administrative Tasks in the Implementation of Bilingual Education Programs."
- A short interview will be conducted using the Examining Administrative Tasks in the Implementation of Bilingual Education Programs--Principal Interview form. This interview will take approximately 15 minutes and will be conducted with twenty randomly selected principals.

The researcher will provide you with a letter which briefly states the purpose of the study and provides a guarantee of anonymity of all data collected. Ms. Olga Villalba will contact you to present the project in full detail. Your cooperation in this research study is requested.

Sincerely,

Joseph W. Lee

JWL:imw

cc: Dr. Carole Perlman
Mrs. Clara Rosiles
Mrs. Aracelis Figueroa
Dr. Olga Kaszubowski
Mr. Frank Ventura

February, 1988

Dear Principal:

I am currently conducting a research study that attempts to identify and analyze the tasks for the administration of bilingual education programs performed by the elementary school principals in the Chicago Public Schools. This study has been approved for implementation by Loyola University and the Chicago Public Schools.

To gather data for this study, I am asking you to complete the attached questionnaire. I will also be conducting interviews on a small random number of principals. If you would like to volunteer for the interview, please fill out the form below and return it along with the completed questionnaire in the enclosed envelope.

Please be assured that the data collected will be confidential and will only be reported by district.

I appreciate your taking the time to participate in this study. Thank you for your cooperation. If you have any questions, please feel free to call me at 292-5255 or 327-7320 after 5:30 p.m.

Sincerely,

Olga Villalba

Olga Villalba
3600 N. Lake Shore
Chicago, Illinois 60613

rtt
Enclosure

I am interested in participating in the interviews. I understand all information provided is confidential and that my anonymity is guaranteed.

Name: _____

School: _____

APPENDIX B

ADMINISTRATIVE TASKS IN THE IMPLEMENTATION
OF BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS
PRINCIPAL QUESTIONNAIRE

I. GENERAL INFORMATION

Sex_____ Bilingual _____ _____ Other Language _____
Yes No (If Yes)

Number of years of experience as a principal _____

Number of years of experience administering a bilingual education program _____

Total Student Population in your school _____

Total Bilingual Education Program Student Population in your school _____

Number of Bilingual Education Programs in your school _____
(Other than State Funded-More than twenty)

Funding Source (s)_____
(State, Title VII, etc)

School Organization _____
(Pk, K to 6, K to 8)

Have you participated or will participate in training and/or inservice sessions dealing with the implementation of the bilingual education program?

_____

II. Following are ten tasks that have been identified for the administration of bilingual education programs.

1. Rank According to Time Spent: Please rank the tasks 1-11 according to the amount of time you spend on them during the school year, e.g. a ranking of 1 should be given to the tasks on which you spend the most time, and, finally, a ranking of 11 should be given to the task on which you spend the least time.

2. Rank According to Importance: Please rank the tasks 1-11 according to their importance e.g., a ranking of 1 should be given to the most important task and, finally, a ranking of 11 should be given to the least important one.

RANK ACCORDING TO TIME SPENT		TASK	RANK ACCORDING TO IMPORTANCE
_____	1.	Identify Limited-English Proficient Students (LEPS) using the Multilingual Data Form	_____
_____	2.	Place identified students in an appropriate bilingual program	_____
_____	3.	Select an organizational model (self-contained, etc.)	_____
_____	4.	Identify staff and facilities	_____
_____	5.	Identify appropriate curriculum and instructional materials	_____
_____	6.	Begin instruction	_____
_____	7.	Provide staff orientation and/or in-service training	_____
_____	8.	Form a bilingual advisory parent committee	_____
_____	9.	Evaluate student progress	_____

_____ 10. Update student instructional categories at the end of the year using the Bilingual Information Form (BIF) _____

_____ 11. Other/Additional task _____ _____

_____ _____ _____

III. 1. What specific problems have you encountered in the implementation of the bilingual education program at your school? Please List

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

2. What recommendations would you make for the implementation of the bilingual education program at your school? Be Specific

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

3. Comments: _____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

APPENDIX C

ADMINISTRATIVE TASKS IN THE IMPLEMENTATION
OF
BILINGUAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

PRINCIPAL INTERVIEW

I. GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Sex: F_____ M_____
2. Bilingual: No_____ Yes_____
   Language: _____
3. Years of experience as a principal:
   _____
4. Years of experience administering a bilingual program:_____
5. School organization: PK-8_____ K-8_____
   K-6_____ Other_____
6. Total student popuilation in school:_____
7. Total student population in bilingual program:_____
8. Have received inservice and/or training on the implementation of the bilingual program:
   Yes_____ No_____

II. QUESTIONNAIRE (Please refer to Part IV)

A. The following questions would serve to clarify some of the data obtained from the previously completed questionnaire:

1. How many of these tasks do you actually perform? Please list by number.

_____

_____

2. How many of these tasks do you delegate? Please list by number.

_____

_____

3. To whom do you delegate these tasks?

_____

4. Do you receive any assistance from resource personnel outside your school for the implementation of the bilingual program in your school?
   Yes_____ From whom?_____ In what area?
   _____ No_____ Why not?_____

5. In your opinion, is this service needed?
   Yes_____ Why?_____ No_____ Why not?_____

6. Do you seek assistance from other principals in your district when needed?
   Yes_____ Explain_____

7. Do you have documents to assist you in the implementation and administration of the bilingual program?
   Yes_____ What are the sources?_____
   No_____

8. What sources of information do you use for the implementation of the bilingual program at your school?_____

B. The following are the results of the Principal Questionnaire previously completed about the tasks for the implementation of bilingual programs. The tasks were ranked to according to A. Time spent on task (Most to Least), and B. Importance of task (Most to Least). I would like to discuss these findings with you, so as to clarify some of the data obtained.

A. Time spent on task (Most to Least)

1_____10

Most 1. Placement of Students in Program
2. Identification of Students
3. Evaluate Students Progress
4. Identify Curriculum and Materials
5. Provide Staff Orientation and Inservice
6. Identify Staff and Facilities
7. Form Advisory Council
8. Begin Instruction
9. Select Organizational Model

Least 10. Upgrade Students Instructional Category at End of Year

11. Other

B. Importance of task (Most or Least)

1_____10)

Most 1. Placement of Students in Program
2. Identification of Students

3. Identify Curriculum and Materials
4. Identify Staff and Facilities
5. Begin Instruction
6. Select Organizational Models
7. Provide Staff Development and Inservices
8. Evaluate Students Progress
9. Update Students Instructional Category at End of Year

Least 10. Form Advisory Council
11. Other

C. Please check (X) from the following, the specific problems that you have encountered in the implementation and administration of the bilingual program at your school:

1. Lack of bilingual teachers_____
2. Lack of materials and supplies_____
3. Lack of consistency in policy interpretations regarding the implementation of the program (student assessment and placement, exit criteria, instructional program, etc.)_____
4. Lack of Tests (Sp.L.A., E.S.L., etc.)

_____

5. Lack of interest and/or support from parents_____
6. Transiency of students_____
7. Lack of sufficient funding for the program_____
8. Lack of training and/or inservice for administrators, teachers, etc._____
9. Lack of district support and/or commitment

_____

10. Lack of proper physical facilities_____
11. Lack of support services for the limited English proficient students_____
12. Too much paper work and/or record keeping, etc. dealing with the bilingual program_____
13. Difficulty of meshing bilingual and all English program demands_____
14. Instructional program components_____
15. Other_____

_____

D. Pleae list your recommendations for the implementation and administration of the bilingual program:_____

_____

III. Comments:_____

_____

APPENDIX D

```
     16  0   IDENIMP ' IMPORTANCE IDENTIFY LPS '
     17  0   PLCRANK ' TIME SPENT PLACE LPS '
     18  0   PLCIMP ' IMPORTANCE PLACE LPS '
     19  0   ORGRANK ' TIME SPENT TO SELECT AN ORGANIZATIONAL MODEL'
     20  0   ORGIMP ' IMPORTANCE OF SELECT AN ORGANIZATIONAL MODEL'
     21  0   STFRANK ' TIME SPENT TO IDENTIFY STAFF '
     22  0   STFIMP ' IMPORTANCE TO IDENTIFY STAFF '
     23  0   CURRRANK ' TIME SPENT TO IDENTIFY CURRICULUM'
     24  0   CURRIMP ' IMPORTANCE TO IDENTIFY CURRICULUM'
     25  0   INSTRANK ' TIME SPENT TO BEGIN INSTRUCTION '
     26  0   INSTIMP ' IMPORTANCE TO BEGIN INSTRUCTION '
     27  0   INSRANK ' TIME SPENT TO PROVIDE INSERVICE TRAINING'
     28  0   INSIMP ' IMPORTANCE TO PROVIDE INSERVICE TRAINING'
     29  0   ADVRANK ' TIME SPENT TO FORM ADVISORY PARENT COMMITTEE '
     30  0   ADVIMP ' IMPORTANCE TO FORM ADVISORY PARENT COMMITTEE '
     31  0   EVALRANK '  TIME SPENT TO EVALUATE STUDENTS PROGRESS '
     32  0   EVALIMP '  IMPORTANCE TO EVALUATE STUDENTS PROGRESS '
     33  0   CATRANK ' TIME SPENT TO UPDATE STUDENT CATEGORIES AT YEAR END '
     34  0   CATIMP ' IMPORTANCE TO UPDATE STUDENT CATEGORIES AT YEAR END '
     35  0   OTHRRANK ' TIME SPENT DOING OTHER TASKS '
     36  0   OTHERIMP ' IMPORTANCE OF DOING OTHER TASKS '
     37  0  /*
     38  0  MISSING VALUES IDENRANK TO OTHERIMP (0)
     39  0  FREQUENCIES VARIABLES=IDENRANK TO OTHERIMP/
     40  0    HISTOGRAM/  STATISTICS=ALL/
     41  0  /*  DESCRIPTIVES VARIABLES=IDENRANK TO OTHERIMP/
     42  0  /*  FREQUENCIES VARIABLES=IDENRANK TO OTHERIMP/
     43  0  /*   STATISTICS=MEAN /HISTOGRAM/
OThere are 1,266,200 bytes of memory available.
 The largest contiguous area has 1,266,200 bytes.
OMemory allows a total of 32,767 values accumulated across all variables.
 There may be up to 8,192 value labels for each variable.
12-Apr-89   SPSS-X RELEASE 3.1 FOR IBM VM/CMS
 15:08:16    Univ. of Illinois at Chicago    IBM-3081K          VM/CMS

OIDENRANK (1) TIME SPENT IDENTIFY LPS  A
```

Value	Value Label	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
1		9	20.9	22.5	22.5
2		8	18.6	20.0	42.5
3		5	11.6	12.5	55.0
4		1	2.3	2.5	57.5
5		1	2.3	2.5	60.0
6		4	9.3	10.0	70.0
7		3	7.0	7.5	77.5
8		2	4.7	5.0	82.5
9		1	2.3	2.5	85.0
10		3	7.0	7.5	92.5
11		3	7.0	7.5	100.0
0		3	7.0	Missing	
Total		43	100.0	100.0	

```
O
   Count      Value    One symbol equals approximately   .20 occurrences

       9       1.00  ****************************************
       8       2.00  ************************************
       5       3.00  ***********************
       1       4.00  *****
```

```
          1        5.00  *****
          4        6.00  ********************
          3        7.00  **********
          2        8.00  **********
          1        9.00  *****
          3       10.00  **********
          3       11.00  **********
                         I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
                         0         2         4         6         8        10
                                  Histogram frequency

  Mean            4.850      Std err          .544      Median          3.000
  Mode            1.000      Std dev         3.441      Variance       11.844
  Kurtosis       -1.020      S E Kurt         .733      Skewness         .638
  S E Skew         .374      Range          10.000      Minimum         1.000
  Maximum         11.000      Sum          182.000

  Valid cases       40      Missing cases       3
  22-Apr-89   SPSS-X RELEASE 3.1 FOR IBM VM/CMS
  15:03:18    Univ. of Illinois at Chicago   IBM 3081K          VM/CMS

  IDENTIMY 18 IMPORTANCE INDENTIFY LPS

                                                                 Valid      Cum
  Value Label                Value  Frequency  Percent          Percent    Percent

                                 1         20     46.5             50.0       50.0
                                 2          7     16.3             17.5       67.5
                                 3          1      2.3              2.5       70.0
                                 4          4      9.3             10.0       80.0
                                 5          1      2.3              2.5       82.5
                                 6          2      4.7              5.0       87.5
                                 8          1      2.3              2.5       90.0
                                 9          3      7.0              7.5       97.5
                                11          1      2.3              2.5      100.0
                                 0          3      7.0          Missing
                           ------------------------------------------------------
                             Total         43    100.0            100.0

  Count        Value     One symbol equals approximately   .40 occurrences

       20         1.00  **************************************************
        7         2.00  *****************
        1         3.00  ***
        4         4.00  **********
        1         5.00  ***
        2         6.00  *****
        0         7.00
        1         8.00  ***
        3         9.00  ********
        0        10.00
        1        11.00  ***
                         I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
                         0         4         8        12        16        20
                                  Histogram frequency

  Mean            2.900      Std err          .445      Median          1.500
  Mode            1.000      Std dev         2.818      Variance        7.939
  Kurtosis        1.316      S E Kurt         .733      Skewness        1.541
  S E Skew         .374      Range          10.000      Minimum         1.000
  Maximum         11.000      Sum          116.000
```

Valid cases 40 Missing cases 3
22-Apr-89 SPSS-X RELEASE 3.1 FOR IBM VM/CMS
15:03:15 Univ. of Illinois at Chicago IBM 3081K VM/CMS

PLOT (2) A TIME SPENT PLACE LPS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1	6	14.0	15.4	15.4
	2	10	23.3	25.6	41.0
	3	5	11.6	12.8	53.8
	4	3	7.0	7.7	61.5
	5	5	11.6	12.8	74.4
	6	6	14.0	15.4	89.7
	7	2	4.7	5.1	94.9
	9	1	2.3	2.6	97.4
	10	1	2.3	2.6	100.0
	0	4	9.3	Missing	
	Total	43	100.0	100.0	

Count	Value	One symbol equals approximately .20 occurrences
6	1.00	******************************
10	2.00	**
5	3.00	*************************
3	4.00	***************
5	5.00	*************************
6	6.00	******************************
2	7.00	**********
0	8.00	
1	9.00	*****
1	10.00	*****

I.....I.....I.....I.....I.....I
0 2 4 6 8 10
Histogram frequency

Mean	3.769	Std err	.372	Median	3.000
Mode	2.000	Std dev	2.372	Variance	5.393
Kurtosis	.019	S E Kurt	.741	Skewness	.761
S E Skew	.378	Range	9.000	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	10.000	Sum	147.000		

Valid cases 39 Missing cases 4
22-Apr-89 SPSS-X RELEASE 3.1 FOR IBM VM/CMS
15:03:15 Univ. of Illinois at Chicago IBM 3081K VM/CMS

PLOT (2) B IMPORTANCE PLACE LPS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1	3	7.0	7.9	7.9
	2	16	37.2	42.1	50.0
	3	8	18.6	21.1	71.1
	4	5	11.6	13.2	84.2
	5	6	14.0	15.8	100.0
	0	5	11.6	Missing	

```
                          Total         43     100.0     100.0
0
     Count        Value    One symbol equals approximately    .40 occurrences

         3         1.00   ********
        16         2.00   ****************************************
         8         3.00   ********************
         5         4.00   *************
         6         5.00   ***************
                          I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
                          0         4         8         12        16        20
                                     Histogram frequency

Mean          2.868      Std err         .200      Median          2.500
Mode          2.000      Std dev        1.234      Variance        1.523
Kurtosis      -.823      S E Kurt        .750      Skewness         .536
S E Skew       .383      Range          4.000      Minimum         1.000
Maximum       5.000      Sum          109.000

0Valid cases      38      Missing cases      5
122-Apr-89   SPSS-X RELEASE 3.1 FOR IBM VM/CMS
 15:03:15    Univ. of Illinois at Chicago    IBM 3081K        VM/CMS
```

OORGZRAN 3A TIME SPENT TO SELECT AN ORGANIZATIONAL MODEL

0

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1	2	4.7	4.9	4.9
	2	2	4.7	4.9	9.8
	3	5	11.6	12.2	22.0
	4	2	4.7	4.9	26.8
	5	4	9.3	9.8	36.6
	6	4	9.3	9.8	46.3
	7	2	4.7	4.9	51.2
	8	3	7.0	7.3	58.5
	9	6	14.0	14.6	73.2
	10	10	23.3	24.4	97.6
	11	1	2.3	2.4	100.0
	0	2	4.7	Missing	
	Total	43	100.0	100.0	

```
0
     Count        Value    One symbol equals approximately    .20 occurrences

         2         1.00   **********
         2         2.00   **********
         5         3.00   *************************
         2         4.00   **********
         4         5.00   ********************
         4         6.00   ********************
         2         7.00   **********
         3         8.00   ***************
         6         9.00   ******************************
        10        10.00   **************************************************
         1        11.00   *****
                          I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
                          0         2         4         6         8         10
                                     Histogram frequency

Mean          6.732      Std err         .475      Median          7.000
```

Mode	10.000	Std dev	3.042	Variance	9.251
Kurtosis	-1.230	S E Kurt	.724	Skewness	-.381
S E Skew	.369	Range	10.000	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	11.000	Sum	276.000		

Valid cases 41 Missing cases 2

22-Apr-89 SPSS-X RELEASE 3.1 FOR IBM VM/CMS
15:08:15 Univ. of Illinois at Chicago IBM 3081K VM/CMS

ORGZIMP B IMPORTANCE OF SELECT AN ORGANIZATIONAL

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1	2	4.7	5.1	5.1
	2	2	4.7	5.1	10.3
	3	8	18.6	20.5	30.8
	4	7	16.3	17.9	48.7
	5	1	2.3	2.6	51.3
	6	5	11.6	12.8	64.1
	7	3	7.0	7.7	71.8
	8	2	4.7	5.1	76.9
	9	6	14.0	15.4	92.3
	10	2	4.7	5.1	97.4
	11	1	2.3	2.6	100.0
	0	4	9.3	Missing	
	Total	43	100.0	100.0	

Count	Value	One symbol equals approximately .20 occurrences
2	1.00	**********
2	2.00	**********
8	3.00	**
7	4.00	**********************************
1	5.00	*****
5	6.00	************************
3	7.00	**************
2	8.00	**********
6	9.00	******************************
2	10.00	**********
1	11.00	*****

I.....I.....I.....I.....I.....I
0 2 4 6 8 10
Histogram frequency

Mean	5.513	Std err	.447	Median	5.000
Mode	3.000	Std dev	2.790	Variance	7.783
Kurtosis	-1.122	S E Kurt	.741	Skewness	.281
S E Skew	.378	Range	10.000	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	11.000	Sum	215.000		

Valid cases 39 Missing cases 4

22-Apr-89 SPSS-X RELEASE 3.1 FOR IBM VM/CMS
15:08:15 Univ. of Illinois at Chicago IBM 3081K VM/CMS

OSTFRANK 4A TIME SPENT TO IDENTIFY STAFF & FACILITIES

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent

	3	7.0	7.3	7.3
	4	9.3	9.8	17.1
	3	7.0	7.3	24.4
4	6	14.0	14.6	39.0
5	1	2.3	2.4	41.5
6	2	4.7	4.9	46.3
7	6	14.0	14.6	61.0
8	3	7.0	7.3	68.3
9	7	16.3	17.1	85.4
10	6	14.0	14.6	100.0
0	2	4.7	Missing	
Total	43	100.0	100.0	

Count Value One symbol equals approximately .20 occurrences

```
3     1.00  ***************
4     2.00  ********************
3     3.00  ***************
6     4.00  ******************************
5     5.00  *****
6     6.00  **********
7     7.00  ***********************************
3     8.00  ***************
7     9.00  ***********************************
6     10.00 ******************************
      I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
      0         2         4         6         8        10
                Histogram frequency
```

Mean	6.098	Std err	.473	Median	7.000
Mode	9.000	Std dev	3.082	Variance	9.190
Kurtosis	-1.365	S E Kurt	.724	Skewness	-.251
S E Skew	.369	Range	9.000	Minimum	1.000
Max mum	10.000	Sum	260.000		

Valid cases 41 Missing cases 2

22-MAR-89 SPSS-X RELEASE 3.1 FOR IBM VM/CMS

Page 3 Univ. of Illinois at Chicago IBM 3081K VM/CMS

QUESTION 48 IMPORTANCE TO FRIENDLY STAFF & FACILITIES

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1	5	11.6	12.8	12.8
	2	6	14.0	15.4	28.2
	3	5	11.6	12.8	41.0
	4	4	9.3	10.3	51.3
	5	2	4.7	5.1	56.4
	6	3	7.0	7.7	64.1
	7	4	9.3	10.3	74.4
	8	5	11.6	12.8	87.2
	9	4	9.3	10.3	97.4
	10	1	2.3	2.6	100.0
	0	4	9.3	Missing	
	Total	43	100.0	100.0	

Count Value One symbol equals approximately .20 occurrences

```
          5        5.00  **********************
          6        2.00  ************************************
          5        3.00  **********************
          4        4.00  ******************
          2        5.00  *********
          3        6.00  **************
          4        7.00  ******************
          5        8.00  **********************
          4        9.00  ******************
          1   .   10.00  *****
                    I.........I.........I.........I.........I.....*...I
                    0         2         4         6         8        10
                              Histogram frequency
```

Mean	4.872	Std err	.438	Median	4.000
Mode	2.000	Std dev	2.868	Variance	8.167
Kurtosis	-1.397	S E Kurt	.741	Skewness	.172
S E Skew	.378	Range	9.000	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	10.000	Sum	190.000		

Valid cases 39 Missing cases 4

12-Apr-89 SPSS-X RELEASE 3.1 FOR IBM VM/CMS

15:08:15 Univ. of Illinois at Chicago IBM 3081K VM/CMS

OCURRANK 5A TIME SPENT TO IDENTIFY CURRICULUM – Instructional Mat-

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1	6	14.0	14.3	14.3
	2	4	9.3	9.5	23.8
	3	6	14.0	14.3	38.1
	4	7	16.3	16.7	54.8
	5	5	11.6	11.9	66.7
	6	4	9.3	9.5	76.2
	7	3	7.0	7.1	83.3
	8	2	4.7	4.8	88.1
	9	3	7.0	7.1	95.2
	10	2	4.7	4.8	100.0
	0	1	2.3	Missing	
	Total	43	100.0	100.0	

```
     Count        Value    One symbol equals approximately   .20 occurrences

         6         1.00  ******************************
         4         2.00  ********************
         6         3.00  ******************************
         7         4.00  ***********************************
         5         5.00  *************************
         4         6.00  ********************
         3         7.00  ***************
         2         8.00  **********
         3         9.00  ***************
         2        10.00  **********
                    I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
                    0         2         4         6         8        10
                              Histogram frequency
```

Mean	4.595	Std err	.409	Median	4.000
Mode	4.000	Std dev	2.651	Variance	7.027

```
Kurtosis        -.691       S E Kurt        .717       Skewness        .453
S E Skew        .365       Range          9.000       Minimum        1.000
Maximum       10.000       Sum          193.000

Valid cases       42       Missing cases      1
22-Apr-89   SPSS-X RELEASE 3.1 FOR IBM VM/CMS
15:03:15    Univ. of Illinois at Chicago   IBM 3081K          VM/CMS
```

OCCURRENCES IMPORTANCE TO IDENTIFY CURRICULUM

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1	5	11.6	12.5	12.5
	2	3	7.0	7.5	20.0
	3	5	11.6	12.5	32.5
	4	5	11.6	12.5	45.0
	5	9	20.9	22.5	67.5
	6	4	9.3	10.0	77.5
	7	4	9.3	10.0	87.5
	8	2	4.7	5.0	92.5
	9	2	4.7	5.0	97.5
	10	1	2.3	2.5	100.0
	0	3	7.0	Missing	
	Total	43	100.0	100.0	

```
     Count       Value     One symbol equals approximately   .20 occurrences

         5        1.00     ************************
         3        2.00     ***************
         5        3.00     ************************
         5        4.00     ************************
         9        5.00     ****************************************
         4        6.00     ******************
         4        7.00     ******************
         2        8.00     **********
         2        9.00     **********
         1       10.00     *****
                           I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
                           0         2         4         6         8        10
                                    Histogram frequency
```

```
Mean            4.675       Std err         .378       Median         6.000
Mode            5.000       Std dev        2.390       Variance       5.712
Kurtosis        -.511       S E Kurt        .733       Skewness        .229
S E Skew        .374       Range          9.000       Minimum        1.000
Maximum       10.000       Sum          187.000

Valid cases       40       Missing cases      3
22-Apr-89   SPSS-X RELEASE 3.1 FOR IBM VM/CMS
15:03:15    Univ. of Illinois at Chicago   IBM 3081K          VM/CMS
```

```
     16  0    IDENIMP  ' IMPORTANCE INDENTIFY LPS '
     17  0    PLCRANK  ' TIME SPENT PLACE LPS '
     18  0    PLCIMP   ' IMPORTANCE PLACE LPS '
     19  0    ORGZRANK ' TIME SPENT TO SELECT AN ORGANIZATIONAL MODEL'
     20  0    ORGZIMP  ' IMPORTANCE OF SELECT AN ORGANIZATIONAL MODEL'
     21  0    STFRANK  ' TIME SPENT TO IDENTIFY STAFF '
     22  0    STFIMP   ' IMPORTANCE TO IDENTIFY STAFF '
     23  0    CURRRANK ' TIME SPENT TO IDENTIFY CURRICULUM'
     24  0    CURRIMP  ' IMPORTANCE TO IDENTIFY CURRICULUM'
     25  0    INSTRANK ' TIME SPENT TO BEGIN INSTRUCTION '
     26  0    INSTIMP  ' IMPORTANCE TO BEGIN INSTRUCTION '
     27  0    INSRANK  ' TIME SPENT TO PROVIDE INSERVICE TRAINING'
     28  0    INSIMP   ' IMPORTANCE TO PROVIDE INSERVICE TRAINING'
     29  0    ADVRANK  ' TIME SPENT TO FORM ADVISORY PARENT COMMITTEE '
     30  0    ADVIMP   ' IMPORTANCE TO FORM ADVISORY PARENT COMMITTEE '
     31  0    EVALRANK '  TIME SPENT TO EVALUATE STUDENTS PROGRESS '
     32  0    EVALIMP  '  IMPORTANCE TO EVALUATE STUDENTS PROGRESS '
     33  0    CATRANK  ' TIME SPENT TO UPDATE STUDENT CATEGORIES AT YEAR END '
     34  0    CATIMP   ' IMPORTANCE TO UPDATE STUDENT CATEGORIES AT YEAR END '
     35  0    OTHRRANK ' TIME SPENT DOING OTHER TASKS '
     36  0    OTHERIMP ' IMPORTANCE OF DOING OTHER TASKS '
     37  0   /*
     38  0   MISSING VALUES IDENRANK TO OTHERIMP (0) .
     39  0   /*VARIABLE LIST VARIABLES=IDENRANK TO OTHERIMP/
     40  0   FREQUENCIES VARIABLES=INSTRANK TO OTHERIMP/
     41  0     HISTOGRAM/  STATISTICS=ALL/
     42  0   /*  DESCRIPTIVES VARIABLES=IDENRANK TO OTHERIMP/
     43  0   /*  FREQUENCIES VARIABLES=IDENRANK TO OTHERIMP/
     44  0   /*   STATISTICS=MEAN /HISTOGRAM/
0There are 1,266,200 bytes of memory available.
 The largest contiguous area has 1,266,200 bytes.
0Memory allows a total of 32,767 values accumulated across all variables.
 There may be up to 8,192 value labels for each variable.
122-Apr-89   SPSS-X RELEASE 3.1 FOR IBM VM/CMS
 15:35:28    Univ. of Illinois at Chicago   IBM 3081K          VM/CMS

0INSTRANK  TIME SPENT TO BEGIN INSTRUCTION

0
   Value Label                  Value  Frequency  Percent  Valid Percent  Cum Percent

                                    1          2      4.7            5.1          5.1
                                    2          2      4.7            5.1         10.3
                                    3          1      2.3            2.6         12.8
                                    4          2      4.7            5.1         17.9
                                    5          7     16.3           17.9         35.9
                                    6          6     14.0           15.4         51.3
                                    7          4      9.3           10.3         61.5
                                    8          8     18.6.          20.5         82.1
                                    9          4      9.3           10.3         92.3
                                   10          3      7.0            7.7        100.0
                                    0          4      9.3        Missing
                                -------    -------  -------
                               Total          43    100.0          100.0

0
      Count       Value     One symbol equals approximately   .20 occurrences

          2        1.00  **********
          2        2.00  **********
          1        3.00  *****
          2        4.00  **********
```

```
          7       5.00  ********************************
          6       6.00  ************************************
          4       7.00  ************************
          8       8.00  ************************************************
          4       9.00  ************************
          3      10.00  ******************
                        I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
                        0         2         4         6         8        10
                                 Histogram frequency

Mean            6.308       Std err          .387       Median          6.000
Mode            8.000       Std dev         2.419       Variance        5.850
Kurtosis        -.274       S E Kurt         .741       Skewness        -.522
S E Skew         .378       Range           9.000       Minimum         1.000
Maximum         10.000      Sum           246.000

Valid cases       39        Missing cases      4
22-Apr-89   SPSS-X RELEASE 3.1 FOR IBM VM/CMS
15:35:23    Univ. of Illinois at Chicago   IBM 3081K          VM/CMS

GET STIMP  GB
IMPORTANCE TO BEGIN INSTRUCTION

 Value Label                  Value  Frequency  Percent  Valid Percent  Cum Percent

                                  1          1      2.3            2.6          2.6
                                  2          2      4.7            5.1          7.7
                                  3          6     14.0           15.4         23.1
                                  4          4      9.3           10.3         33.3
                                  5          5     11.6           12.8         46.2
                                  6          9     20.9           23.1         69.2
                                  7          8     18.6           20.5         89.7
                                  8          3      7.0            7.7         97.4
                                 10          1      2.3            2.6        100.0
                                  0          4      9.3        Missing
                                     --------  -------  -------
                            Total         43    100.0          100.0

      Count        Value     One symbol equals approximately   .20 occurrences

          1         1.00  *****
          2         2.00  **********
          6         3.00  ******************************
          4         4.00  ********************
          5         5.00  *************************
          9         6.00  *********************************************
          8         7.00  ****************************************
          3         8.00  ***************
          0         9.00
          1        10.00  *****
                        I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
                        0         2         4         6         8        10
                                 Histogram frequency

Mean            5.333       Std err          .319       Median          6.000
Mode            6.000       Std dev         1.991       Variance        3.965
Kurtosis        -.352       S E Kurt         .741       Skewness        -.151
S E Skew         .378       Range           9.000       Minimum         1.000
Maximum         10.000      Sum           208.000

Valid cases       39        Missing cases      4
```

12-Apr-89 SPSS-X RELEASE 3.1 FOR IBM VM/CMS
15:35:23 Univ. of Illinois at Chicago IBM 3081K VM/CMS

0INSRANK 7A TIME SPENT TO PROVIDE INSERVICE TRAININ

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1	2	4.7	4.8	4.8
	2	4	9.3	9.5	14.3
	3	8	18.6	19.0	33.3
	4	8	18.6	19.0	52.4
	5	6	14.0	14.3	66.7
	6	6	14.0	14.3	81.0
	7	3	7.0	7.1	88.1
	8	2	4.7	4.8	92.9
	9	2	4.7	4.8	97.6
	10	1	2.3	2.4	100.0
	9	1	2.3	Missing	
	Total	43	100.0	100.0	

Count	Value	One symbol equals approximately .20 occurrences
2	1.00	**********
4	2.00	********************
8	3.00	**
8	4.00	**
6	5.00	******************************
6	6.00	******************************
3	7.00	***************
2	8.00	**********
2	9.00	**********
1	10.00	*****

Histogram frequency

Mean	4.690	Std err	.333	Median	4.000
Mode	3.000	Std dev	2.192	Variance	4.804
Kurtosis	-.209	S E Kurt	.717	Skewness	.518
S E Skew	.365	Range	9.000	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	10.000	Sum	197.000		

Valid cases 42 Missing cases 1

12-Apr-89 SPSS-X RELEASE 3.1 FOR IBM VM/CMS
15:35:23 Univ. of Illinois at Chicago IBM 3081K VM/CMS

0INSIMP 7B IMPORTANCE TO PROVIDE INSERVICE TRAININ

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	2	4	9.3	10.0	10.0
	3	3	7.0	7.5	17.5
	4	4	9.3	10.0	27.5
	5	6	14.0	15.0	42.5
	6	12	27.9	30.0	72.5
	7	5	11.6	12.5	85.0
	8	2	4.7	5.0	90.0
	9	2	4.7	5.0	95.0

10	2	4.7	5.0	100.0
0	3	7.0	Missing	
Total	43	100.0	100.0	

Count Value One symbol equals approximately .40 occurrences

```
   4    2.00  **********
   3    3.00  ********
   4    4.00  **********
   6    5.00  ***************
  12    6.00  ******************************
   5    7.00  *************
   2    8.00  *****
   2    9.00  *****
   2   10.00  *****
          I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
          0         4         8        12        16        20
                    Histogram frequency
```

Mean	5.600	Std err	.330	Median	6.000
Mode	6.000	Std dev	2.085	Variance	4.349
Kurtosis	-.179	S E Kurt	.733	Skewness	.101
S E Skew	.374	Range	8.000	Minimum	2.000
Maximum	10.000	Sum	224.000		

Valid cases 40 Missing cases 3

22-Apr-89 SPSS-X RELEASE 3.1 FOR IBM VM/CMS

15:36:23 Univ. of Illinois at Chicago IBM 3081K VM/CMS

8A

ADVRAN4 TIME SPENT TO FORM ADVISORY PARENT COMM

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1	1	2.3	2.4	2.4
	2	1	2.3	2.4	4.9
	3	4	9.3	9.8	14.6
	4	4	9.3	9.8	24.4
	5	5	11.6	12.2	36.6
	6	6	14.0	14.6	51.2
	7	7	16.3	17.1	68.3
	8	5	11.6	12.2	80.5
	9	5	11.6	12.2	92.7
	10	2	4.7	4.9	97.6
	11	1	2.3	2.4	100.0
	0	2	4.7	Missing	
	Total	43	100.0	100.0	

Count Value One symbol equals approximately .20 occurrences

```
   1    1.00  *****
   1    2.00  *****
   4    3.00  ********************
   4    4.00  ********************
   5    5.00  *************************
   6    6.00  ******************************
   7    7.00  ***********************************
   5    8.00  *************************
   5    9.00  *************************
```

```
          2       10.00  **********
          1       11.00  *****
                 I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
                 0         2         4         6         8        10
                           Histogram frequency

Mean            6.268       Std err          .370       Median          6.000
Mode            7.000       Std dev         2.367       Variance        5.601
Kurtosis        -.361       S E Kurt         .724       Skewness        -.159
S E Skew         .369       Range          10.000       Minimum         1.000
Maximum         11.000       Sum          257.000

Valid cases       41      Missing cases       2
12-Apr-89   SPSS-X RELEASE 3.1 FOR IBM VM/CMS
15:30:28    Univ. of Illinois at Chicago   IBM 3081K          VM/CMS

ADVIMP  4B IMPORTANCE TO FORM ADVISORY PARENT COMM

                                                          Valid      Cum
  Value Label                 Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent   Percent

                                3          3      7.0      7.5       7.5
                                5          4      9.3     10.0      17.5
                                6          4      9.3     10.0      27.5
                                7          5     11.6     12.5      40.0
                                8          8     18.6     20.0      60.0
                                9          7     16.3     17.5      77.5
                               10          9     20.9     22.5     100.0
                                0          3      7.0    Missing
                                       -------  -------  -------
                            Total         43    100.0    100.0

  Count          Value    One symbol equals approximately   .20 occurrences

      3          3.00  ***************
      0          4.00
      4          5.00  ********************
      4          6.00  ********************
      5          7.00  *************************
      8          8.00  ****************************************
      7          9.00  ***********************************
      9         10.00  *********************************************
                 I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
                 0         2         4         6         8        10
                           Histogram frequency

Mean            7.625       Std err          .330       Median          8.000
Mode           10.000       Std dev         2.084       Variance        4.343
Kurtosis        -.228       S E Kurt         .733       Skewness        -.741
S E Skew         .374       Range          7.000       Minimum         3.000
Maximum         10.000       Sum          305.000

Valid cases       40      Missing cases       3
12-Apr-89   SPSS-X RELEASE 3.1 FOR IBM VM/CMS
15:30:28    Univ. of Illinois at Chicago   IBM 3081K          VM/CMS

EVALPARN  9A TIME SPENT TO EVALUATE STUDENTS PROGRE

                                                          Valid      Cum
  Value Label                 Value  Frequency  Percent  Percent   Percent
```

1	7	16.3	17.1	17.1
2	2	4.7	4.9	22.0
3	6	14.0	14.6	36.6
4	6	14.0	14.6	51.2
5	5	11.6	12.2	63.4
6	6	14.0	14.6	78.0
7	2	4.7	4.9	82.9
8	4	9.3	9.8	92.7
9	3	7.0	7.3	100.0
0	2	4.7	Missing	
Total	43	100.0	100.0	

```
Count      Value     One symbol equals approximately   .20 occurrences

    7      1.00   **********************************
    2      2.00   **********
    6      3.00   ******************************
    6      4.00   ******************************
    5      5.00   ************************
    6      6.00   ******************************
    2      7.00   **********
    4      8.00   ********************
    3      9.00   ***************
           I.........I.........I.........I.........I
           0         2         4         6         8        10
                    Histogram frequency
```

Mean	4.361	Std err	.391	Median	4.000
Mode	1.000	Std dev	2.500	Variance	6.252
Kurtosis	-.959	S E Kurt	.724	Skewness	.166
S E Skew	.369	Range	8.000	Minimum	1.000
Maximum	9.000	Sum	187.000		

Valid cases 41 Missing cases 2

122-Apr-87 SPSS-X RELEASE 3.1 FOR IBM VM/CMS
15:35:23 Univ. of Illinois at Chicago IBM 3081K VM/CMS

DEVALUE IMPORTANCE TO EVALUATE STUDENTS PROGRE

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	1	2	4.7	5.3	5.3
	2	1	2.3	2.6	7.9
	3	3	7.0	7.9	15.8
	4	5	11.6	13.2	28.9
	5	3	7.0	7.9	36.8
	6	2	4.7	5.3	42.1
	7	8	18.6	21.1	63.2
	8	9	20.9	23.7	86.8
	9	5	11.6	13.2	100.0
	0	5	11.6	Missing	
	Total	43	100.0	100.0	

```
Count      Value     One symbol equals approximately   .20 occurrences

    2      1.00   **********
    1      2.00   *****
    3      3.00   ***************
```

```
Occurrences      4.00  **************************
                 5.00  ***************
                 6.00  **********
                 7.00  ************************************
                 8.00  ***************************************
                 9.00  ************************
                       I.........I.........I.........I.........I
                       0         2         4         6         8        10
                                 Histogram frequency

Mean          6.132      Std err       .381      Median        7.000
Mode          8.000      Std dev      1.250      Variance      5.523
Kurtosis      -.625      S E Kurt      .750      Skewness      -.668
S E Skew      .383       Range        8.000      Minimum       1.000
Maximum       9.000      Sum        238.000

Valid cases      38      Missing cases      5
12-Apr-89   SPSS-X RELEASE 3.1 FOR IBM VM/CMS
15:33:23    Univ. of Illinois at Chicago   IBM 3081K          VM/CMS

OCATRANK 10A TIME SPENT TO UPDATE STUDENT CATEGORIES

0
Value Label                    Value  Frequency  Percent  Valid Percent  Cum Percent

                                   1          2      4.7            5.1          5.1
                                   2          3      7.0            7.7         12.8
                                   3          1      2.3            2.6         15.4
                                   5          3      7.0            7.7         23.1
                                   6          3      7.0            7.7         30.8
                                   7          3      7.0            7.7         38.5
                                   8          6     14.0           15.4         53.8
                                   9          8     18.6           20.5         74.4
                                  10          9     20.9           23.1         97.4
                                  11          1      2.3            2.6        100.0
                                   0          4      9.3        Missing
                               Total         43    100.0          100.0

0
Count      Value    One symbol equals approximately   .20 occurrences

           1.00  **********
           2.00  ***************
           3.00  *****
           4.00
           5.00  ***************
           6.00  ***************
           7.00  ***************
           8.00  ************************************
           9.00  ****************************************
          10.00  ************************************
          11.00  *****
                 I.........I.........I.........I.........I
                 0         2         4         6         8        10
                           Histogram frequency

Mean          7.333      Std err       .456      Median        8.000
Mode         10.000      Std dev      2.880      Variance      8.123
Kurtosis      -.078      S E Kurt      .741      Skewness      -.996
S E Skew      .378       Range       10.000      Minimum       1.000
Maximum      11.000      Sum        286.000
```

Valid cases 39 Missing cases 4
22-Apr-89 SPSS-X RELEASE 3.1 FOR IBM VM/CMS
15:35:23 Univ. of Illinois at Chicago IBM 3081K VM/CMS

108

VAR IMPORTANCE TO UPDATE STUDENT CATEGORIES

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	5	3	7.0	9.1	9.1
	6	1	2.3	3.0	12.1
	7	2	4.7	6.1	18.2
	8	4	9.3	12.1	30.3
	9	7	16.3	21.2	51.5
	10	16	36.9	48.5	97.0
	11	1	2.3	3.0	100.0
	0	10	23.3	Missing	
	Total	43	100.0	100.0	

Count	Value	One symbol equals approximately .40 occurrences
3	5.00	********
1	6.00	***
2	7.00	*****
4	8.00	**********
7	9.00	******************
15	10.00	**************************************
1	11.00	***

```
I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
0         4         8        12        16        20
          Histogram frequency
```

Mean	8.818	Std err	.287	Median	9.000
Mode	10.000	Std dev	1.844	Variance	2.716
Kurtosis	.664	S E Kurt	.798	Skewness	-1.252
S E Skew	.409	Range	6.000	Minimum	5.000
Maximum	11.000	Sum	291.000		

Valid cases 33 Missing cases 10
22-Apr-89 SPSS-X RELEASE 3.1 FOR IBM VM/CMS
15:35:23 Univ. of Illinois at Chicago IBM 3081K VM/CMS

11A

VAR TIME SPENT DOING OTHER TASKS

Value Label	Value	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cum Percent
	4	1	2.3	4.8	4.8
	10	2	4.7	9.5	14.3
	11	18	41.9	85.7	100.0
	0	22	51.2	Missing	
	Total	43	100.0	100.0	

Count	Value	One symbol equals approximately .40 occurrences
1	4.00	***
0	5.00	
0	6.00	

```
          0        7.00
          0        8.00
          0        9.00
          2       10.00  *****
         18       11.00  ******************************************
                         I.........I.........I.........I.........I
                         0         4         8        12        16        20
                                   Histogram frequency

Mean          10.671      Std err         .335      Median        11.000
Mode          11.000      Std dev        1.535      Variance       2.357
Kurtosis      19.171      S E Kurt        .972      Skewness      -4.318
S E Skew       .501       Range          7.000      Minimum        4.000
Maximum       11.000      Sum          222.000

Valid cases       21      Missing cases     22
12-Apr-89   SPSS-X RELEASE 3.1 FOR IBM VM/CMS
15:30:23    Univ. of Illinois at Chicago   IBM 3081K          VM/CMS

GOTHERIM-11B IMPORTANCE OF DOING OTHER TASKS

  Value Label                  Value  Frequency  Percent  Valid Percent  Cum Percent

                                   3          1      2.3            4.5          4.5
                                  10          1      2.3            4.5          9.1
                                  11         20     46.5           90.9        100.0
                                   0         21     48.8        Missing
                                 Total       43    100.0          100.0

     Count      Value    One symbol equals approximately   .40 occurrences

         1       3.00  ***
         0       4.00
         0       5.00
         0       6.00
         0       7.00
         0       8.00
         0       9.00
         1      10.00  ***
        20      11.00  **************************************************
                       I.........I.........I.........I.........I.........I
                       0         4         8        12        16        20
                                 Histogram frequency

Mean          10.591      Std err         .356      Median        11.000
Mode          11.000      Std dev        1.709      Variance       2.920
Kurtosis      21.217      S E Kurt        .953      Skewness      -4.580
S E Skew       .491       Range          6.000      Minimum        3.000
Maximum       11.000      Sum          233.000

Valid cases       22      Missing cases     21
12-Apr-89   SPSS-X RELEASE 3.1 FOR IBM VM/CMS
15:30:23    Univ. of Illinois at Chicago   IBM 3081K          VM/CMS

Processing task required .16 seconds CPU time;  .70 seconds elapsed.

   => 0  FINISH
     45 command lines read.
      0 errors detected.
```

2	3.6957	1 PLACE LEPS STUDENTS	2.9167	2	PLACE LEPS STUDENTS
3	4.3652	9 SELECT ORGANIZATIONAL MO	4.9167	5	SELECT ORGANIZATIONAL MO
4	4.7500	7 IDENTIFY STAFF	5.0000	4	IDENTIFY STAFF
5	4.9583	5 IDENTIFY CURRICULUM	5.3333	7	IDENTIFY CURRICULUM
6	5.5833	4 BEGIN INSTRUCTION	5.3750	6	BEGIN INSTRUCTION
7	6.1583	8 PROVIDE IN-SERVICE TRAIN	5.4583	8	PROVIDE IN-SERVICE TRAIN
8	6.6652	8 FORM ADVISORY PARENT COM	6.1667	9	FORM ADVISORY PARENT COM
9	6.6957	6 EVALUATE STUDENT PROGRES	8.2917	8	EVALUATE STUDENT PROGRES
10	7.0870	10 UPDATE STUDENT CATEGORIE	9.0870	10	UPDATE STUDENT CATEGORIE
11	10.4667	11 OTHER TASKS	10.4375	11	OTHER TASKS

********** RHO FOR THIS RUN IS 0.8182

1 ANALYSIS FOR BIO VARIABLE NO. 1 = SEX
USEING VALUE RANGE OF 2 TO 2
SEX = 2 TO 2 = FEMALE

TASK	***** TIME SPENT ***** SUM	N	AVE	***** IMPORTANCE* SUM	N	AVE
1	97	17	5.7059	50	16	3.1250
2	62	16	3.8750	39	14	2.7857
3	121	17	7.1176	84	15	5.6000
4	116	17	6.8235	70	15	4.6667
5	74	18	4.1111	69	16	4.3125
6	92	16	5.7500	79	13	5.2667
7	83	18	4.6111	96	16	6.0000
8	106	18	5.8889	106	16	6.6250
9	82	18	4.5556	85	14	6.0714
10	123	16	7.6875	82	10	8.2000
11	66	6	10.8333	66	6	11.0000

RANK ORDER BY BIO VARIABLE NO. 1 = SEX

1	3.8750	2 IDENTIFY LEPS STUDENTS	2.7857	2	IDENTIFY LEPS STUDENTS
2	4.1111	5 PLACE LEPS STUDENTS	3.1250	1	PLACE LEPS STUDENTS
3	4.5556	9 SELECT ORGANIZATIONAL MO	4.3125	5	SELECT ORGANIZATIONAL MO
4	4.6111	7 IDENTIFY STAFF	4.6667	4	IDENTIFY STAFF
5	5.7059	1 IDENTIFY CURRICULUM	5.2667	6	IDENTIFY CURRICULUM
6	5.7500	6 BEGIN INSTRUCTION	5.6000	3	BEGIN INSTRUCTION
7	5.8889	8 PROVIDE IN-SERVICE TRAIN	6.0000	7	PROVIDE IN-SERVICE TRAIN
8	6.8235	4 FORM ADVISORY PARENT COM	6.0714	9	FORM ADVISORY PARENT COM
9	7.1176	3 EVALUATE STUDENT PROGRES	6.6250	8	EVALUATE STUDENT PROGRES
10	7.6875	10 UPDATE STUDENT CATEGORIE	8.2000	10	UPDATE STUDENT CATEGORIE
11	10.8333	11 OTHER TASKS	11.0000	11	OTHER TASKS

********** RHO FOR THIS RUN IS 0.4273

(2) ANALYSIS FOR BIO VARIABLE NO. 2 = BILINGUAL
USEING VALUE RANGE OF 1 TO 2
BIL = 1 TO 2 = YES & NO

TASK	***** TIME SPENT ***** SUM	N	AVE	***** IMPORTANCE* SUM	N	AVE
1	182	40	4.5500	116	40	2.9000
2	147	39	3.7692	109	38	2.8684
3	276	41	6.7317	215	39	5.5128
4	250	41	6.0976	190	39	4.8718
5	193	42	4.5952	187	40	4.6750
6	246	39	6.3077	208	39	5.3333
7	197	42	4.6905	224	40	5.6000
8	257	41	6.2683	305	40	7.6250
9	187	41	4.5610	233	38	6.1316
10	286	39	7.3333	291	33	8.8182
11	222	21	10.5714	233	22	10.5909

RANK ORDER BY BIO VARIABLE NO. 2 = BILINGUAL

1	3.7692	2	IDENTIFY LEPS STUDENTS	2.3684	2 IDENTIFY LEPS STUDENTS
2	4.5600	1	PLACE LEPS STUDENTS	2.9000	1 PLACE LEPS STUDENTS
3	4.5610	9	SELECT ORGANIZATIONAL MO	4.6750	5 SELECT ORGANIZATIONAL MO
4	4.6962	5	IDENTIFY STAFF	4.8718	4 IDENTIFY STAFF
5	4.6905	7	IDENTIFY CURRICULUM	5.3333	6 IDENTIFY CURRICULUM
6	6.0976	4	BEGIN INSTRUCTION	5.5128	3 BEGIN INSTRUCTION
7	6.2683	6	PROVIDE IN-SERVICE TRAIN	5.6000	7 PROVIDE IN-SERVICE TRAIN
8	6.3077	8	FORM ADVISORY PARENT COM	6.1316	9 FORM ADVISORY PARENT COM
9	6.7317	3	EVALUATE STUDENT PROGRES	7.6250	8 EVALUATE STUDENT PROGRES
10	7.3333	10	UPDATE STUDENT CATEGORIE	8.8182	10 UPDATE STUDENT CATEGORIE
11	10.5714	11	OTHER TASKS	10.5909	11 OTHER TASKS

********** RHO FOR THIS RUN IS 0.7545

1 ANALYSIS FOR BIO VARIABLE NO. 2 = BILINGUAL
USEING VALUE RANGE OF 1 TO 1
BIL = 1 TO 1 = YES

	***** TIME SPENT *****			***** IMPORTANCE*		
TASK	SUM	N	AVE	SUM	N	AVE
1	31	11	2.8182	44	11	4.0000
2	37	11	3.3636	31	11	2.8182
3	84	11	7.6364	62	11	5.6364
4	59	11	5.3636	43	11	3.9091
5	45	11	4.0909	42	11	3.8182
6	65	11	5.9091	63	11	5.7273
7	58	11	5.2727	59	11	5.3636
8	80	11	7.2727	89	11	8.0909
9	42	11	3.8182	71	11	6.4545
10	87	11	7.9091	93	10	9.3000
11	65	6	10.8333	65	6	10.8333

RANK ORDER BY BIO VARIABLE NO. 2 = BILINGUAL

1	2.8182	1	IDENTIFY LEPS STUDENTS	2.8182	2 IDENTIFY LEPS STUDENTS
2	3.3636	2	PLACE LEPS STUDENTS	3.8182	5 PLACE LEPS STUDENTS
3	3.8182	9	SELECT ORGANIZATIONAL MO	3.9091	4 SELECT ORGANIZATIONAL MO
4	4.0909	5	IDENTIFY STAFF	4.0000	1 IDENTIFY STAFF
5	5.2727	7	IDENTIFY CURRICULUM	5.3636	7 IDENTIFY CURRICULUM
6	5.3636	4	BEGIN INSTRUCTION	5.6364	3 BEGIN INSTRUCTION
7	5.9091	6	PROVIDE IN-SERVICE TRAIN	5.7273	6 PROVIDE IN-SERVICE TRAIN
8	7.2727	8	FORM ADVISORY PARENT COM	6.4545	9 FORM ADVISORY PARENT COM
9	7.6364	3	EVALUATE STUDENT PROGRES	8.0909	8 EVALUATE STUDENT PROGRES

10	7.9091	10	UPDATE STUDENT CATEGORIE	9.3000	10	UPDATE STUDENT CATEGORIE
11	10.8333	11	OTHER TASKS	10.8333	11	OTHER TASKS

********** RHO FOR THIS RUN IS 0.6455

1 ANALYSIS FOR BIO VARIABLE NO. 2 = BILINGUAL
USEING VALUE RANGE OF 2 TO 2
BIL = 2 TO 2 = NO

TASK	***** TIME SPENT ***** SUM	N	AVE	***** IMPORTANCE* SUM	N	AVE
1	151	29	5.2069	72	29	2.4828
2	110	28	3.9286	78	27	2.8889
3	192	30	6.4000	153	28	5.4643
4	191	30	6.3667	147	28	5.2500
5	148	31	4.7742	145	29	5.0000
6	181	28	6.4643	145	28	5.1786
7	139	31	4.4839	165	29	5.6897
8	177	30	5.9000	216	29	7.4483
9	145	30	4.8333	162	27	6.0000
10	199	28	7.1071	198	23	8.6087
11	157	15	10.4667	168	16	10.5000

RANK ORDER BY BIO VARIABLE NO. 2 = BILINGUAL

1	3.9286	2	IDENTIFY LEPS STUDENTS	2.4828	1	IDENTIFY LEPS STUDENTS
2	4.4839	7	PLACE LEPS STUDENTS	2.8889	2	PLACE LEPS STUDENTS
3	4.7742	5	SELECT ORGANIZATIONAL MO	5.0000	5	SELECT ORGANIZATIONAL MO
4	4.8333	9	IDENTIFY STAFF	5.1786	6	IDENTIFY STAFF
5	5.2069	1	IDENTIFY CURRICULUM	5.2500	4	IDENTIFY CURRICULUM
6	5.9000	8	BEGIN INSTRUCTION	5.4643	3	BEGIN INSTRUCTION
7	6.3667	4	PROVIDE IN-SERVICE TRAIN	5.6897	7	PROVIDE IN-SERVICE TRAIN
8	6.4000	3	FORM ADVISORY PARENT COM	6.0000	9	FORM ADVISORY PARENT COM
9	6.4643	6	EVALUATE STUDENT PROGRES	7.4483	8	EVALUATE STUDENT PROGRES
10	7.1071	10	UPDATE STUDENT CATEGORIE	8.6087	10	UPDATE STUDENT CATEGORIE
11	10.4667	11	OTHER TASKS	10.5000	11	OTHER TASKS

********** RHO FOR THIS RUN IS 0.4636

(3) ANALYSIS FOR BIO VAR NO. 4 = YEARS OF EXP (GENERAL)
USEING VALUE RANGE OF 0 TO 12
YEARS EX (GEN) = .1 TO 12.

TASK	***** TIME SPENT ***** SUM	N	AVE	***** IMPORTANCE* SUM	N	AVE
1	91	19	4.7895	50	18	2.7778
2	81	19	4.2632	61	18	3.3889
3	155	20	7.7500	92	18	5.1111
4	128	20	6.4000	63	18	3.5000
5	65	20	3.2500	79	18	4.3889
6	108	18	6.0000	91	17	5.3529
7	83	20	4.1500	109	18	6.0556
8	120	20	6.0000	133	18	7.3889
9	96	20	4.8000	131	18	7.2778

10	130	18	7.2222	130	14	9.2857
11	108	10	10.8000	109	10	10.9000

RANK ORDER BY BIO VAR NO. 4 = YEARS OF EXP (GENERAL)

1	3.2600	5	IDENTIFY LEPS STUDENTS	2.7778	1 IDENTIFY LEPS STUDENTS
2	4.1500	7	PLACE LEPS STUDENTS	3.3889	2 PLACE LEPS STUDENTS
3	4.4632	2	SELECT ORGANIZATIONAL MO	3.5000	4 SELECT ORGANIZATIONAL MO
4	4.7895	1	IDENTIFY STAFF	4.3889	5 IDENTIFY STAFF
5	4.8000	9	IDENTIFY CURRICULUM	5.1111	3 IDENTIFY CURRICULUM
6	6.0000	8	BEGIN INSTRUCTION	5.3529	6 BEGIN INSTRUCTION
7	6.0000	6	PROVIDE IN-SERVICE TRAIN	6.0556	7 PROVIDE IN-SERVICE TRAIN
8	6.4000	4	FORM ADVISORY PARENT COM	7.2778	9 FORM ADVISORY PARENT COM
9	7.2222	10	EVALUATE STUDENT PROGRES	7.3889	8 EVALUATE STUDENT PROGRES
10	7.7500	3	UPDATE STUDENT CATEGORIE	9.2857	10 UPDATE STUDENT CATEGORIE
11	10.8000	11	OTHER TASKS	10.9000	11 OTHER TASKS

********** RHO FOR THIS RUN IS 0.1818

1 ANALYSIS FOR BIO VAR NO. 4 = YEARS OF EXP (GENERAL)
USEING VALUE RANGE OF 12 TO 100
YEARS EX (GEN) = 18 OR MORE YEARS

***** TIME SPENT ***** ***** IMPORTANCE*

TASK	SUM	N	AVE	SUM	N	AVE
1	89	20	4.4500	64	21	3.0476
2	65	19	3.4211	45	19	2.3684
3	116	20	5.8000	117	20	5.8500
4	118	20	5.9000	126	20	6.3000
5	119	21	5.6667	103	21	4.9048
6	128	20	6.4000	113	21	5.3810
7	106	21	5.0476	108	21	5.1429
8	131	20	6.5500	164	21	7.8095
9	88	20	4.4000	93	19	4.8947
10	149	20	7.4500	151	18	8.3889
11	103	10	10.3000	113	11	10.2727

RANK ORDER BY BIO VAR NO. 4 = YEARS OF EXP (GENERAL)

1	3.4211	2	IDENTIFY LEPS STUDENTS	2.3684	2 IDENTIFY LEPS STUDENTS
2	4.4000	9	PLACE LEPS STUDENTS	3.0476	1 PLACE LEPS STUDENTS
3	4.4500	1	SELECT ORGANIZATIONAL MO	4.3947	9 SELECT ORGANIZATIONAL MO
4	5.0476	7	IDENTIFY STAFF	4.9048	5 IDENTIFY STAFF
5	5.6667	5	IDENTIFY CURRICULUM	5.1429	7 IDENTIFY CURRICULUM
6	5.8000	3	BEGIN INSTRUCTION	5.3810	6 BEGIN INSTRUCTION
7	5.9000	4	PROVIDE IN-SERVICE TRAIN	5.8500	3 PROVIDE IN-SERVICE TRAIN
8	6.4000	6	FORM ADVISORY PARENT COM	6.3000	4 FORM ADVISORY PARENT COM
9	6.5500	8	EVALUATE STUDENT PROGRES	7.8095	8 EVALUATE STUDENT PROGRES
10	7.4500	10	UPDATE STUDENT CATEGORIE	8.3889	10 UPDATE STUDENT CATEGORIE
11	10.3000	11	OTHER TASKS	10.2727	11 OTHER TASKS

********** RHO FOR THIS RUN IS 0.3182

(4) 1 ANALYSIS FOR BIO VAR NO. 5 = YEARS OF EXP (BILINGUAL)

4 USEING VALUE RANGE OF 0 TO 9 less
YEARS EX (BIL) = .1 TO 9

TASK	***** TIME SPENT ***** SUM	N	AVE	***** IMPORTANCE* SUM	N	AVE
1	91	16	5.6875	42	16	2.6250
2	65	16	4.0625	49	16	3.0625
3	118	18	6.5556	90	16	5.6250
4	113	18	6.2778	69	16	4.3125
5	75	18	4.1667	70	16	4.3750
6	99	15	6.6000	72	15	4.8000
7	85	18	4.7222	105	16	6.5625
8	103	17	6.0588	118	16	7.3750
9	73	17	4.2941	97	16	6.0625
10	114	16	7.1250	116	13	8.9231
11	76	7	10.8571	88	8	11.0000

RANK ORDER BY BIO VAR NO. 5 = YEARS OF EXP (BILINGUAL)

1	4.0625	2	IDENTIFY LEPS STUDENTS	2.6250	1 IDENTIFY LEPS STUDENTS
2	4.1667	5	PLACE LEPS STUDENTS	3.0625	2 PLACE LEPS STUDENTS
3	4.2941	9	SELECT ORGANIZATIONAL MO	4.3125	4 SELECT ORGANIZATIONAL MO
4	4.7222	7	IDENTIFY STAFF	4.3750	5 IDENTIFY STAFF
5	5.6875	1	IDENTIFY CURRICULUM	4.8000	6 IDENTIFY CURRICULUM
6	6.0588	8	BEGIN INSTRUCTION	5.6250	3 BEGIN INSTRUCTION
7	6.2778	4	PROVIDE IN-SERVICE TRAIN	6.0625	9 PROVIDE IN-SERVICE TRAIN
8	6.5556	3	FORM ADVISORY PARENT COM	6.5625	7 FORM ADVISORY PARENT COM
9	6.6000	6	EVALUATE STUDENT PROGRES	7.3750	8 EVALUATE STUDENT PROGRES
10	7.1250	10	UPDATE STUDENT CATEGORIE	8.9231	10 UPDATE STUDENT CATEGORIE
11	10.8571	11	OTHER TASKS	11.0000	11 OTHER TASKS

********** RHO FOR THIS RUN IS 0.3909

1 ANALYSIS FOR BIO VAR NO. 5 = YEARS OF EXP (BILINGUAL)
USEING VALUE RANGE OF 10 TO 100 more
YEARS EX (BIL) = 10 OR MORE YEARS

TASK	***** TIME SPENT ***** SUM	N	AVE	***** IMPORTANCE* SUM	N	AVE
1	91	24	3.7917	74	24	3.0833
2	82	23	3.5652	60	22	2.7273
3	158	23	6.8696	125	23	5.4348
4	137	23	5.9565	121	23	5.2609
5	118	24	4.9167	117	24	4.8750
6	147	24	6.1250	136	24	5.6667
7	112	24	4.6667	119	24	4.9583
8	154	24	6.4167	187	24	7.7917
9	114	24	4.7500	136	22	6.1818
10	172	23	7.4783	175	20	8.7500
11	146	14	10.4286	145	14	10.3571

.8364 P

(5)

ANALYSIS FOR BIO VARIABLE NO. 6 = STUDENT POP (GEN)
USEING VALUE RANGE OF 1 TO 9999
STUDENTS POP (GEN) = ALL

TASK	***** TIME SPENT ***** SUM	N	AVE	***** IMPORTANCE* SUM	N	AVE
1	177	38	4.6579	110	38	2.8947
2	139	37	3.7568	104	36	2.8889
3	259	39	6.6410	202	37	5.4595
4	234	39	6.0000	180	37	4.8649
5	182	40	4.5500	179	38	4.7105
6	236	37	6.3784	194	37	5.2432
7	185	40	4.6250	214	38	5.6316
8	240	39	6.1538	290	38	7.6316
9	182	39	4.6667	224	36	6.2222
10	276	37	7.4595	270	31	8.7097
11	201	19	10.5789	212	20	10.6000

RANK ORDER BY BIO VARIABLE NO. 6 = STUDENT POP (GEN)

1	3.7568	2 IDENTIFY LEPS STUDENTS	2.8889	2 IDENTIFY LEPS STUDENTS	
2	4.5500	5 PLACE LEPS STUDENTS	2.8947	1 PLACE LEPS STUDENTS	
3	4.6250	7 SELECT ORGANIZATIONAL MO	4.7105	5 SELECT ORGANIZATIONAL MO	
4	4.6579	1 IDENTIFY STAFF	4.8649	4 IDENTIFY STAFF	
5	4.6667	9 IDENTIFY CURRICULUM	5.2432	6 IDENTIFY CURRICULUM	
6	6.0000	4 BEGIN INSTRUCTION	5.4595	3 BEGIN INSTRUCTION	
7	6.1538	8 PROVIDE IN-SERVICE TRAIN	5.6316	7 PROVIDE IN-SERVICE TRAIN	
8	6.3784	6 FORM ADVISORY PARENT COM	6.2222	9 FORM ADVISORY PARENT COM	
9	6.6410	3 EVALUATE STUDENT PROGRES	7.6316	8 EVALUATE STUDENT PROGRES	
10	7.4595	10 UPDATE STUDENT CATEGORIE	8.7097	10 UPDATE STUDENT CATEGORIE	
11	10.5789	11 OTHER TASKS	10.6000	11 OTHER TASKS	

********** RHO FOR THIS RUN IS 0.6636

less

ANALYSIS FOR BIO VARIABLE NO. 6 = STUDENT POP (GEN)
USEING VALUE RANGE OF 1 TO 800
STUDENTS POP (GEN) = LESS OR EQ 800

TASK	***** TIME SPENT ***** SUM	N	AVE	***** IMPORTANCE* SUM	N	AVE
1	77	17	4.5294	51	17	3.0000
2	64	16	4.0000	44	15	2.9333
3	104	17	6.1176	82	16	5.1250
4	115	17	6.7647	86	16	5.3750
5	97	18	5.3889	79	17	4.6471
6	114	16	7.1250	83	16	5.1875
7	79	18	4.3889	95	17	5.5882
8	91	18	5.0556	115	17	6.7647
9	80	18	4.4444	94	15	6.2667
10	128	17	7.5294	126	14	9.0000
11	76	7	10.8571	77	7	11.0000

RANK ORDER BY BIO VARIABLE NO. 6 = STUDENT POP (GEN)

1	4.0000	2	IDENTIFY LEPS STUDENTS	2.9333	2	IDENTIFY LEPS STUDENTS
2	4.3889	7	PLACE LEPS STUDENTS	3.0000	1	PLACE LEPS STUDENTS
3	4.4444	9	SELECT ORGANIZATIONAL MO	4.6471	5	SELECT ORGANIZATIONAL MO
4	4.5294	1	IDENTIFY STAFF	5.1250	3	IDENTIFY STAFF
5	5.0556	8	IDENTIFY CURRICULUM	5.1875	6	IDENTIFY CURRICULUM
6	5.3889	5	BEGIN INSTRUCTION	5.3750	4	BEGIN INSTRUCTION
7	6.1176	3	PROVIDE IN-SERVICE TRAIN	5.5882	7	PROVIDE IN-SERVICE TRAIN
8	6.7647	4	FORM ADVISORY PARENT COM	6.2667	9	FORM ADVISORY PARENT COM
9	7.1330	6	EVALUATE STUDENT PROGRES	6.7647	8	EVALUATE STUDENT PROGRES
10	7.5294	10	UPDATE STUDENT CATEGORIE	9.0000	10	UPDATE STUDENT CATEGORIE
11	10.6471	11	OTHER TASKS	11.0000	11	OTHER TASKS

********** R#D FOR THIS RUN IS 0.5182 .52

1 ANALYSIS FOR BIO VARIABLE NO. 6 = STUDENT POP (GEN)
USEING VALUE RANGE OF 801 TO 9999
STUDENTS POP (GEN) = MORE THAN 800

***** TIME SPENT ***** ***** IMPORTANCE*

TASK	SUM	N	AVE	SUM	N	AVE
1	100	21	4.7619	59	21	2.8095
2	75	21	3.5714	60	21	2.8571
3	156	22	7.0455	120	21	5.7143
4	119	22	5.4091	94	21	4.4762
5	85	22	3.8636	100	21	4.7619
6	122	21	5.8095	111	21	5.2857
7	106	22	4.8182	119	21	5.6667
8	149	21	7.0952	175	21	8.3333
9	102	21	4.8571	130	21	6.1905
10	148	20	7.4000	144	17	8.4706
11	125	12	10.4167	135	13	10.3846

RANK ORDER BY BIO VARIABLE NO. 6 = STUDENT POP (GEN)

1	3.5714	2	IDENTIFY LEPS STUDENTS	2.8095	1	IDENTIFY LEPS STUDENTS
2	3.8636	5	PLACE LEPS STUDENTS	2.8571	2	PLACE LEPS STUDENTS
3	4.7619	1	SELECT ORGANIZATIONAL MO	4.4762	4	SELECT ORGANIZATIONAL MO
4	4.8182	7	IDENTIFY STAFF	4.7619	5	IDENTIFY STAFF
5	4.8571	9	IDENTIFY CURRICULUM	5.2857	6	IDENTIFY CURRICULUM
6	5.4091	4	BEGIN INSTRUCTION	5.6667	7	BEGIN INSTRUCTION
7	5.8095	6	PROVIDE IN-SERVICE TRAIN	5.7143	3	PROVIDE IN-SERVICE TRAIN
8	7.0455	3	FORM ADVISORY PARENT COM	6.1905	9	FORM ADVISORY PARENT COM
9	7.0952	8	EVALUATE STUDENT PROGRES	8.3333	8	EVALUATE STUDENT PROGRES
10	7.4000	10	UPDATE STUDENT CATEGORIE	8.4706	10	UPDATE STUDENT CATEGORIE

11 10.4167 11 OTHER TASKS 10.3846 11 OTHER TASKS

********** RHO FOR THIS RUN IS 0.6091

(6) 1 ANALYSIS FOR BIO VARIABLE NO. 7 = STUDENT POP (BIL)
USEING VALUE RANGE OF 1 TO 9999
STUDENTS POP (BIL) = ALL

***** TIME SPENT ***** ***** IMPORTANCE*

TASK	SUM	N	AVE	SUM	N	AVE
1	170	37	4.5946	109	37	2.9459
2	137	36	3.8056	102	35	2.9143
3	251	38	6.6053	193	36	5.3611
4	232	38	6.1053	172	36	4.7778
5	175	39	4.4872	169	37	4.5676
6	229	36	6.3611	192	36	5.3333
7	179	39	4.5897	206	37	5.5676
8	231	38	6.0789	282	37	7.6216
9	174	38	4.5789	221	35	6.3143
10	278	36	7.7222	267	30	8.9000
11	189	18	10.5000	200	19	10.5263

RANK ORDER BY BIO VARIABLE NO. 7 = STUDENT POP (BIL)

1	3.8056	2	IDENTIFY LEPS STUDENTS	2.9143	2 IDENTIFY LEPS STUDENTS
2	4.4872	5	PLACE LEPS STUDENTS	2.9459	1 PLACE LEPS STUDENTS
3	4.5789	9	SELECT ORGANIZATIONAL MO	4.3676	5 SELECT ORGANIZATIONAL MO
4	4.5897	7	IDENTIFY STAFF	4.7778	4 IDENTIFY STAFF
5	4.5946	1	IDENTIFY CURRICULUM	5.3333	6 IDENTIFY CURRICULUM
6	6.0789	8	BEGIN INSTRUCTION	5.3611	3 BEGIN INSTRUCTION
7	6.1053	4	PROVIDE IN-SERVICE TRAIN	5.3676	7 PROVIDE IN-SERVICE TRAIN
8	6.3611	6	FORM ADVISORY PARENT COM	6.3143	9 FORM ADVISORY PARENT COM
9	6.6053	3	EVALUATE STUDENT PROGRES	7.6216	8 EVALUATE STUDENT PROGRES
10	7.7222	10	UPDATE STUDENT CATEGORIE	8.9000	10 UPDATE STUDENT CATEGORIE
11	10.5000	11	OTHER TASKS	10.5263	11 OTHER TASKS

********** RHO FOR THIS RUN IS 0.3909

1 ANALYSIS FOR BIO VARIABLE NO. 7 = STUDENT POP (BIL)
USEING VALUE RANGE OF 1 TO 250
STUDENTS POP (BIL) = LESS OR EQ 250

less

***** TIME SPENT ***** ***** IMPORTANCE*

TASK	SUM	N	AVE	SUM	N	AVE
1	103	21	4.9048	56	21	2.6667
2	79	20	3.9500	54	20	2.7000
3	137	21	6.5238	99	20	4.9500
4	137	21	6.5238	93	20	4.6500
5	108	22	4.9091	101	21	4.8095
6	120	20	6.0000	107	20	5.3500
7	105	22	4.7727	129	21	6.1429
8	122	22	5.5455	148	21	7.0476
9	106	22	4.8182	119	20	5.9500
10	155	20	7.7500	148	17	8.7059
11	98	9	10.8889	99	9	11.0000

RANK ORDER BY BIO VARIABLE NO. 7 = STUDENT POP (BIL)

1	3.9500	2 IDENTIFY LEPS STUDENTS	2.6667	1 IDENTIFY LEPS STUDENTS
2	4.7727	7 PLACE LEPS STUDENTS	2.7000	2 PLACE LEPS STUDENTS
3	4.8182	9 SELECT ORGANIZATIONAL MO	4.6500	4 SELECT ORGANIZATIONAL MO
4	4.9048	1 IDENTIFY STAFF	4.8095	5 IDENTIFY STAFF
5	4.9091	5 IDENTIFY CURRICULUM	4.9500	3 IDENTIFY CURRICULUM
6	5.5455	8 BEGIN INSTRUCTION	5.3500	6 BEGIN INSTRUCTION
7	6.0000	6 PROVIDE IN-SERVICE TRAIN	5.9500	9 PROVIDE IN-SERVICE TRAIN
8	6.5238	4 FORM ADVISORY PARENT COM	6.1429	7 FORM ADVISORY PARENT COM
9	6.5238	3 EVALUATE STUDENT PROGRES	7.0476	8 EVALUATE STUDENT PROGRES
10	7.7500	10 UPDATE STUDENT CATEGORIE	8.7059	10 UPDATE STUDENT CATEGORIE
11	10.6889	11 OTHER TASKS	11.0000	11 OTHER TASKS

********** RHO FOR THIS RUN IS 0.4636

1 ANALYSIS FOR BIO VARIABLE NO. 7 = STUDENT POP (BIL)
USEING VALUE RANGE OF 251 TO 99999
STUDENTS POP (BIL) = MORE THAN 250

TASK	***** TIME SPENT ***** SUM	N	AVE	***** IMPORTANCE* SUM	N	AVE
1	67	16	4.1875	53	16	3.3125
2	58	16	3.6250	48	15	3.2000
3	114	17	6.7059	94	16	5.8750
4	95	17	5.5882	79	16	4.9375
5	67	17	3.9412	68	16	4.2500
6	109	16	6.8125	86	16	5.3125
7	74	17	4.3529	77	16	4.8125
8	109	16	6.8125	134	16	8.3750
9	68	16	4.2500	102	15	6.8000
10	123	16	7.6875	119	13	9.1538
11	91	9	10.1111	101	10	10.1000

RANK ORDER BY BIO VARIABLE NO. 7 = STUDENT POP (BIL)

1	3.6250	2 IDENTIFY LEPS STUDENTS	3.2000	2 IDENTIFY LEPS STUDENTS
2	3.9412	5 PLACE LEPS STUDENTS	3.3125	1 PLACE LEPS STUDENTS
3	4.1875	1 SELECT ORGANIZATIONAL MO	4.2500	5 SELECT ORGANIZATIONAL MO
4	4.2500	9 IDENTIFY STAFF	4.8125	7 IDENTIFY STAFF
5	4.3529	7 IDENTIFY CURRICULUM	4.9375	4 IDENTIFY CURRICULUM
6	5.5882	4 BEGIN INSTRUCTION	5.3125	6 BEGIN INSTRUCTION
7	6.7059	3 PROVIDE IN-SERVICE TRAIN	5.8750	3 PROVIDE IN-SERVICE TRAIN
8	6.8125	8 FORM ADVISORY PARENT COM	6.8000	9 FORM ADVISORY PARENT COM
9	6.8125	6 EVALUATE STUDENT PROGRES	8.3750	8 EVALUATE STUDENT PROGRES
10	7.6875	10 UPDATE STUDENT CATEGORIE	9.1538	10 UPDATE STUDENT CATEGORIE
11	10.1111	11 OTHER TASKS	10.1000	11 OTHER TASKS

********** RHO FOR THIS RUN IS 0.7545

Wilcoxon Signed-Ranks Tests File: prncpl Date: 06-25-1989

FILTER: None

Dependent variables	N	Mean	S.D. Diff.	T (P-Val)	Signed Ranks	+	-	Tie	Z (P-Val)
TEXP2		6.182			N	4	5	2	
	11		3.842	0.16	Mean				0.11
		6.000		(.8783)	Rank	5.750	4.400		(.9153)
TEXP1									
IEXP2		6.000			N	3	3	5	
	11		2.898	0.00	Mean				0.00
		6.000		(1.000)	Rank	3.500	3.500		(1.000)
IEXP1									
TBILX2		5.545			N	3	5	3	
	11		2.687	0.90	Mean				1.49
		6.273		(.3902)	Rank	3.667	5.000		(.1367)
TBILXP1									
IBILX2		5.909			N	3	3	5	
	11		1.401	0.43	Mean				0.43
		6.091		(.6759)	Rank	2.833	4.167		(.6707)
IBILXP1									

Dependent variables	N	Mean	S.D. Diff.	T (P-Val)	Signed Ranks	+	-	Tie	Z (P-Val)
TFEM									
		6.000			N	4	3	4	
	11		2.948	0.10	Mean				0.21
		5.909		(.9205)	Rank	3.750	4.333		(.8316)
TMALE									
IFEM									
		6.000			N	2	3	6	
	11		1.673	0.00	Mean				0.11
		6.000		(1.000)	Rank	3.500	3.667		(.9153)
IMALE									
TBILN									
		6.000			N	5	4	2	
	11		3.847	0.00	Mean				0.21
		6.000		(1.000)	Rank	4.300	5.875		(.8316)
TBILY									
IBILN									
		6.000			N	3	3	5	
	11		2.145	0.00	Mean				0.11
		6.000		(1.000)	Rank	3.333	3.667		(.9153)
IBILY									
TPOP2									
		6.000			N	4	4	3	
	11		3.464	0.00	Mean				0.32
		6.000		(1.000)	Rank	4.875	4.125		(.7498)
TPOP1									
IPOP2									
		6.000			N	3	3	5	
	11		1.789	0.00	Mean				0.11
		6.000		(1.000)	Rank	3.667	3.333		(.9153)
IPOP1									
TBILP2									
		6.000			N	4	4	3	
	11		4.313	0.00	Mean				0.00
		6.000		(1.000)	Rank	4.500	4.500		(1.000)
TBILP1									
IBILP2									
		6.000			N	5	2	4	
	11		2.191	0.00	Mean				0.96
		6.000		(1.000)	Rank	3.700	4.750		(.3387)
IBILP1									

APPROVAL SHEET

The dissertation submitted by Olga Villalba has been read and approved by the following committee:

Dr. Max A. Bailey, Director
Associate Professor, Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, Loyola

Dr. Philip M. Carlin
Associate Professor, Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, Loyola

Dr. Melvin P. Heller
Professor and Chairman, Educational Leadership and Policy Studies, Loyola University of Chicago

The final copies have been examined by the director of the dissertation and the signature which appears below verifies the fact that any necessary changes have been incorporated and that the dissertation is now given final approval by the Committee with reference to content and form.

The dissertation is therefore accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

April 17, 1990
Date

Max A. Bailey
Director's Signature