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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to analyze four aspects of the role of the high school principal to determine if the principal's leadership orientation plays a part in the execution of the duties performed in each category (instructional leader, educational manager, communicator and decision maker).

Three types of instruments were used to gather data: face-to-face interviews; artifacts and documents provided by the principals; and observation of principals conducting staff meetings. Demographic questionnaires were sent to principals of schools accredited by the North Central Association in Chicago and Cook county with student populations under 1000. Based on results of the demographic questionnaire, ten principals, who represented a broad spectrum of characteristics in terms of gender, educational preparation and experience in the principalship, comprised the sample.
Results of this study indicate that regardless of leadership orientation, principals act as instructional leaders, educational managers, communicators and decision makers. Within each role, however, differences of style and focus exist in light of primary leadership orientation.

Although alteration of leadership orientation is not recommended, addition of strategies which capitalize upon the strengths of each orientation is recommended.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Purpose

The purpose of this study is to analyze four aspects of the role of the high school principal to determine if the principal's leadership-orientation plays a part in the execution of the duties performed in each category (instructional leader, educational manager, communicator and decision maker).

Justification

In recent years, schools have been called upon to take on more responsibilities that were formerly borne by extended families and social service agencies. At the same time, schools have been called upon to add tasks to their agendas because of mandates from state and federal government and demands from colleges and universities. High schools are particularly challenged by this tug of war because of the age level they serve. Students are concerned with preparation for the next step in their lives and are also caught in the turmoil of adolescence. Teachers are
pressed to prepare students for that next step and at the same time deal with the social and psychological growth issues of the adolescents in their charge. All of these issues have implications for the high school principal, who must somehow balance the need for getting the tasks done against the need for nurturing both staff and students through those turbulent years. How do principals respond to this challenge?

A review of the literature has revealed that a majority of experts agree on the necessity for having the school principal act as the instructional leader of the school. However, many educational experts also maintain that the principal must wear the hat of educational manager; there is a general consensus that the principal must fulfill both of these functions, as the head of the school.

For purposes of organization, the aspects of the principal's role as communicator and decision maker have been set apart. In reality, the principal acts as decision maker and communicator primarily, but not exclusively, when he or she functions as instructional leader and educational manager.

As a result, these four aspects of the principal's role
were examined: instructional leader; educational manager; communicator; and decision maker.

The literature has also revealed that two dimensions of leadership orientation have been identified: 1) task-orientation and 2) relationship-orientation. In studying leadership theory, as well as in examining the role of the principal, the task-orientation and relations-orientation categorizations provide the clearest paradigm for a full examination of this educational reality and will, therefore, serve as a lens for examination and analysis.

The principal's role, therefore, was examined in light of the following conceptual framework. The arrows in the diagram point in both directions to illustrate a continuous process of interaction among all four aspects of the role. The two leadership orientation dimensions sit at the core of the model (Figure 1).

Principal's Role

Instructional Leader

Decision Maker

Task Orientation and Relations Orientation

Communicator

Educational Manager

This study was conducted to answer the research
question: How does a principal who is task-oriented or relationship-oriented approach the following four aspects of his or her role: instructional leadership, educational management, communication and decision making?

**Methodology**

Once the research question was identified, a sample was selected. A selection of high school principals in the Chicagoland area served as the sample. High schools were selected because of the adolescent issues the students are facing and the demands accompanying them. Both of these components complicate the educational process and thereby complicate the role of the principal, who must address them. High schools in the Chicagoland area, which included Chicago and Cook County, were chosen because of the diversity this geographical area represented in terms of socioeconomic factors.

North Central Association Accredited schools were chosen because of the policies and standards for schools, which must be met for accreditation. North Central Association schools must produce statements of philosophy and goals and evidence of administration and organization which ensure the achievement of those goals. In addition,
curriculum and instruction requirements and the standards for staffing, facilities and school community relationships are clearly spelled out. Schools are subjected to annual review and periodic, thorough evaluation. All four areas of the principalship to be examined are included in the principal's role for the schools to achieve and maintain the North Central Association standards. In addition, North Central Association Accredited schools include non-public as well as public schools; they also include single gender schools as well as coeducational schools.

The sample was narrowed to include only those North Central Association schools listed as having grades 9-12 because of their focus on the four year high school model, which directly addresses the needs of high school adolescents. Schools with enrollments under 1000 were chosen on the basis that, in schools this size, the principal has a greater chance of fulfilling all four roles to be examined in the study himself or herself, rather than delegating the role to an assistant principal or using central office personnel in the role.

Vocational and adult schools were eliminated from the sample because the impact on the high school of the higher
education curricular requirements would not be felt. For the same reason, optional schools and special function schools were eliminated from the sample. And finally, the researcher's high school was eliminated due to possible bias. Fifty-seven schools met the preliminary criteria.

A cover letter (Appendix A) was mailed to each of the fifty-seven principals describing the study and asking the principals to return a preliminary questionnaire regarding demographics of both the high school and principal vis-a-vis socioeconomics, affiliation and years in the principalship (Appendix B). A stamped, self-addressed envelope was included. Principals were asked if they would be willing to be interviewed, if they would be willing to share pertinent documents and if they would be willing to be observed in a meeting with the staff. Principals were asked to return the questionnaire even if they were declining to be interviewed, or share documents, or be observed in a meeting with the staff. Principals were assured of confidentiality of responses. Four weeks later, a follow-up letter was sent (Appendix A) to solicit additional responses.

Forty-three principals returned the preliminary questionnaire. Of those principals returning the
questionnaire, twenty-eight principals agreed to be interviewed, to share documents and to be observed. Nine principals did not wish to be interviewed; eight principals did not wish to share documents; eleven principals did not wish to be observed at a meeting. Of the twenty-eight principals who agreed to be interviewed, to share documents and to be observed, twenty principals had served in their present positions for three or more years. Three of these principals were interviewed and participated in a pilot study to field test the interview schedule. These interviews were mechanically recorded and analyzed. Feedback from these principals, on the instrument, was used to revise questions for understanding and clarity. This pilot study provided the researcher with opportunities to practice the art of interviewing, to determine which questions and types of questions elicited a meaningful response, and to benefit from the critique of principal experts.

Data from the participants were collected using the following methods: 1) principals participated in face-to-face interviews with the researcher; 2) principals provided artifacts and documents that either they had written or that
represented actions they had taken; and 3) principals were observed conducting meetings with staff members. Method triangulation was used to capture a more complete, holistic and contextual portrayal of the social reality being examined and to allow more confidence in the results of the study. Use of multiple viewpoints allowed for greater accuracy in describing this phenomenon.

Face-to-face interviews were conducted with ten principals in the refined sample to determine both leadership-orientation (task-orientation or relationship-orientation), and performance of the principal's responsibilities in the four areas cited for the study (instructional leadership, educational management, communication and decision making). Although an attempt was made to be flexible and sensitive to nuances during the interviews, a semi-structured interview schedule was used (Appendix C). Questions were constructed based on information which emerged from a review of the literature regarding leadership orientation and role aspects. Each interviewee was given a definition of task-orientation and relations-orientation and was asked to self-identify as to primary mode of orientation. Other questions in the
interview schedule dealt with performance of the role and questions covered all four aspects. These interviews were mechanically recorded and later transcribed and coded. A coding system was devised which grew out of the leadership theory and role descriptions cited in the review of the literature (Appendix D).

Principals provided artifacts and documents that either they had written or that others had written to reflect actions the principals had taken. Principals' letters and memos comprised primary sources and job descriptions, minutes from meetings and school newsletters served as secondary sources. All artifacts and documents were subjected to both internal and external validity and tests for verisimilitude. Documents and artifacts were examined, coded and analyzed to corroborate the findings of both the face-to-face interviews and the observations of meetings or to add information to form a complete picture of the social reality studied.

Principals were observed conducting meetings with staff members. An attempt was made, on the part of the researcher, to immerse herself in the setting, so meetings were mechanically recorded when participants permitted.
when this was not permitted, the interviewer took notes on the principal's participation. These tapes and notes were used to corroborate the findings of both the face-to-face interviews and the analyses of artifacts and documents.

Analytic memos were kept throughout the data collection process. Data from all three methods were analyzed to determine both similarities and differences among the responses of participants, using the constant, comparative method. Emerging patterns were noted as well as unique responses and all data were analyzed in light of the related literature where appropriate.

This qualitative study was conducted in an attempt to explore the range of behavior and expand the understanding of the resulting interactions.

**Definition of Terms**

There are several terms used throughout this study that need to be clearly understood:

**Principal** - Person who directs the day-to-day operation of a school.

**High School** - Grades 9 through 12

**Public School** - School funded with state and federal money.
Non-Public School - School not funded with state and federal money.

Relations-Oriented - Leader's tendency to show concern for people in displaying leadership behavior.

Task-Oriented - Leader's tendency for work in displaying leadership behavior.

Analysis - Defined in Bloom's Taxonomy as breaking down into parts and relating parts to the whole.

Orientation - Philosophical position as displayed in behavior.

Leadership - Defined by Sergiovanni and Starratt as the supervisor's ability to influence an individual or group toward the achievement of goals.

Limitations

The interview results, documentation examination and meeting observations were limited to a particular geographic area - the Chicagoland area comprised of Chicago and Cook County. Because the interview technique, field observation and document examination were used to gather data, the sample was limited to provide a manageable number of participants for the study. The results, therefore, are limited to the sample population.
A second limitation of the study was that it dealt with only four aspects of the role of the principal.

A third limitation was that the study dealt with high school principals only.

A fourth limitation of the study was that it dealt only with those leadership theories citing task-orientation and relationship-orientation as dimensions of leadership orientation.

A final limitation is that only high schools under 1,000 were used.
CHAPTER II

A REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

This study is concerned with selected aspects of the role of the high school principal in light of leadership orientation. A review of the literature indicates that four aspects of the role of the principal have emerged as relevant to the study of the principalship: (1) instructional leader; (2) educational manager; (3) communicator; and (4) decision maker. The review further indicates that leadership styles can be classified into two categories, task-oriented and relationship-oriented.

A search was conducted to determine whether a similar study had already been done on this topic and to identify major issues and writers connected to the topic. The following resources were utilized: Dissertation Abstracts International, Resources in Education (ERIC), Current Index to Journals in Education, Encyclopedia of Educational Research and Education Index. Investigation of these
resources revealed that this study had not been done. Although several studies have dealt with either the principal's role as an instructional leader\(^1\) and as school manager\(^2\) or as school manager alone\(^3\), these studies either included both elementary and secondary principals and compared them or dealt with public schools only. This study deals with both instructional leadership and educational management and includes both public and non-public schools.

The review is divided into five sections: (1) leadership styles which identify task-orientation or relations-orientation; (2) the role of the principal as instructional leader; (3) the role of the principal as educational manager; (4) the role of the principal as communicator; and (5) the role of the principal as decision maker.

**Leadership Styles Which Identify Task-Orientations**

\(^1\)Ronald William Kalicki, "The Principal's Role in Instructional Leadership: Factors Influencing Perceptions Leadership)," *Dissertation Abstracts International* 54/04 (1993), 1176.


or Relations-Orientation

An attempt to divide leadership styles into task-orientation and relationship-orientation emerged from the Ohio State University Leadership Studies, conducted in the early 1940s, through the use of the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ). Originally developed by John Hemphill and Alvin Coons and later refined by Andrew Halpin and B.J. Wines, the LBDQ measured two basic dimensions of leader behavior: (1) initiating structure, behavior which not only delineates the relationship between the leader and subordinates but establishes patterns of organization, channels of communication and methods of procedure; and (2) consideration, which is leader behavior concerned with "friendship, trust, warmth, interest and respect in the relationship between the leader and members of the work group."\(^5\)

At the same time, the University of Michigan Survey Research Center conducted studies on leadership behavior


\(^5\)Ibid., 182.
dealing with business and industrial organizations, such as insurance and manufacturing companies and electric utilities. These studies clustered characteristics that were closely related to one another. Two concepts were identified: (1) employee orientation, referring to the supervisor who stresses the "human relations" aspect of the job (This supervisor takes a personal interest in employees and believes employees are individuals with need-dispositions and individuality.); and (2) production orientation, in which the supervisor emphasizes the mission or job to be done (This supervisor stresses developing plans and procedures to accomplish the task.). The terminology may have been different but the concepts were the same.

In 1947, a study directed by Robert Bales at the Laboratory of Social Relations at Harvard University of social behavior in small groups led to the suggestion that there are two separate leadership roles; the task leader, who keeps the group engaged in the work, and the social leader, who maintains unity and assures group members that their special needs are respected. Hoy and Miskel note that

6Ibid., 189.
although the research situation and methodology were
different, the results were remarkably consistent with the
Ohio State and Michigan studies.\(^7\)

In 1964, Robert Blake and Jane Mouton identified two
aspects regarding managerial behavior: (1) a concern for
production, and (2) a concern for people, and developed the
Managerial Grid.\(^8\) Blake and Mouton were quick to clarify
that "concern for" did not mean to reflect the degree to
which people's needs are met but rather the degree to which
the boss' actions reflect his own attitude on what is
significant, relative to his employees. They describe
concern for production as including the quality of policy
decisions, the number of accounts processed, the
thoroughness of staff services and whatever it is that
organizations engage people to accomplish. Concern for
people includes a concern for the degree of personal
commitment to completing a job, accountability based on
trust rather than obedience, self-esteem, establishing and
maintaining good working conditions, equitable salary

\(^7\)Ibid., 190.

\(^8\)Robert R. Blake and Jane S. Mouton, *The Managerial
structure and fringe benefits, desire for security and social relationships and friendships with colleagues.\(^9\)

Blake and Mouton identified five major grid styles which contained 81 leadership styles. Each style is labeled according to its place on the grid. The 9, 1 style, located in the lower right corner, or task-oriented leadership style is one in which the leader displays a high concern for production and a low concern for people. Achievement is the aim and quotas and deadlines are used to motivate subordinates. The 1, 9 style or relationship-oriented style, which appears in the upper left-hand corner, is characterized by a low concern for production and a high concern for people. The dispositions and feelings of people are of utmost importance and a country club atmosphere is produced. The 1, 1 style or impoverished leadership, depicted in the lower left-hand corner of the grid, is characterized by both low concern for production and low concern for people. The supervisor has minimum influence over subordinates. The 9, 9 style or integrated leadership is characterized by a high concern for both production and

\(^9\)Ibid., 9.
people. Teamwork, involvement and group decision making are keys in this style, which is pictured in the upper right-hand corner of the grid. And finally, 5, 5 style or balanced leadership, which appears at the center of the grid, is characterized by a balance between emphasizing the relevant aspects of the work and taking people into consideration. \(^{10}\)

In 1967, Fred Fiedler also identified two contrasting leadership styles: (1) task-oriented leaders or those leaders who derive major need satisfaction from the successful accomplishment of the task; and (2) relationship-oriented leaders or those leaders who receive basic need satisfaction from successful interpersonal interactions. \(^{11}\)

Fiedler developed a questionnaire, the least-preferred co-worker scale (LPC), which asks the leader to describe his least-preferred co-worker and measures the leader's emotional reaction to the people with whom he cannot work well. The high scoring leader, who describes his least-preferred co-worker in positive terms, is labeled

---

\(^{10}\)Ibid., 199-202.

\(^{11}\)Ibid., 191.
relationship-oriented. According to Fiedler, this leader derives his major satisfaction from successful interpersonal relations with the group. The leader with a low LPC score is one who describes his least-preferred co-worker in negative terms and derives his major satisfaction from successful task performance.

Fiedler is quick to state, however, that under certain conditions both types of leaders may be concerned with task and both may use interpersonal relationships. He makes a distinction in noting that the relationship-oriented leader will be concerned with the task in order to have successful interpersonal relations, while the task-oriented leader will be concerned with the interpersonal relations in order to achieve task success.¹²

In 1981, Blake and Mouton were joined by Martha Shipe Williams and developed the Academic Administrator Grid. This grid, modeled after the Managerial Grid, served as a framework for organizing leadership theory in college and university administration.¹³ Two aspects of leadership were

¹²Ibid., 192.

¹³Robert R. Blake, Jane Srygley Mouton, and Martha Shipe Williams, The Academic Administrator Grid, (San
cited by the team: (1) concern for institutional performance (This aspect translates into concern with getting results, either directly or through others.) and (2) in terms of their concern for people (This aspect means concern for other administrators, faculty members, students, benefactors and the public at the higher education level.). Leaders can be described in terms of their concern for either performance or people and how they deal with these two dimensions. 14

By placing the two dimensions at right angles to one another and forming a matrix, 81 possible combinations of concerns emerge. 15 These 81 combinations have been grouped into five major grid styles: (1) 1, 1 Caretaker Administration (displayed in the lower left corner of the grid) - The 1, 1 administrator shows little concern for institutional performance and low involvement in exercising power and authority. This administrator exerts a minimum effort necessary to get the required work done; (2) 9, 1 Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1981), 9.

---

14 Ibid., 10.
15 Ibid., 11.
Authority - Obedience Administration (displayed in the lower right corner of the grid) - The 9, 1 administrator shows a high concern for institutional performance and a low concern for the people with whom he is dealing. This administrator arranges conditions of work so that human elements interfere to a minimum degree; (3) 1, 9 Comfortable and Pleasant Administration (displayed in the upper left-hand corner of the grid) - The 1, 9 administrator has a low concern for institutional performance and a high concern for people. This administrator gives thoughtful attention to peoples' needs for satisfying relationships and creates a comfortable, friendly atmosphere and work tempo; (4) 5, 5 Constituency - Centered Administration (displayed in the center of the grid) - This administrator is moderately concerned for institutional performance and moderately concerned for people. He balances the necessity for getting out results yet maintains a satisfactory level of morale; and (5) 9, 9 Team Administration (displayed at the upper right-hand corner of the grid) - This administrator displays a high concern for institutional performance and a high concern for people. He elicits quality achievement from
committed people. These two concerns are not always present in the same amount. Each of them ranges through a scale of quantity. Some administrators may be less concerned than others with institutional performance, just as some may be less concerned than others with the people they work with in day-to-day activities.

William Reddin used the task behavior and relationship behavior dimensions of the previous theorists and added an effectiveness dimension in constructing his three-dimensional model of leadership styles. In using these dimensions, Reddin has attempted to integrate the concepts of leadership style with situational demands of a specific environment.

Paul Hersey and Kenneth Blanchard's Situational Leadership Theory extends Blake and Mouton's Managerial Grid and Reddin's Three Dimensional Leadership styles by identifying two key leadership behaviors: (1) task behavior

\[^{16}\text{Ibid.}, 13-15.\]

\[^{17}\text{Ibid.}, 10.\]

in which the leader explains what each subordinate is to do, as well as when, where and how these tasks are to be performed, thereby engaging in one-way communication; and 2) relationship behavior in which the leader engages in two-way communication and provides "socio-emotional support, psychological strokes and facilitating behaviors." Hersey and Blanchard incorporated the maturity of followers as a key situational variable in their model.\(^\text{19}\)

Sergiovanni and Starratt sum up best what the literature on leadership styles indicates when they state:

"The research tradition dealing with leadership style in education and noneducational settings has identified two key dimensions of leadership. These dimensions have been given a variety of labels. Subtle differences may exist in the labels, but by and large experts agree that leadership style is defined by the extent to which the leader seems to show concern for, focuses on, or seems oriented toward getting work done or accomplishing tasks and the extent to which the leader seems to show concern for, focuses on, or seems oriented toward the needs or feelings of people and his or her relationships with them."\(^\text{20}\)

**The Role of the Principal as Instructional Leader**

Before discussing the role of the principal as

\(^\text{19}\)Ibid., 153.

instructional leader, it is important to define leadership and clarify what it means in an educational setting.

Roland Barth defines leadership as a constant search for the unique conditions under which each person best works, learns and grows and for the means to provide those conditions. Leadership, he says, is trying to look freshly at every problem as it comes up and searching freshly for solutions." 21

Ronald Doll describes leadership as a function requiring human behaviors which help a school achieve its constantly changing purposes. Doll classifies some behaviors as oriented toward production or task performance and others as oriented toward interpersonal relationships. 22

Thelbert Drake and William Roe define leadership as a planned process that results in

"challenging people to work collaboratively toward an ever expanding vision of excellence in the achievement of organizational and personal/professional goals and objectives, creating a threat free environment for growth so that the creative talents and skills of each

---


person are used to best advantage, encouraging and building work relationships that are individually and organizationally satisfying, unifying and strengthening in the realization of mutually determined goals and objectives and optimizing available material and human resources."

When trying to describe what leadership consists of, some theorists talk in terms of leadership traits or leadership behavior. Drake notes that Stodgill put leadership traits into three classifications: (1) self-oriented traits that include intelligence, physical, social and personality characteristics; (2) task related characteristics, such as achievement, enterprise and drive for responsibility; and (3) social characteristics such as cooperativeness, prestige, diplomacy and sociability. 24

Drake also states that Lewin, in citing the three types of leadership behavior (democratic, autocratic and laissez-faire) noted that leadership behavior could vary greatly along an autocratic-democratic continuum. 25

Several writers stress the importance of "vision" when

---


24 Drake, 131.

25 Ibid., 132.
talking about leadership. Robert J. Starratt highlights the importance of the leader's communicating his or her vision to all members of the organization. A leader is, says Starratt, "profoundly convinced of the significance of what he and his group are doing and communicates it verbally and nonverbally to those inside and outside the organization." 26

Linda Tinelli Sheive and Marion Beauchamp Schoenheit, in conducting a research project to investigate what vision means in the context of the work life of educators, defined vision as, "a blueprint of a desired state, an image of a preferred condition that leaders work to achieve in the future." 27

What then do the researchers make of the principal as leader? As long ago as 1965, Corbally, Jenson and Staub postured that the terms principalship and leadership are synonymous in education. The principal, they claimed, is in a position to affect attitude, social climate, morale,


progress, cooperation and direction of effort in the secondary school.\textsuperscript{28} In 1987, Rolf Blank wrote that educational research on school organization and administration has recently been dominated by the concept of "principal as leader" and that the role of the principal as leader is critical in creating school conditions that lead to higher student academic performance.\textsuperscript{29} Recently, Robert Bookbinder noted that a consistent finding in the study of excellent businesses includes the importance of leadership and that that very same leadership of the organization is echoed in the effective schools research, particularly with reference to the leadership of the principal.\textsuperscript{30} How does the principal act as leader? As long ago as 1966, Samuel Goldman claimed that the school principal should be the


educational leader in the community and that he acts as a leader when he influences others in a certain direction as they seek solutions to mutual problems. More recently, Kimbrough and Burkett claimed that principals are leaders in defining goals for the school, developing a curriculum compatible with those goals and promoting instructional processes that support both. They further stated that the leadership of the principal can be one of the key variables influencing the nature of organizational climate and the extent of his or her influence depends on the principal's motivation, leadership skills, sensitivity to goals and the establishment of trust and legitimation with the faculty.

Educational leadership by a principal is not a given. As early as 1979, Gilbert Weldy noted that educational leadership by the principal was not an automatic result of his assumption of the office and that educational leaders,


32Ibid., 80.


34Ibid., 157.
like others, must assume leadership by displaying
"knowledge, initiative, consideration, fairness, energy,
goal orientation, process wisdom, organizing ability and
skill in moving and motivating."\textsuperscript{35}

In 1994, Drake and Roe claimed that opportunities to
exert leadership are abundant with the shift toward site
based decision making, the incorporation of technology in
the work place, home and school, increased pressure on the
tax dollar and rising demands from the community for
tangible results from schooling.\textsuperscript{36}

The concept of the principal as motivator is integral
to his or her role as leader. Anderson and Davis have noted
that the principal must have the capacity to evoke "from
their co-workers their voluntary, active participation in
assuming responsibilities which contribute to growth in
relationships, attitudes and activities of the group."\textsuperscript{37}

\textsuperscript{35}Gilbert R. Weldy, \textit{Principals: What They Do and Who
They Are} (Reston, Virginia: The National Association of

\textsuperscript{36}Drake and Roe, 129,

\textsuperscript{37}Vivienne Anderson and Daniel R. Davis, \textit{Patterns of
Educational Leadership} (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall,
"Clearly," note Blumberg and Greenfield, "building principals are critical figures in the life of a school." But how do principals fulfill this critical, leadership role?

The majority of the experts agree that the principal fulfills his or her leadership role primarily in the area of instruction. Although there has been some debate over whether or not this is possible, the Illinois School Code requires that the principal spend 51% of his or her time as the instructional leader:

"School boards shall specify in their formal job description for principals that his or her primary responsibility is in the improvement of instruction. A majority of the time spent by a principal shall be spent on curriculum and staff development through both formal and informal activities, establishing clear lines of communication regarding school goals, accomplishments, practices and policies with parents and teachers. School boards shall ensure that their principals are evaluated on their instructional leadership ability and their ability to maintain a positive education and learning climate." 39

Several educational specialists have attempted a


definition of instructional leadership. Interpretations of the term or concept vary, as do the parameters the concept encompasses. Samuel Goldman asserts that the central focus of all administrative effort should be upon the development of a program that will provide "rich educational opportunities" for each student and puts the responsibility for the development of that program squarely on the shoulders of the school principal.\textsuperscript{40} Wynn DeBevoise broadly interprets the concept of instructional leadership to encompass actions a principal takes or delegates to others to promote student learning, such as setting school wide goals, providing the resources needed for learning to occur, supervising and evaluating teachers, coordinating staff development and creating collegial relationships with and among teachers.\textsuperscript{41}

Ubben and Hughes emphasize that the purpose of instructional leadership is the improvement of the school. They add that the principal is the key individual for

\textsuperscript{40}Goldman, 38.

providing the instructional leadership in the school and base their position on the effective schools research.42 Linda Avila also quotes the effective schools research, which she claims has strengthened the voices of those demanding that the principal perform this role.43

Others describe instructional leadership as coordinating and controlling the instructional program. Bossert, Dwyer, Rowan and Lee note that "work on 'successful schools' underscores the importance of instructional leadership, especially the role of the principal in coordinating and controlling the educational program."44 Chase and Kane recommend that the school principal be acknowledged as the school's leader and as the manager of the instructional program and that this role be strengthened.45


44Steven Bossert, David Dwyer, Brian Rowan and Ginny Lee, "The Instructional Management Role of the Principal." Educational Administration Quarterly, 18 (Summer 1992): 34.

45Cheryl M. Chase and Michael B. Kane, The Principal as Instructional Leader: How Much More Time Before We Act?
James Stronge agrees that some interpretations define instructional leadership in its broadest sense, but believes that prevalent interpretations provide a narrower range of activities such as supervising and evaluating teachers and administering staff development programs.46

What kinds of activities then would qualify as instructional leadership? Keith Acheson lists: time spent observing classrooms, recording teacher student behavior and conferring with teachers about their teaching; portions of faculty meetings dealing with curriculum and instruction; testing and student diagnosis; and committee meetings on topics of curriculum, instruction and testing.47

How then does the principal act as instructional leader? Experts cite various concrete ways in which the principal acts as instructional leader. Melton and Stanavage note that the principal acts as instructional


leader when he exercises his responsibility to direct, guide and coordinate the total educational program within the school.\textsuperscript{48} Pendergrass and Wood claim he acts as instructional leader when he focuses in on program supervision and curriculum improvement.\textsuperscript{49} David Dwyer states more specifically that he acts to improve instruction by manipulating class size and composition, scheduling, staff assignments, the scope and sequence of curriculum, the distribution of instructional materials and even teaching styles.\textsuperscript{50} Roy Mendez concurs with all of the previous experts in asserting that the principal acts as instructional leader by specifying instructional goals, selecting and evaluating personnel, planning curriculum and scheduling learning activities.\textsuperscript{51}

\textsuperscript{48}George Melton and John Stanavage, \textit{The Principalship, Job Specifications and Salary Considerations for the 70's} (Washington, NASSP, 1970), 2.


\textsuperscript{50}David C. Dwyer, "The Search for Instructional Leadership: Routines and Subtleties in the Principal's Role." \textit{Educational Leadership} 41 (February 1984): 36.

\textsuperscript{51}Roy Mendez, "How Principals Improve their Instructional Leadership?", \textit{NASSP Bulletin} 70 (March 1986): 5.
School climate is a major concern of principals who seek to exercise instructional leadership. McCleary and Thomson posture that effective principals believe that school climate is directly affected by their actions and exercise considerable influence over their school's atmosphere. Bossert, Dwyer, Rowan and Lee state that creating a school climate that is conducive to learning is a fundamental part of the instructional management role of the principal. In David Dwyer's study of successful principals, he found that his subjects treated climate as a characteristic of their schools that they could monitor and change, encompassing physical as well as social elements. In their views, changing climate included everything from painting walls to organizing how students lined up after recess.

Several writers concur and stress the importance of creating school climate as integral to the success of

---


53 Bossert, Dwyer, Rowan and Lee, 54.

54 Dwyer, 36.
exercising instructional leadership. Richard Dufour and Robert Eaker label the principal a "climate manager." And finally, Paula Short and Ron Jones note that instructional leadership also includes creating a climate that fosters individual professional growth for the staff.

The areas of curriculum and instruction are critical in the fulfillment of the principal's role as instructional leader. Most effective principals, add McCleary and Thomson, are engaged in developing and improving instruction and depend heavily on involvement of subject area departments and individual faculty members for curriculum development. The principal must be able to identify curriculum and instructional problems, analyze curricular content and instructional methods and correlate them with instructional objectives and outcomes, states Medwid. As the instructional analyst, the principal must be able to

---


57McCleary and Thomson, 23.
conceptualize curriculum and instruction in generic terms and then ensure quality instruction through critical decision making based on sound information. 58 "Research on effective schools," says Thomas Ellis, "has verified the proposition that schools are rarely effective, unless the principal is a proficient instructional leader." 59 And finally, Smith notes that the principal must possess knowledge and skill in curriculum and instructional matters so that teachers perceive that their interaction with the principal leads to improved instructional practice. 60

The principal's work in the area of curriculum is to coordinate the many activities of the school to ensure that the total curriculum is aligned. 61 Murphy states that the principal must address eight curricular issues in his or her


role as instructional leader: (1) amount of content; (2) academic focus to course work; (3) focus and sequence to course work; (4) breadth vs. depth of content; (5) differential access to knowledge; (6) homework as an extension of content; (7) curricular alignment and (8) quality of course objectives.\textsuperscript{62} In addressing these eight areas, principals must take a central role in curriculum matters by developing systems that will inform them about development in each area.\textsuperscript{63} Garner and Bradley note that the managerial responsibilities of the principal often interfere with his or her instructional and curricular responsibilities, but if a dynamic curriculum is to exist in the school, the principal must support the curriculum and help the staff select and implement a curriculum design.\textsuperscript{64}

The principal exercises leadership over curriculum implementation through work with the teachers around methods


\textsuperscript{63}Ibid., 4.

\textsuperscript{64}Art Garner and Mary Jane Bradley, "The Principal as a Leader in Curriculum Innovation," \textit{The Clearing House} 64 (July/August 1991): 419.
of instruction. He or she accomplishes this through providing staff development opportunities and actively engaging in evaluation of teacher performance. In two studies, one as early as 1978, conducted by Robert Krajewski and another, as late as 1991, done by Paula Short and Ron Jones, the principals who took part saw their role as staff development facilitator as integral to the improvement of instruction. In Krajewski's study, which dealt with 1,127 members of the Texas Association of Secondary School Principals, principals noted that, although principals viewed themselves as administrators in practice, ideally they preferred to be instructional and curricular leaders and saw their responsibility of selecting and orienting their staffs as a way to facilitate that leadership role. 65 Short and Jones' study of the perceptions of twenty outstanding principals found that, as a group, these principals saw themselves as facilitators whose primary focus was to provide the staff with opportunities for growth. For some, this meant funding travel, workshop

registration and, in some cases, paying substitutes so that the staff could learn new skills on school time. In addition, these principals modeled continual growth by participating in staff development opportunities themselves.

In 1985, a leading expert on supervision and evaluation, Keith Acheson, stressed the importance of the principal's being knowledgeable with respect to a range of generic teaching skills and a variety of strategies. This should be the focus of the principal, he claimed, since it is unreasonable to expect the principal to be an expert in every subject matter and grade level. Edward De Roche lists supervision of instruction and evaluation of teacher performance as key to the role of the principal, as the school's instructional leader, and notes that the principal has the major responsibility for formalizing the

---

66 Short and Jones, 2.
67 Ibid., 3.
68 Acheson, 8.
evaluation process. Anderson and Nicholson found, in their study of eight comprehensive high schools, that the most important functions of the principals tended to be involving supervision and evaluation of teachers. As Acheson concludes, "the role of evaluator of teacher performance seems nearly inescapable if the principal is to retain any status as instructional leader." The principal recognizes various resources that will aid in the process of improving instruction, procures them and makes effective use of them. The principal plays an important part in shaping an effective instructional organization. He or she must interpret information from many sources, hold tightly to his or her experiences as an educator, and find meaning in the sometimes paradoxical demands placed upon him or her.

Wayne Worner and Robert Stokes ask the question, "What is the most important function of a secondary principal? The
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response is as clear and unanimous as it has been for years, instructional leadership."  

Richard Niece postures that there are five categories of descriptors when discussing instructional leadership which must be maintained by the principal: (1) possessing a substantial knowledge base in curriculum, instruction and evaluation; (2) providing vision and direction for the school; (3) promoting positive teaching and learning environments; (4) establishing patterns of effective communication and motivation; and (5) maintaining high expectations for self, staff and students. In conclusion, Jacobson, Logsdon and Wiegman sum it up best when they said, as long ago as 1973,

"The principal is confronted with a variety of tasks. Managing a school is time-consuming and demanding. Many of the tasks are routine, while others require planning and expertise. Changed societal conditions have resulted in conditions that make the task more difficult. In spite of all this, still and always, the principal's most important task is the improvement of

---


The Role of the Principal as Educational Manager

The role of the principal as educational manager is perhaps the most visible role on a day-to-day basis. Hodge and Johnson make a clear distinction between leadership and management. They state that leadership is the ability to shape the attitudes and behavior of others, whether in formal or informal situations; whereas, management concerns itself with the formal task of decision and command.\(^7^8\)

Larry Hughes characterizes leadership activities as those which are related to change and dynamism and management activities as those encompassing productive efforts to manage a status quo in which people work comfortably.\(^7^9\) Hughes quotes Blumberg as stating that the successful principal applies the "craft" of administration

---


by balancing the art of leadership and the science of management to improve the curriculum, instruction, and other pertinent elements of school.\textsuperscript{80}

In 1984, Wesley Bosson noted that the principalship was emerging into a school manager position rather than a leadership position. Bosson stated that nearly 85\% of a principal's time was devoted to operating the school plant, discipline and paper work.\textsuperscript{81} Bookbinder concurs, stating that principals spend most of their time responding to administrative and managerial tasks.\textsuperscript{82} In some ways, principals are similar to managers in business.

Long before Bosson, Goldman noted that managing the school includes four major areas of responsibility: (1) student personnel; (2) finance and business; (3) plant maintenance; and (4) auxiliary services.\textsuperscript{83} Doll describes executive managers as those who "keep the machinery running" according to already conceived policies and ways of

\textsuperscript{80}Ibid., 34.

\textsuperscript{81}Wesley Bosson, "Is The Emerging Principal a Leader or Manager?", \textit{Thrust} 13 (February/March 1984): 38.

\textsuperscript{82}Bookbinder, 35.

\textsuperscript{83}Goldman, 71.
proceeding. With these concepts in mind, this section will explore the role of the principal as educational manager.

In 1973, Richard Hostrop noted that Peter F. Drucker applied five characteristics of a manager to the role of the principal: (1) he knows where his time goes; (2) he focuses on outward contributions; (3) he builds on his own strengths, the strengths of his superiors, colleagues and subordinates; (4) he concentrates on a few major areas when superior performance will produce outstanding results; and (5) he makes decisions.

Gary Yukl claimed that the managerial traits which are beneficial to business managers are also beneficial for school principals: self-confidence, need for socialized power; need for achievement; desire to compete with peers; respect for authority figures, tolerance for high stress; high energy level; interest in oral, persuasive activities; and relevant technical, conceptual, and interpersonal

84Doll, 5.

In 1990, Kimbrough and Burkett have added the management of technology to the list of areas of responsibility, "Schools, in response to the demands of society, are being computerized. The principal is responsible for providing the leadership for this new emphasis." Robert Bookbinder noted, in 1992, that human resources management had expanded and moved beyond mere administration of the traditional activities of employment and had become more integrated into all of the functions of the school because the school had become more complex and challenging. For this reason, Bookbinder called for the principal as integral to all aspects of the organization.

In 1979, Berlie Fallon and Gilbert Weldy launched a debate as to whether or not the principal was an instructional leader or a manager. Fallon asserted that, "principals, by the very nature of the things which press

---


*Kimbrough and Burkett, 235.*
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them the most, are primarily involved in administrative and managerial roles." Fallon went on to claim that principals were not, nor have they ever been maximally effective instructional leaders, that they do not have the in-depth knowledge of subject fields, that instructional leadership is not administrative at its very core and that the academic preparations for the principalship do not prepare them for the role of instructional leadership and finally that they do in fact not have the time to give to the role of instructional leadership.\(^8^9\) Gilbert Weldy argued that Fallon's chief error lay in defining instructional leadership as consisting solely of observing and evaluating classroom teachers. Weldy claimed that principals could avail themselves of the research and could in fact observe effective teaching, regardless of subject matter, detect student misbehavior, apathy or disobedience, and observe teacher behavior both within and outside the classroom. In addition, Weldy added (1) in-service improvement activities; (2) curriculum development activities;

\(^{8^9}\)Berlie J. Fallon, "Point: Principals are Instructional Leaders - Hit or Myth," *NASSP Bulletin* 63 (January 1979): 67-68.
(3) development of the master schedule; (4) development and implementation of evaluation and grading systems; (5) provision for students with special needs or talents; (6) allocation of resources; and (7) carrying out mandates of state and local boards of education requirements for curriculum as areas where principals could exercise instructional leadership. 90

Since Fallon and Weldy sparked the debate, some experts have asserted that the principal cannot be both the instructional leader and the educational manager. Carolyn Ruck notes that, although there may have been a time when it was appropriate for principals to do it all, with the increased specialization in schools it is now time to change the principal's role from laborer to that of team coordinator. 91 Rallis and Highsmith note that an effective school requires a manager competent in maintenance functions; at the same time, teachers in an effective school

---


require an instructional leader to support their professional development. These researchers question whether it is practical to expect most principals to perform two roles that are so different and require such diverse skills. 92 Rick Ginsberg argues that through no fault of their own, principals can never be both instructional leader and manager and cites seven constraints that preclude this: (1) lack of a precise definition of instructional leadership; (2) present training programs for principals; (3) present selection criteria for principals in most districts; (4) the everyday nature of the principal's job; (5) the weak technology and disputed conceptions of teaching; (6) typical rewards and incentives for principals; and (7) collective bargaining agreements and teacher contracts. 93

Other experts, however, believe that the principal must be both instructional leader and educational manager.


Donmoyer and Wagstaff assert that all principals are instructional leaders, if one considers an instructional leader as one who has a significant impact, for better or worse, on student opportunities to learn in the classroom. This definition, they claim, eliminates the leader-manager distinction. Instructional leadership then is no longer a separate function distinct from a principal's managerial duties but rather the most direct way for the principal to exercise instructional leadership.\textsuperscript{94} They list six managerial tasks that can have a significant impact on teaching and learning and can influence instruction: (1) scheduling; (2) hiring personnel; (3) supervising personnel; (4) coordinating pupil services; (5) managing staff development; and (6) budgeting.\textsuperscript{95}

James Stronge again addressed the subject and stated that a disturbing theme had emerged from instructional leadership theory, "that a managerial role for the principal is antithetical to high quality instructional leadership."


\textsuperscript{95}Ibid., 23-24.
On the contrary, Stronge cites Snyder and Johnson as suggesting that rather than dichotomize these two, the proper role of the principal is one in which an integration of management and instructional leadership produced a unifying conceptualization of the principal as that of educational leadership. Chase and Kane assert that the word "manager" has taken on negative connotations, while the term "instructional leader" has been associated with all that is good and healthy for the education of children. Chase and Kane say that in reality both functions must be performed, that if principals are not able effectively to fulfill the management responsibilities, an environment for teaching and learning will not exist, "The safety of students must be insured, discipline must be maintained, teachers must be protected from constant interruptions and instructional materials and resources must be provided." The role of the principal as educational manager is essential to the smooth operation of the school. Educational managers perform six tasks that are vital to

96 Stronge, 5.
97 Chase and Kane, 13.
this smooth operation: (1) establish precise goals and measurable objectives; (2) evaluate progress toward predetermined goals and objectives; (3) organize; (4) motivate and communicate; (5) strengthen superordinates, peers and subordinates, and (6) make decisions. This role is varied and challenging and provides the underpinnings for the implementation of the delivery of curriculum, instruction and staff development within the school. As Peter Drucker summed it up, "The manager has the task of creating a true whole that is larger than the sum of its parts, a productive entity that turns out more than the sum of the resources put into it." As Thomas Sergiovanni states,

"Distinctions between management and leadership are useful for theorists and help to clarify and sort various activities and behaviors of principals. For practical purposes, however, both emphases should be considered as necessary and important aspects of a principal's administrative style. The choice is not whether a principal is leader or manager but whether the two emphases are in balance and, indeed, whether they complement each other."
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The Role of the Principal as Communicator

Although the role of the principal as communicator has been set apart for organizational purposes, in reality the principal acts as communicator primarily, but not exclusively, when he or she functions as instructional leader and educational manager.

Goldman notes that communication can be effected by the principal in a variety of ways, through written communication, personal conversations, press releases, attendance at meetings or general involvement in community affairs.\(^{101}\)

When discussing communication and educational leadership, Hoy and Miskel cite Keith Davis' definition of communication as the process of passing information and understanding from one person to another.\(^{102}\) They note that communication does not take place unless the receiver interprets exactly the information being transmitted. So, in order to have communication, both a sender and receiver

\(^{101}\) Goldman, 69.

\(^{102}\) Hoy and Miskel, 239.
must participate. Therefore, the role of the principal as communicator includes his or her participation as both a sender and receiver.

Hoy and Miskel list four characteristics of communication which constitute the framework for discussion of the administrator, and in this case the principal, as communicator: (1) the purpose is to either inform, instruct, evaluate or influence; (2) the content of communication is the message to be sent; (3) the process involves feedback from the receiver to the transmitter; and (4) the communication can be either written or non-written, verbal or nonverbal. 103

One of the most important ways a principal acts as communicator is as spokesperson for the school. Goldman says the school principal occupies a key position and that it is his major responsibility to maintain open lines of communication between the school and its many community groups. 104 Lipham and Hoeh claim that their research indicates that the principal, in working with various

---
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community groups, is frequently called on to represent the viewpoint of the school on a variety of issues. They go on to stress that the effective principal must clearly and accurately communicate such views, since openness of communication is such a significant element of mutual understanding. Lipham and Hoeh also note that their research indicates that the principal, in working with various community groups, frequently is called on to represent the viewpoint of the schools concerning a multitude of issues and problems. The principal is responsible for explaining school goals, objectives and procedures for achieving them to all of the publics, parents, students, faculty and, in small districts, community members. Melton and Stanavage state that the principal is a communicator, explaining the school's goals, procedures, and objectives to everyone concerned. As an interpreter, the principal presents the school, its program, its purposes, its philosophy, its problems to the students, community groups, is frequently called on to represent the viewpoint of the school on a variety of issues. They go on to stress that the effective principal must clearly and accurately communicate such views, since openness of communication is such a significant element of mutual understanding. Lipham and Hoeh also note that their research indicates that the principal, in working with various community groups, frequently is called on to represent the viewpoint of the schools concerning a multitude of issues and problems. The principal is responsible for explaining school goals, objectives and procedures for achieving them to all of the publics, parents, students, faculty and, in small districts, community members. Melton and Stanavage state that the principal is a communicator, explaining the school's goals, procedures, and objectives to everyone concerned. As an interpreter, the principal presents the school, its program, its purposes, its philosophy, its problems to the students, community groups, is frequently called on to represent the viewpoint of the school on a variety of issues. They go on to stress that the effective principal must clearly and accurately communicate such views, since openness of communication is such a significant element of mutual understanding. Lipham and Hoeh also note that their research indicates that the principal, in working with various community groups, frequently is called on to represent the viewpoint of the schools concerning a multitude of issues and problems. The principal is responsible for explaining school goals, objectives and procedures for achieving them to all of the publics, parents, students, faculty and, in small districts, community members. Melton and Stanavage state that the principal is a communicator, explaining the school's goals, procedures, and objectives to everyone concerned. As an interpreter, the principal presents the school, its program, its purposes, its philosophy, its problems to the students, community groups, is frequently called on to represent the viewpoint of the school on a variety of issues. They go on to stress that the effective principal must clearly and accurately communicate such views, since openness of communication is such a significant element of mutual understanding. Lipham and Hoeh also note that their research indicates that the principal, in working with various community groups, frequently is called on to represent the viewpoint of the schools concerning a multitude of issues and problems. The principal is responsible for explaining school goals, objectives and procedures for achieving them to all of the publics, parents, students, faculty and, in small districts, community members. Melton and Stanavage state that the principal is a communicator, explaining the school's goals, procedures, and objectives to everyone concerned. As an interpreter, the principal presents the school, its program, its purposes, its philosophy, its problems to the students,
staff, community, central office and the board of education and colleagues in the principalship.\textsuperscript{107}

Therefore, as John Hubley concludes, developing the principal's communications and public relations skills is not only basic to the school's operation but a vital process for the future of secondary education.\textsuperscript{108} DeBevoise concurs, in her synthesis of research on the principal as instructional leader, by noting that several researchers cited included communicating a vision of the school's purposes and standards.\textsuperscript{109}

Bernard Masse asserts that as administrative head, at the building level, the principal is in an excellent position to serve as advocate and spokesperson for the school.\textsuperscript{110} He continues and states that the principal must also serve as a conveyor of new ideas and as a catalyst for

\textsuperscript{107}Melton and Stanavage, 6.


\textsuperscript{109}DeBevoise, 20.

responsible change within the school's ongoing operation.\textsuperscript{111}

Kenneth Tye concurs, by noting that the principal acts as the spokesperson for the school, representing the school's program and faculty with parents, community, district administration and board of education. The principal, he says, needs to be able to articulate the wishes and policies of parents and the district leadership to the school staff as well.\textsuperscript{112} And finally, Goldman notes that a major task of school administrators is to keep the public well informed of school activities so that it, the public, may make wise decisions about education and so that positive support will continue. To do this and at the same time to achieve instructional improvement at the school, the principal must be able to communicate clearly with a variety of groups and individuals.\textsuperscript{113}

In her essay on collegial or peer supervision and evaluation, Ruck states that to foster open communication,

\begin{itemize}
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principals must encourage professionals to communicate freely with one another and respect ideas so expressed.\textsuperscript{114} Smith and Andrews note that in performing the role of the principal as instructional leader, the principal must be a skilled communicator in one-on-one, small group and large group settings.\textsuperscript{115} A part of this involves those professionals within the building as well as community groups outside of the building. In all of these interactions, the fact that two way communication is necessary is often stressed. Melton and Stanavage stress that communication must be two-way, "Not only must the principal interpret the school to the community: he must also interpret the community to the school."\textsuperscript{116} Dubin claims that principals must train themselves to be sensitive to the importance of open, honest two-way communication through their own behavior and actions.\textsuperscript{117} To do this, the principal must be a good listener. Kimbrough and Burkett state that, not only must this not be overlooked, it may be the most

\textsuperscript{114}Ruck, 11.
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\textsuperscript{117}Dubin, 63.
important skill in communication.\textsuperscript{118}

Nonverbal communication is as important as verbal communication when performing the role of the principal. Hutto and Criss discuss the implications of body language. Body position during communication sends out a message about intent in the conversation and what is going on around us.\textsuperscript{119}

There are several ways that principals act as communicators when performing both the role of the instructional leader and the educational manager, noted Weldy, Dubin and Bookbinder over the years. Weldy speaks of the actions of the principal as mediator. The principal must be able to moderate all of the conflicting forces and influences and bring people together to work in harmony. To do this, the principal needs a knowledge, not only of human psychology and group processes, but also of effective communication.\textsuperscript{120} Dubin states that it is important for the principal to provide frequent staff recognition not only for

\textsuperscript{118}Kimbrough and Burkett, 152.
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outstanding achievement but also for the everyday services they perform, both verbally as well as through informal notes.\textsuperscript{121} Bookbinder notes that principals act as mediators in resolving disputes and are politicians and diplomats, building relationships and using persuasion and compromise to promote school goals.\textsuperscript{122}

Margaret Mallia interviewed principals during their first year on the job and discovered that, although there were differences between principals and their schools, some patterns did emerge. She discovered that the principal was the focal point of the information center of the school.\textsuperscript{123} She noted that most of the principal's time was spent in talking with others and concluded that much of the principal's work is accomplished through this medium.\textsuperscript{124}

Authorities in the field of management place communication as a central factor in administration. The

\textsuperscript{121} Dubin, 63.
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typical model of communication includes sender, encoding channel, receiver, decoding and response elements accompanied by a feedback loop and noise factor. All of this must take place when the principal acts as communicator.

The Role of the Principal as Decision Maker

In similar fashion to the role of the principal as communicator, the role of the principal as decision maker has been set apart for organizational purposes. In reality, the principal acts as communicator primarily, but not exclusively, when he or she functions as instructional leader and educational manager.

Morphet, Johns and Reller cite Daniel E. Griffiths as stating that the central process of administration is decision making. Griffiths claims that decision making is composed of the following six elements: (1) recognize, define and limit the problem; (2) analyze and evaluate the problem; (3) establish criteria or standards by which solutions will be evaluated or judged as acceptable and adequate to the need; (4) collect data; (5) formulate and

---
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select the perfected solution or solutions (test them in advance); and (6) put into effect the preferred solution.\(^{126}\)

Hoy and Miskel name five steps in the decision making process which are the same as Griffiths' but do not include data collection.\(^{127}\)

Jensen and Clarke note that the, "function of administration is the effective conduct of the process of decision making, the process through which the administrator exercises the controlling and directing aspects of administration."\(^{128}\) DeRoche notes that, legally, the building principal is the chief administrative officer, the supervisor and the decision maker.\(^{129}\) Drake and Roe quote from recent work done on site based management that, as decision making processes move toward individual buildings and as instructional means become even more flexible and as instructional technology advances, the principal can and
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should become a leader of decision making.\textsuperscript{130} Dennis Evans supports this position, by asserting that principals' best decisions are those that promote effective decision making by others.\textsuperscript{131}

Lipham and Hoeh explain three types of decision making used by principals: (1) routine decision making; (2) heuristic decision making; and (3) compromise decision making. Routine decision making is usually structured and hierarchical in nature, i.e. principal and teachers; role behavior is characterized by specialized yet coordinated effort; the processes utilized are largely formal; and the relationships are likely to be somewhat stressful examples, such as principals' approving teachers' requisitions or enforcing student attendance.\textsuperscript{132} In heuristic, or creative decision making, there is less of an emphasis on hierarchy; each individual is free to explore ideas bearing on the problem; the processes are characterized by free, full and open problem definition and alternative generation and the

\textsuperscript{130}Drake and Roe, 26.


\textsuperscript{132}Lipham and Hoeh, 163.
emotional-social tone is relatively relaxed. Working with students or teachers to solve a curricular issue would be an example of heuristic decision making. The third type, compromise decision making or negotiated decision making, is concerned with a strategy for dealing with conflict that may occur because of differences in cultural values, role expectations or vested interests of individuals. This type of decision making might involve conflicts between parents and teachers or between one student group versus another.\footnote{Ibid., 164.}

What does the principal make decisions about? Bossert, Dwyer, Rowan and Lee assert that the principal can affect student learning by either making decisions that constrain teachers' decisions at the classroom level or "buffer" classrooms so that they can run smoothly.\footnote{Bossert, Dwyer, Rowan and Lee, 54.} Decisions concerning curriculum content, selection of teachers, staff development activities, supervision of instruction, evaluation of faculty and staff and program evaluation are critical avenues through which the principal affects the quality of staff and programs and, in turn, the quality of
instruction available to students, states Masse.\textsuperscript{135} All of this relates to the principal as instructional leader and decision maker.

But what about the role of educational manager and decision making? Weldy notes that principals have traditionally prided themselves in being able to make decisions, especially tough ones. But years ago, he states, their authority was virtually absolute. Writing in 1979, he stated, "Today's principals are very process oriented and their decisions are unquestionably more difficult."\textsuperscript{136} The expectation of teachers, students, parents and lay people that they have some input into the decisions that affect them had left principals confused and frustrated.\textsuperscript{137} Weldy urged principals to be process oriented and to be aware of which groups should be consulted, which groups should be informed (before or after) and which should participate fully in the decision making. Furthermore, the principal, "needs an unerring sense" of when a decision should be made,

\textsuperscript{135}Masse, 206.

\textsuperscript{136}Weldy, 43.

\textsuperscript{137}Ibid., 44.
when to delegate it to someone and when to delay the decision. Either way, the principal is still the chief decision maker, though few decisions will be made alone.\textsuperscript{138}

The principal's day, purport Ubben and Hughes, is characterized by confrontation and problem solving, by reaction and proaction. Decision making, they claim, is the "essential executive act," for it involves getting done those things which help achieve the goals of the organization.\textsuperscript{139} Sometimes this decision making process takes no more than five minutes or less (if it involves something as concrete as whether to send a sick student home) and sometimes it takes more time (as in a decision involving a citizen's group that is upset about some issue.)\textsuperscript{140}

In 1990, Lawrence Rossow still cited Griffiths' administrative theory on decision making and reiterated the need for involving others in the decision making. He noted that group decision making could enhance the effectiveness

\textsuperscript{138}Ibid., 46.

\textsuperscript{139}Ubben and Hughes, 38.

\textsuperscript{140}Ibid., 41.
of the ultimate decision.\textsuperscript{141}

In 1979, McCleary and Thomson noted that the effective principal perceives differences from situation to situation, analyzes the actions required, and then moves toward a decision based on that analysis.\textsuperscript{142} This is as true today as it was then and identifies the crux of the principal's role as decision maker.

\textbf{Summary}

The literature indicates that there are two dimensions to the leadership orientation of administrators, predilection for getting the tasks performed, or task-orientation, and predilection for nurturing relationships with those who are led, or relations-orientation.

The high school principal is in a unique position as the educational leader of the school community. He or she displays leadership traits, behavior, and skills which can help move the school toward achieving its goals and objectives.

\textsuperscript{141}Lawrence F. Rossow. \textit{The Principalship: Dimensions in Instructional Leadership} (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1990), 94.

\textsuperscript{142}McCleary and Thomson, 27.
There are four major aspects of the principal's role: (1) instructional leader; (2) educational manager; (3) communicator; and (4) decision maker. The principal acts as instructional leader when he or she coordinates the instructional program. This includes delivering the curriculum, analyzing and modifying instructional methods, supervising and evaluating teachers and counselors, and providing staff development programs. The principal acts as educational manager when he or she acts upon student and personnel issues, manages school finances and auxiliary services and supervises the operation of the plant. The principal acts as both communicator and decision maker, in most cases but not exclusively, when performing the roles of instructional leader and educational manager. The principal acts as communicator when acting as spokesperson for the school, listening to the concerns of teachers, students and parents, and mediating between conflicting parties. The principal acts as decision maker when handling routine matters and working with others to solve problems.

William Greenfield best summarizes the role of the high school principal when he says, "There are many conceptions of the role of the principal. Those dominating the research
literature include principal as leader; instructional supervisor; administrative decision maker; organizational change agent; and conflict manager. While most principals probably incorporate elements associated with each of these images in their actual behavior or the job, the most prevalent assumption reflected in the research literature is that of the principal as leader."\textsuperscript{143}

CHAPTER III

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

As indicated in the Review of Related Literature, the principal performs four aspects of his or her role in the execution of his or her duties: (1) instructional leader; (2) educational manager; (3) communicator; and (4) decision maker. He or she approaches these four aspects armed with a leadership orientation which may be characterized as primarily either task-oriented or relations-oriented.

In order to document, assess and examine these four aspects of the principal's role and his or her primary leadership orientation, three methods were used: (1) face-to-face interview; (2) observation of the principal conducting a staff meeting; and (3) examination of artifacts and documents which were either written by the principal or which represented actions taken by the principal.

Demographic questionnaires were sent to the principals of fifty-seven schools, which met the criteria for selection as stated in the Introduction. Forty-three principals
returned the preliminary questionnaire. (Two more questionnaires were returned but not filled out.) Of those forty-three principals, twenty-eight agreed to be interviewed, to share documents and to be observed. Three of the twenty-eight principals took part in the pilot study. They, not only submitted to the face-to-face interview, but also gave expert advice on the semi-structured schedule used for the interview. The interview schedule was revised in light of those comments.

Based on results of the demographic questionnaire, ten principals were selected to take part in the study. These principals represented a broad spectrum of characteristics in terms of gender, educational preparation and experience in the principalship. Their schools represented a balance of coeducational, and single gender and urban and suburban high schools. Because the sample included only high schools under 1000 (to ensure that the four aspects of the role were indeed performed by the principal), the percentage of non-public schools receiving the questionnaire was higher than the percentage of public schools receiving the questionnaire. Thus, the refined sample was composed of fewer public schools than non-public schools. All public
school principals who agreed to be observed, interviewed and provide documents, however, were included as participants.

Data are presented in answer to the research question in light of the four aspects of the role of the principal and his or her primary leadership orientation. Findings are presented in the sections that deal with the four aspects and analysis of the findings is used to answer the research question.

Profile of Respondents

The respondents to the demographic questionnaire consisted of 43 high school principals in the Chicagoland area during the 1994-95 school year. The response rate was 75.4 percent of the sample (Table 1).

TABLE 1: MAJOR CHARACTERISTICS OF TOTAL RESPONDENTS

Classification of Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification of Schools</th>
<th>Suburban</th>
<th>Urban</th>
<th>Public</th>
<th>Nonpublic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coed</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Education of Principal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education of Principal</th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>MA and MS/M.Ed</th>
<th>MS and M.Ed/CAS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coed</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.Ed</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed.S</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed.D</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gender of Principal

Male - 24
Female - 19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal at Current School</th>
<th>Principal at Other Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5 yrs. - 32</td>
<td>0 yrs. - 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 yrs. - 10</td>
<td>1-5 yrs. - 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 yrs. - 1</td>
<td>6-10 yrs. - 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 yrs. - 0</td>
<td>11-15 yrs. - 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;20 yrs. - 0</td>
<td>16-20 yrs. - 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&gt;20 yrs. - 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Administrative Experience at Current School</th>
<th>Administrative Experience at Other Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 yrs. - 0</td>
<td>0 yrs. - 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 yrs. - 10</td>
<td>1-5 yrs. - 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 yrs. - 3</td>
<td>6-10 yrs. - 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 yrs. - 3</td>
<td>11-15 yrs. - 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 yrs. - 1</td>
<td>16-20 yrs. - 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer - 1</td>
<td>&gt;20 yrs. - 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Experience at Current School</th>
<th>Teaching Experience at Other Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 yrs. - 20</td>
<td>0 yrs. - 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 yrs. - 7</td>
<td>1-5 yrs. - 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 yrs. - 4</td>
<td>6-10 yrs. - 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 yrs. - 5</td>
<td>11-15 yrs. - 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 yrs. - 2</td>
<td>16-20 yrs. - 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;20 yrs. - 5</td>
<td>&gt;20 yrs. - 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Distribution of the classification of schools favored the nonpublic (81.3%), urban (53.4%) and single gender (53.4%) characteristics. Distribution of principals'
characteristics favored males (55.8%) with masters degrees (76.7%) rather than doctorates. Forty-two of the forty-three respondents or 97.7% had been principal of their current school for under eleven years. Twenty-seven or 62.7% of the respondents were serving in their first principalship. Twenty-five or 58.1% of the principals did have administrative experience at other schools. Twenty-three or 53.4% of the principals had taught at their current schools. Thirty or 69.7% of the respondents had taught at other schools. Seventeen principals or 39.5% of the principals had previous administrative experience at their current schools.

The data clearly demonstrated that the vast majority of respondents held masters degrees, were principal at their current school for under six years, and were serving in their first principalship.

Profile of Participants

The participants in the study consisted of ten high school principals in the Chicagoland area during the 1994-95 school year. Six of the principals were male and four were female. Three principals held doctorates and seven held masters degrees. Two of the principals, with masters
degrees, held more than one masters degree. Six principals had served as principal of the school fewer than three years; the remaining four principals had served as principal at their schools for three or more years.

The high schools, in which these principals served, represented a broad spectrum of characteristics. Six schools were suburban and four schools were urban. Five schools were on the north side of Chicago and five schools were on the south side of Chicago. Four high schools were coed and six schools were single gender. Of the six, single gender schools, three were male schools and three were female schools. Because only three public school principals would agree to submit to the face-to-face interview, plus to be observed at a meeting and to provide documents, only three of the ten schools participating were public schools. All three public school principals, who were willing to participate, were included in the study. The other seven schools were private schools.

Principal A is a male principal of a suburban public school who holds a Master of Arts degree. He has served as principal of this high school for two years and of another high school for eight years. Before that, he had been a
curriculum coordinator for two years and had taught mathematics for thirteen years.

Principal B is a male principal of a suburban school who holds an Educational Specialist degree and had served as principal of his school for one year during the 1993-94 school year and for three years at another high school. He had served as both associate and assistant principal for twelve years before becoming a principal and had taught social studies.

Principal C is a female principal of a private school for females in the suburbs. She holds a Ph.D. degree and has served as principal of this school for five years and as associate principal of the same school for three years prior to becoming principal. She taught English for sixteen years.

Principal D is a male principal of a coeducational, private, suburban school and holds a Master of Arts degree. He has served as principal of this school for two years and of another school for one year. Before that, he served as an administrative assistant for three years and a teacher of social studies for fourteen years.

Principal E is a female principal of an urban female
school and holds both a Master of Arts degree and a Master of Science degree. She has been principal of this school for three years and its assistant principal for seven years and religion teacher for one year. She has also served in other schools as dean of students for two years and as a teacher of English and religion for ten years.

Principal F is a male principal of an urban, private, male school who holds an Ed.D. degree and has served as principal for eight years. Before that he was a dean of students for fifteen years and a teacher of business for five years. His entire career of 28 years has been spent at this high school.

Principal G is a male principal of a suburban, private, coeducational school and holds both a Master of Arts and Master of Education degree. He has served at this school as principal for two years and as dean, associate principal and associate dean for five years. He was associate dean of another high school for four years and a teacher of history for two years.

Principal H is a female principal of a suburban public high school and holds a Ph.D degree. She has been principal of this high school for four years and another high school
for three years. Before that she was a director of instruction for nine years and a teacher of English for seven years at other schools.

Principal I, who holds a Master of Arts degree, is a female principal of an urban, private school for females and is serving in the first year of her first principalship. Before this assignment, she was a director of religious education for eleven years and a theology teacher.

Principal J is a male principal of a private, urban school for males. He holds a Masters of Education and has been principal of this school for five years and assistant principal of another school for two years. He began his career as a teacher of history and did that for four years.

All, but one principal, have served in high schools other than the one they are presently leading. All ten principals came to the principalship they are in with both administrative and teaching experience.

Leadership Orientation of Participants

The ten principals who participated in the study were given a definition of two leadership orientations: task-orientation and relations-orientation and asked which one they considered to be their primary mode of leadership.
Eight of the principals identified themselves as primarily relations-oriented and two identified themselves as primarily task-oriented.

After an examination and analysis of taped interviews, documents written by the principals and written concerning actions they had taken and analytic notes taken during observations of staff meetings conducted by the principals, their primary mode of leadership was determined (Table 2).

**TABLE 2: LEADERSHIP ORIENTATION OF PARTICIPANTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal</th>
<th>Self-Identification</th>
<th>Appearance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>TO</td>
<td>TO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>RO</td>
<td>RO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>RO</td>
<td>RO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>RO</td>
<td>RO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>RO</td>
<td>TO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>RO</td>
<td>TO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>TO</td>
<td>Blend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>RO</td>
<td>TO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>RO</td>
<td>RO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>RO</td>
<td>RO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Six of the principals, who identified themselves as relations-oriented, were indeed found to be primarily relations-oriented. Two of the principals who identified themselves as relations-oriented were in fact determined to be primarily task-oriented.

Of the two principals who identified themselves as
primarily task-oriented, one was indeed found to be task-oriented and the other was so evenly balanced between the two that a determination one way or the other could not be made. This principal, who reflects more of a balanced style of leadership described previously by Blake and Mouton as balanced and at the center of the grid and as constituency centered as described by Blake, Mouton and Williams, will be treated separately when discussing his performance of the four aspects of the principal's role.

Principal A identified himself as primarily task-oriented and this was confirmed by the data collected. A middle aged man with a mustache, he appeared before the students to greet them in a shirt and tie with his sleeves rolled up and a beeper on his belt. His office is filled with photographs and principal's awards which he jokingly states are there to impress people who come in. He has a warm, pleasant and outgoing disposition.

In self-identifying as primarily task-oriented, Principal A opens with a need to look at a balance between the two orientations and states that he needs to focus on getting things done but in a humane way. He has been involved in making some significant changes at this high
school and states that, especially when initiating change, it is important to focus on the task but bring people along. He says that "some attention needs to be paid to interpersonal and relationship skills."

During the interview, Principal A spoke about the importance of being out and around and visible but to monitor and direct rather than to listen and react to what people are thinking. He speaks of keeping, "my finger on the pulse of what's going on" and staying, "on top of what's going on in the classroom." He emphasized the meeting of deadlines and the job to be done. In discussing the curriculum development the faculty is engaged in, he asks them, "What's going to be your time line?"

Principal A uses everyone to get done what he wants done. He speaks of presenting a new proposed plan for evaluation to the faculty before the union has approved it against the protests of the union. He tells the union, "Nobody said you can't approve it, but they're going to see it and they're going to know what you approve and don't approve." When asked if he was happy with the instrument, he said, "Yes. It's basically my plan."

When he speaks of veteran teachers it is with a tinge
of negativism, stating that some of them had been there for 25 years and had never been observed before he arrived and, "...of course they were wonderful. They could walk on water if you could read their evaluations." He cited a case of a veteran teacher who was nervous about being observed and came to him and said, "Please don't come in my class. I get very nervous." Principal A did not display a concern for her feelings or try to comfort her and ease her into the process at all. He cited his response as, "Well, you're going to have to get over that. You've been teaching for 25 years; you shouldn't be nervous when the principal walks into your room. You're going to have to learn." He said she wasn't real happy about it, "But she's gotten the message." Principal A is easy to understand when he speaks and explains his actions but does so out of a need to make sure the person knows exactly what he wants done, not so the person will perform well and experience increased satisfaction and self-esteem. He states that he does not, "want to get in the way of their creativity because then they have an excuse."

When Principal A does look out for the personal welfare of his individual staff members, it is because he wants them
to owe him something. Principal A engages in a bartering system with his staff. He cites the case of a teacher who had a heart attack and that he was the first one on the phone and the first one to visit him, "He'll do anything I ask because he saw that I took the time to show my concern, to support him and to be there for him when he needed me."

Documents provided by Principal A corroborate this task-orientation. Memos to the faculty use language such as, "Beginning immediately there will be..." and "Do not interrupt Mrs...with your requests" and a letter to senior parents uses the phrase, "It is expected that for parents as well as students" rather than, "Please help us by" which would be more relational.

During a meeting with the chair of the counseling department and the freshman counselor, Principal A was observed as extremely directional and the center of attention at all times further corroborating a primarily task-orientation. The counselors were very much in a "reporting to him" stance rather than a "team working together" posture. He jumps on the lines of the other professionals as they speak and inserts himself, even when the chair addresses the freshman counselor. He never asks
the others how they would like to proceed, but instead tells
them to do something and that he has no problem with their
doing it. Even when he seeks their input on other agenda
items, he does not wait to hear what they have to say but
instead says, "Let's go on to other goodies you guys have.
Let me guess" and then lists them.

Principal A is accurate in his self-assessment as
primarily task-oriented. He is clear about his
expectations, monitors staff very carefully and often and
moves along his agenda, for his purpose is to get the job
done. He does not display strong listening skills; he never
mentions laying groundwork or negotiating and compromise
does not appear to be a part of his vocabulary.

Principal B identified himself as primarily relations­
oriented and this was confirmed by the data collected. A
tall man with an athletic build, he was comfortably dressed
for spirit day in jeans and a school polo shirt. His office
is cluttered with family photographs, drawings done by his
children and a large portrait of John Wayne, whom he says
serves as a role model. A large calendar on the outside of
his door is accessible to students and staff as well as his
secretary. He is friendly and outgoing and exudes a warmth
and gentleness that explains his previous involvement with student government.

Principal B labels himself as primarily relations-oriented and this was confirmed by the data collection. His first statement is that he "likes to give people opportunities to grow and succeed" thereby expressing a concern with the interest of workers. He states that he is not "hung up on deadlines," deadlines being a very task-oriented focus, and likes to focus on what they can do best and how they can do it. He cites having mentors in his life who were people-people and expresses a sadness over the state of education which prevents a principal from giving a hug to a kid who needs it.

Principal B talks about being visible and out and about the building, but for very different reasons than Principal A did. He spoke of coming into a situation in which the board faced the problem of a very lax climate and an undisciplined student body. The board established some strict new policies which he was charged with implementing, and he described his strategy, "The way I approached it was very positive. I became very visible. I think I went to every classroom, talked to the students directly about the
changes...I went to every practice, spoke to the kids, that things have changed, that we have a new focus." He was concerned with building the confidence and trust of the faculty also, saying, "I think through the year, as people became more adjusted to my style, realized that I was walking the walk and talking the talk as I outlined it that their confidence and their trust in me grew because there I was relaying that to the faculty."

During the interview, Principal B noted that he is not concerned with uniform procedures and that he uses them when he has to by law but tries to supplement them to get a broader scope, a more humane picture, which is very relations-oriented. He responded that there was a formal evaluation process that he uses and asks questions in the pre-conference because they are called for in the contract, but what he also does is sit down with the teacher and says, "...let's sit down; let's just talk about what you're going to be doing in the classroom and what we really are saying and what are your concerns." Principal B said he wanted to establish with the staff that, "...I was concerned about who they were as a teacher in the classroom not just what they were doing in the classroom."
He cited the example of having a beginning teacher who had a rough go of it and realizing that, if he saw the teacher for the two formal visits called for by the contract, the individual would not make it past his first year. So Principal B went to the association and to the superintendent and said, "This isn't going to work cause I can't operate under these things and help this man out to become a better teacher. I need a division chair to work with him on his curriculum; I need the dean to work with him on classroom management and I will take a look at the whole thing." As a result, the team went in about twelve more times and enough progress had been made to rehire the teacher and the principal claimed that they were pleased with the strides being made.

Principal B displays an abundance of relations-oriented behavior: He trusts people to do the job; he is willing to make changes in light of staff input and he finds time to listen to staff members. Interactions with department chairs are both formal and informal, "So we meet on a regular basis. A lot of what we do is informal through, you know, a lot of the conversation that takes place goes, "________ (first name), can I see you in your office for a few
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minutes...I've got a concern with this teacher."

Principal B creates a comfortable, friendly atmosphere, treats all staff members as his equals and finds time to listen to staff members, "A lot of what I try to do is face-to-face communication." He expresses dismay about the placement of his office because it is away from the hub of where the students are and hopes to move it, if there were to be remodeling plans in the future.

Documents supplied by Principal B corroborated his relations-orientation as manifested in the interview. Board of education minutes reveal that the principal took students and parents to sample a lunch program at another school which was using a service his school was investigating. This showed a consultative rather than directional stance and a focus on the importance of seeking input and listening to the opinions of others. Principal B's letters from the principal to parents are non-dictatorial even though they state expectations that are similar to those stated by Principal A, "We are encouraging parents and students to attend. We are also encouraging students and parents in attendance for both honors day and graduation to dress appropriately," and "If you have any questions about any of
the programs, please do not hesitate to call my office.
With pride in our school, I am...."

Principal B was observed at two staff meetings. One meeting consisted of the mathematics department, as they worked with the School Improvement Plan Coordinator on mathematics' goals. The second meeting centered around dismissal of a senior two weeks before graduation and included the dean of students, the principal, the teacher failing the student and, at times, the assistant dean of students.

At both meetings, Principal B displayed relations-oriented behavior, further corroborating a primarily relations-orientation. He spoke little and listened much; he trusted the people to do their jobs, treated them as equals and was concerned for their feelings. At the mathematics' meeting he took notes, observed and let the department struggle with issues and only commented when they needed some piece of information only he could contribute. At the discipline meeting, he let the dean do his job and displayed concern for the teacher who had sketchy records and could easily have been placed on the hot seat. As a decision was being reached, Principal B turned to the
teacher and asked what the teacher was comfortable with in
terms of an action.

Principal B is accurate in his self-labeling as
primarily relations-oriented. He views his staff as equals,
confers with them and trusts them to do their job without
constant monitoring on his part. He asks people what they
are comfortable with, in terms of decisions, and clearly
focuses on faculty growth and development.

Principal C, a small, peppy, energetic woman,
identifies herself as primarily relations-oriented and,
although her affect is crisp and matter-of-fact and would
appear to be task-oriented, the data collected confirm her
relations-oriented label. All data were collected in a
large room with folding table and chairs. Food had been
supplied for the Administrative Team meeting. Principal C
smiles and laughs easily and interacts with fellow
administrators in a friendly, open manner.

When asked to identify herself as primarily either
task-oriented or relations-oriented, Principal C took a long
pause and stressed the hand-in-hand relationship of the two
orientations. She believed that the tasks could be
delegated and she could really let go and trust other
people's expertise and that that was management; dealing in relationships, she believed, was really leadership and she needed to be the one to do that. Principal C expressly stated concern for employees' self-esteem, saying answering the question Are they confident? was important to her and concern for good work conditions or answering the question Are they supported? is also important to her. Both of those concerns are very much relations-oriented concerns.

Principal C puts a high emphasis on consulting with staff and putting staff suggestions into operation and believes employees are individuals with need dispositions and individuality. Regarding staff development, in particular, she states, "I think staff development is definitely a part of my role as instructional leader, but I do that largely by finding out what the staff perceives themselves seems to need and I think that dealing with the adult learner is important. You don't apply things to the adult learner that the adult doesn't want to know about so you are kind of balancing what your vision of the school is with where the other adults in the school are." (sic)

Unlike Principal A, a primarily task-oriented principal who said, "I had some extensive training in cooperative
learning so what we did was we split the faculty for the two half days and I did cooperative learning training with half..." and used his expertise to drive the staff development activities, Principal C cited bringing things to the faculty advisory council and saying "...now what about this..." She reported that at one point, the committee came and said to her that they had a day in March that was an in-service day and said, "Why don't you just say that it's going to be a faculty day and have everybody come and let us arrange our own." Principal C said fine and reported that, "They did a great job. They were there at eight and left at three and went out to lunch and they managed to talk to one another enough to arrange it." This is a clear example of treating all staff members as equals and trusting them to do a job, two relations-oriented behaviors.

Principal C cited the competency of the staff several times throughout the interview and noted that she believes very strongly in ad hoc committees and convenes them every chance she gets. She consults students as well as teachers before making decisions and is willing to change her position in light of the information she receives, "...when we have to talk about issues, I would be the one directing
that with the kids. The shoe issue for example, I brought in a couple of kids and said, 'Here talk to me about this. I'm not happy about this. Help me solve the problem'."

When Principal C talks about evaluating teachers, she has used the instrument agreed upon by the staff even though she is not "totally happy with it." She describes an incident in which a teacher received a couple of three's on a five point scale and perceived herself as a total failure. In light of her uneasiness, Principal C had the faculty members fill out their own grid and then had conversations about any discrepancies between their perceptions and hers. She states that if she does have to move to dismiss, "We do it early in a person's career" thereby displaying relations-oriented behavior.

In a similar fashion to Principal B, Principal C is out and about the building to listen to people, "I do try to walk around the building once a day. There are some days that I'm not here enough to do that but I kind of keep my ear to the ground to find out what's going on. People talk to me, so there's a lot of conversation...." Never, during the course of the interview, did Principal C indicate that she was trying to monitor people or make sure they are doing
the right thing.

Documents provided by Principal C corroborate a primarily relations-orientation. Memos to the faculty are filled with statements providing social-emotional "strokes," "Hang on and hand in. For many on our faculty, these are difficult days. Family worries and stresses weigh heavily on some..." and "Thanks in advance for pitching in where necessary for all of the special events and the classroom teaching that continues through them all." When she needs to get the faculty to do something, she urges them gently instead of telling them to do it, "Lastly, we'll need to take a look at this whole area for next year. Until then, please be mindful that the choices we are making are from many goods. Let's not treat each other and our students as if there is an evil intent behind the planning of our colleagues. Peace."

Principal C displays a personal interest in her employees as shown in some faculty memos, "I surely hope that you had at least a bit of time over the weekend to enjoy the beautiful weather." She displays this same concern in a letter to senior parents about a celebration, "You are special to us and to our honorees," in contrast to
Principal A, a primarily task-oriented principal who uses phrases like, "It is expected that all parents will support" in a letter to senior parents.

Principal C's behavior at an Administrative Team meeting gave more corroboration to her identification as primarily relations-orientation. She opened the meeting by stating that each person brings something to put on the agenda and then the team works its way through it.

The atmosphere is friendly and comfortable, with Principal C laughing easily and adding humorous comments throughout the meeting. Principal C demonstrates respect for the other workers, is willing to make changes after hearing their input and treats the other team members as her equal. At times she sits back and watches the other three team members discuss issues and hash things out in a similar fashion as Principal B, who was also labeled as primarily relations-oriented. Principal C uses sentences and phrases like, "Is that comfortable for you?" and "Do you want to maintain this as it is?" and "...if everyone is okay with that." When a discussion seems to be over, she suggests a possible statement which would say what the others have agreed upon. All discussions are very free flowing and the
group operates very much like a team.

On first blush, Principal C appears to be very busy and task-oriented, but upon further analysis is very much primarily relations-oriented. She gives everyone positive comments, creates a friendly, open atmosphere and is highly consultative. The job gets done, but each task is covered by a relations-oriented overcoat.

Principal D identified himself as primarily relations-oriented and this was confirmed by the data collected. A young, energetic man, Principal D displayed an exuberance unique for someone conducting the final faculty meeting of the year. He has arranged the library tables in a circle and chats informally with people by making a joke about "aberrant administrative behavior."

In labeling himself as relations-oriented, Principal D notes that, "The reason people have trouble in their life is not because they don't know enough. It's because they can't get along with people." He notes that successful teachers are successful because they are able to establish relationships with kids. He sees his role as that of helping them reach some sort of satisfaction in their lives." This is very similar to Principal B, who is very
much concerned with faculty growth.

Principal D displays a high level of trust in both the teachers and department chairpeople in his school. He states that, "Most of the important things are done by the classroom teachers..." and that, "I do most of the classroom observations, but the department chairmen are also involved." Department chairmen meet formally in a curriculum committee and Principal D asserts that, "The Curriculum Committee serves kind of as the arena in which we debate most of the educational issues that we are confronted with on a regular basis so it's a pretty important group."

He views himself as a consensus builder and surveys the faculty frequently to solicit their input on school matters saying, "I consult with from time to time. I'll ask the faculty in a questionnaire, what do they want." (sic) In discussing the weekly memos he writes to the faculty, he notes that the memos contain weekly schedules and teachers' supervision responsibilities; but they also contain, "...issues we've raised and asked people to think about. In some cases, I'll survey the faculty."

When Principal D uses prescribed methods of procedure, for example in teacher evaluation, he adds to that procedure
and evaluation report a narrative to give a fuller picture of the teacher's performance. This is very similar to Principal B's method of using the procedure mandated by the policy but adding a component to give a fuller portrait of a teacher's performance, thereby assuring that faculty members' needs are respected. Again, he cites staff consultation as important saying, "...and the teachers report that it's been fairly helpful."

Principal D also shows a willingness to go outside established structures and methods of procedure when he describes the presence of a faculty representative on the board who served during the tenure of an interim principal and should have stepped off the board when Principal D was hired, "Since I've come, that's really my job but we have such a great respect for the person who's doing that job and they're such a valuable contributor to the board that we just let that situation continue..."

Principal D provides the teachers with professional articles to get them, "to think about what they are doing," not to let them know what he thinks they should be doing. And when he makes suggestions to the teachers regarding changes he thinks would improve a lesson he has observed, he
does not say, "make this change," thereby speaking in a manner not to be questioned but rather uses phrases like, "you might want to think about adding these," and, "you might have done this a different way."

Documents provided by Principal D corroborate this primarily relations-orientation. Principal D's memos to the faculty reflect a comfortable, friendly atmosphere, a treatment of all staff members as equals and a concern with his interpersonal interactions with staff. He announces the addition of a teacher by stating, "Mrs. ...officially joins our happy throng today. She has been hired for the balance of the semester. Please welcome her and make her feel at home." He asks, "I would like to dine with the math department Monday at 11:00 a.m. See me if that presents a problem."

A letter to parents requiring entering freshmen to have a complete physical exam with up-to-date immunization records states, "Please note that your son or daughter will not be able to attend school until the office has the necessary forms. Do not send your student to school until all forms are complete. I regret taking this severe measure, but we can no longer wait for this necessary
information. I will be available Monday morning after 7:15 a.m. if you have questions."

Principal D was observed conducting the year-end faculty meeting and his actions confirmed a relations-orientation. The meeting took place in the school library and the tables had been placed in a large circle so that faculty members could all see one another. As people entered, Principal D was chatting with teachers about a faculty party they had all attended. Principal D laughed easily, as did the teachers. As the discussion progressed, he took input from each group and when describing administrative decisions, he gave his rationale for each decision.

Principal D is friendly and approachable and seems to make staff members feel at ease when talking to them, which are all relations-oriented characteristics. He cites the high priority he places on the importance of teachers' feeling free to talk to him "about something that's going on in their personal life or something that's going on with another faculty member" as more important than whether or not he makes sure they've all turned in their lesson plans.

Principal E identified herself as primarily relations-
oriented and this was confirmed by the data collected. A tall, dark haired woman, Principal E is very soft spoken and gentle when she replies. Her office is cluttered with memorabilia and inspirational plaques and bumper stickers. In addition to her desk, the office contains a rocking chair and arm chair and its floor is covered with throw rugs, thereby creating a space that resembles a living room rather than an office. She arrived for the interview from a breakfast meeting to celebrate the end of the dean's first year. Everything about Principal E sets the stage for a relations-orientation.

In identifying herself as relations-oriented, Principal E states that her greatest frustration has been the task-orientation necessary in the principalship, because she has "a great sense of responsibility both personally and professionally," so she has to complete the tasks. In discussing her staff, she believes that "you move them and you move them with trust and that can't happen with a task-oriented principal."

Principal E is concerned with the interests of those who work on her staff. She consults them and puts their suggestions into operation. Principal E reports that the
administrative team asks the faculty at the beginning of each year to provide them with suggestions in the areas that they would like to see addressed. Then the team returns the list and asks them to prioritize. Last year the faculty determined that cooperative learning was a definite in-service need, especially given the school's multicultural makeup. So she asked the faculty if they would participate in two full day workshops on cooperative learning, unlike Principal A who claimed that he had expertise in this area, so he presented a workshop on the topic.

The faculty meeting agenda is developed by the principal, who refers to herself as the team leader, and the other team members. The agenda is then posted for the faculty, who can add to the agenda. The format for the meeting, says Principal E, is a discussion format.

Principal E says that both doors of her office are open, "90% of the time during the year. The teachers know that I'm always available to them. They can stop me in the hall if there's a concern that they have or they can come in here and we can close the doors. So that's always been something that's been appreciated. At least that's what I've been told." She believes there should be an openness
and an opportunity for dialogue and strives for that. "I feel that the name of the game here at __________ is communication and that's what we try to do with one another as a faculty and staff. She communicates mostly using face-to-face communication, much like Principal B, another relations-oriented principal.

Principal E, trusts people to do the job. Although she is ultimately responsible for all the department chairpeople, her assistant principal is primarily responsible for some and she for others. She talks of herself as the contact person for those departments and seeks their input on their job performance. In a fashion similar to Principal C, another relations-oriented principal, she asks teachers to evaluate themselves; only Principal E has them use the same form she does and then they compare notes, using the forms as a basis for discussion.

The way Principal E discussed veteran faculty is markedly different from the way Principal A, a task-oriented principal did. Principal E spoke in terms of "bringing along veteran faculty with love rather than rancor"; Principal A spoke of them using a tone of derision, "and of
course they were wonderful. They could walk on water if you could read their evaluations."

Principal E creates a comfortable, friendly atmosphere. Like Principal B, who mourns the loss of the ability to hug a student in saying, "I'm so cautious about even walking up and putting my hand on a student anymore that I've lost a big part of who I am," Principal E expresses sadness over the loss of some of the interaction she had with the students when she was academic dean. So she took a supervision and goes into the cafeteria two to three times a week to interact with the students so that she does not only see them over disciplinary actions.

Documents provided by Principal E corroborate this primarily relations-orientation. Quotes from these documents are extremely different from quotes from Principal A's documents, even when they are communicating the same thing.

Principal E's letter to parents uses language such as, "We ask for your cooperation and support in our endeavors," as opposed to Principal A's language to parents, which states, "It is expected that all parents will support." And in a newsletter to parents about schedules, Principal E
says, "Please understand that uniqueness of class combinations or balance in class sizes sometimes make changes impossible" whereas Principal A notes "Do not interrupt Mrs. ______ with your requests in addressing schedule concerns of teachers."

Principal E was observed meeting with the assistant principal for a year end wrap-up and continued to display relations-oriented behavior. Principal E sits next to her assistant principal, speaks in a soft voice and takes part in a very free-flowing discussion of equals. She uses phrases like, "I'm not sure where we are with that" and "How about the _______ department? Let's ask them." She is very respectful and concerned for people's feelings and takes a personal interest in employees. The meeting ends with Principal E asking, regarding a staff member, "She has a doctor's appointment, could one of us take her?"

Principal E is primarily relations-oriented. She engages in predominantly two way communications, uses language that is very non-dictatorial and presents an affect that is warm, gentle and caring.

Principal F is a primarily task-oriented principal who labeled himself as primarily relations-oriented. A tall,
athletic man, he has a warm handshake and a ready smile. In self-labeling, Principal F claims that he believes he is primarily relations-oriented because he tries to make every decision "based on what's best for our kids." Curiously enough, Principal A, another primarily task-oriented principal, used just those words about himself but considered himself task-oriented. Principal F views task-orientation as being very concerned with operating on a time line and says that he leaves that to other people as part of their jobs and concerns himself with relations. However, he contradicts himself because, throughout the interview, he speaks of doing things, "on a very regular basis" and "on a daily basis" and on "a timely basis," thereby displaying a strong emphasis on meeting deadlines which is a task-oriented behavior. He and his assistant principals observe classroom instruction on a very regular basis, are in the cafeteria on a daily basis and make decisions on a timely basis.

Task-oriented leaders emphasize the mission of the school and Principal F's responses during the interview cite the mission of the school frequently. His school is part of a larger network of religious schools and Principal F is
very much concerned with his school's performance in fulfilling their part of the larger mission. He ensures the mission by building the staff development program around it and by hiring teachers with it in mind. Principal F's staff development program centers around preparing teachers to work together in this larger philosophy, "...to this association. We're trying from day one of our faculty inservices with team building type association workshops and throughout the year our faculty meetings and inservices will gear toward that ______ movement." He hires teachers who have been graduates either of other association schools or of his school and says, "They've come back and they've been our best role models for kids...we have about 20 in our faculty that are _____ boys - about 15 are _____ grads and these are guys - they feel good about ______; they come back; they want to contribute."

Curiously enough, Principal J, a primarily relations-oriented principal who will be discussed later, also runs a school which belongs to this association and builds his staff development program around teacher needs, stating, "I have no problems bringing in speakers and that but I want to look at what they feel, the need for them."
Principal F keeps staff engaged in tasks they are performing and uses task-oriented language in describing procedures. He claims his job is "to oversee the many facets of the curriculum" and that department chairpeople "will be required to turn in a written report to the office on that evaluation," and that budget runs "need to be cleared through my office."

Principal F focuses on establishing methods of procedure and sees to it that the work of staff members is coordinated. He describes both a curriculum committee and a department chair committee, as well as an administrative team and a faculty life committee, and says most issues are raised, discussed and decided upon using these structures.

Principal F is much like Principal A. Both principals work to create a comfortable, friendly atmosphere in their schools, and listen to students and teachers, but in a very structured way, channeling everything through committees and patterns of organization. Like Principal A, who presented a new evaluation plan to the teachers and the union that was basically his plan rather than a plan he created with the faculty, Principal F displays a directional nature, "My task as principal is to guide the faculty and that committee into
the right direction...."

Documents, provided by Principal F, corroborate this primarily task-orientation. Minutes from department chairpersons' meetings, a newsletter to parents and letters to graduating seniors and faculty returning for a new school year all contain nuts and bolts items and directions for behavior with little, if any, warm, introductory remarks. The letter to graduates about the honors convocation begins in a laudatory fashion, yet ends with a warning, "Tuesday night's ceremony is for you...but it's for you as a group, and it's for the school community as a whole to celebrate your achievement. It is a formal event and therefore calls for acceptable social behavior and decorum."

Principal F was observed conducting an administrative team meeting. He sat behind his desk and the team sat in chairs facing him, which were arranged in a semi-circle around his desk. This arrangement put a distance between them and him even though the meeting was peppered with banter and joking. On first blush it looks as though Principal F consults with staff and puts suggestions made by the staff into operation, which are relations-oriented behaviors; however, upon deeper analysis, it is clear that
he only takes input that is filtered through this administrative team and those members of his administrative team have been at the school with him anywhere from eighteen to twenty-nine years and the person who acts as assistant principal is his brother. All of these advisors think exactly the way he does, and are clearly not going to challenge him if he wants something to happen.

In a similar fashion to Principal A, who noted that a teacher will do anything he asked because he was the first to telephone him after his heart attack, Principal F bartered with the dean to get him to cover bingo. He kept kidding the dean about what fun it was going to be and then said, "____, I know this is a favor" and told him that they would meet for dinner later that night adding, "By the way, thanks."

Principal F is very much in charge of everything and a primarily task-oriented leader, even though he identifies himself as relations-oriented. He makes sure that his part in the organization is understood by all members, emphasizes the job to be done and keeps staff engaged in the tasks they are performing.

Principal G is an anomaly. He labels himself as task-
oriented, yet is such a blend of task- and relations-oriented behavior that a determination of primary leadership orientation could not be made, given the data collected. A young man with a trim build, he smiles easily and has a very dry wit.

In labeling himself as primarily task-oriented, he notes, "I'm concerned about relations but I'm definitely more concerned about the tasks, how we fulfill the mission of what we're here for, what we need to get done and when we need to get it done." Then he talks about balancing the institution's needs against the individual's needs as the way he looks at tasks and he bounces back and forth stating that, "...you can't let the institution go under because of personal relationships," which would indicate a task-orientation vis-a-vis emphasizing the mission of the school. But he also says, "You have to listen to people. You have to trust people and let 'em go," which is categorized as relations-oriented behavior.

During the interview, Principal G notes that he believes his biggest job as principal is "to convey what the mission of the school is and to make sure that everyone stays on task with that mission." He works closely with
department heads by overseeing the curriculum committee and meets with elected representatives of the faculty and student council members to talk about issues, thereby, establishing patterns of organization and methods of procedure. He uses language such as, "oversee," "in a formal sense," and "on a regular basis," which display an emphasis on meeting deadlines and getting the job done. These phrases reinforce a task-oriented focus. At the same time, however, he talks about talking to teachers about what the school climate is like and listening to teachers' suggestions on in-service, "I try to be as responsive as possible." In talking about the teaching staff, Principal G states, "I encourage them and promote them and I think that's a big part of my job. We have a lot of real talented people here and you just need to let them loose a little bit and let them have, you know, give them the ability to do what they can do. So a lot of my job's that too." (These statements will be echoed by Principal I who clearly displays a primarily relations-orientation.)

Principal G is extremely concerned with the mission of the school and believes it is his job to keep the staff engaged in the tasks they are performing in much the same
way that Principal A and Principal F, two task-oriented principals, speak of this monitoring role, "You know that's a big part of my job. The teachers are being good models and that they're not doing things that don't - that interfere with what the missions of the school are...I may need to terminate somebody if they're not staying with what the mission of the school is. I try to be as hands-on as possible and keeping on what their responsibility is." (sic)

At the same time, he notes a sadness over losing touch with students and being in tune with their situations, in much the same way that Principal E misses the time she spent with the students in her role as academic dean. And so Principal G will teach a class next year. He also cites a dislike for the location of his office, which was far away from the students who come and talk to him, and spoke of a move back to the center of where they are in much the same way that Principal B, a relations-oriented principal, did in his remarks.

Documents provided by Principal G corroborated this orientation anomaly. In a very task-oriented fashion, a newsletter to parents bears no introductory remarks, unlike the newsletter of Principal E, a relations-oriented
principal and much like Principal F's letters and newsletters. A memo to three colleagues simply states the facts, as do the minutes from the department chairperson's meeting. At the same time, however, these minutes reflect the presentation of a variety of progress-report forms for the chairpersons to examine and from which they can make their final selection. This is reminiscent of the board minutes of Principal B indicating that he took representatives to sample other schools' cafeterias before selecting a new food service, a relations-oriented behavior.

Principal G was observed conducting an administrative team meeting to review the student handbook. This was the same chore performed by Principal C, a relations-oriented principal with her administrative team. Many of the behaviors were similar, with Principal G joking with others, as they worked their way through a dry task, and others joking with him. Like Principal C, Principal G treated all staff members as equals and consulted them on each area and provided social-emotional strokes, using language such as, "How should we...?" and "That's a good idea" and "Why don't you talk to...and see if he even wants to...." It is as free flowing a work session as Principal E's meeting; and
yet, this principal is clearly directing the meeting and correcting the master copy and remains at the center of the meeting as does Principal F. An observer gets the sense, however, that a change could occur in this handbook that the principal did not initiate but with which he could live if everyone else favored it.

Principal G is such a blend of task-orientation and relations-orientation that a determination as to primary-orientation could not be made. He will be treated separately during the analysis of job performance of the four aspects of the principal's role that follows.

Principal H identified herself as being primarily relations-oriented but in fact displayed herself as primarily task-oriented as evidenced by the data collected. A soft-spoken middle-aged woman, she moves gracefully and deliberately and sits across from the interviewer in a comfortable chair with an end table to her right. She labels herself relations-oriented "sixty-forty" and at times seems to present herself that way. After the three components of the data were examined, however, task-orientation took precedence and she has been identified as primarily task-oriented.
Principal H displays several task-oriented behaviors: she makes sure her part in the organization is understood by all members; makes her attitudes clear to her staff; and speaks in a manner not to be questioned. When describing an in-service program for secretaries, as well as teachers and supervisors, Principal H states that she purchased a book on effective teaching for each teacher and told them that it was going to be used in reference to evaluations, and in all conversations. She told of an ugly incident with a teacher who was being, "very resistant" in which she said, "Look at this chapter, let's talk about what this chapter says; now are you really suggesting that you don't like _____?" She states that at the beginning of the year, every staff member had "something, a book, in hand which said something that I wanted them to know." Later on in the interview, she mentions sending an article to every teacher from the Harvard Educational Review, over her signature, adding, "I think this is a dynamite article." She noted that "80% of them may never read it but they know that I think it's important for them to read and that if I cite it later and they haven't read it, they'll go back and find it because now they know I've said this is important."
In a similar fashion to Principal A, who selected cooperative learning as a staff development focus because of his expertise, Principal H led a session in assessment because of her own strength in that area and the book she had selected for the faculty to read. Principal H instructs her department chairmen, while the two of them are interviewing a teacher, by finding "a way of phrasing a question of a candidate" about a topic she thinks is important.

Principal H establishes methods of procedure and encourages the use of those uniform procedures, both of which are task-oriented behaviors. When asked about teacher evaluation, she responded, "I'm a secondary evaluator. That means roughly that I'm primary evaluator of all department chairs. I use the evaluation plan as other chairs would for chairs and for others I go in for one visitation only."

This approach is very different from Principal B, the relations-oriented principal, who was unsatisfied with the formal system and went in over twelve times over a period of a few months to help a first year teacher.

Even when Principal H describes a situation that appears to be relations-oriented, a deeper analysis
demonstrates a task-orientation. Principal H recounts the story of a teacher who was upset and came to see her because he was interviewing elsewhere and a secretary in the school found out and told everyone about it. When he arrived and Principal H saw him, she dropped everything and took him to lunch to talk to him. She says, "I knew that he was feeling pain and he wanted to talk." What she also says in her interview is that she sent word to her assistant principal and the superintendent that, "I may not be joining them for lunch. He's not taking this job. Tell ______ and _____ that whatever his need is, it's going to take over my lunch...." This raises the question of motive for the lunch. Was she looking out for the personal welfare of an individual staff member as a relations-oriented leader would or keeping the staff member engaged in the task he was performing, namely on her staff, like a task-oriented leader would? Principal H's next statements reveal she was doing the latter. She goes on to explain that because of her background in communications, she knew that if she disclosed something very personal first he would "almost have to disclose something personal in kind" to get him to start talking so she could convince him to stay. This bartering
is similar to the bartering behavior displayed by Principal A and Principal F, two task-oriented principals.

Principal H also resembles Principal A in her rationale for taking suggestions, which is a relations-oriented activity, and putting a task-oriented spin on it. Principal A asserts that he takes suggestions from teachers because, "I don't want to get in the way of their creativity because then they have an excuse." Principal H involves department chairs in staffing, hiring and evaluating because, "...you're going to live with your mistakes and you're going to live with your pluses."

Documents provided by Principal H corroborate this task-orientation. Department chair minutes, parent newsletters are very businesslike, although some letters from the principal do contain sentences that create a comfortable friendly atmosphere. It is curious that all references to Principal H refer to her as Dr. ___ while others are referred to by their first names. This creates a distance which does not signal that all are treated as equals.

This was more markedly displayed in the department chairperson meeting observed by the researcher, which
corroborated a task-orientation. Principal H conducted the meeting in an atmosphere that appeared relaxed on the surface. Principal H seemed to laugh easily, to give social emotional "strokes" by telling the department members she was proud of them at the previous night's board meeting and to be mindful of people's feelings. She used phrases such as, "I hope I didn't misspeak," and "I'm conscious of____ being at my left. I should have let him have this conversation with you not me." But she never stopped and turned to that department chairperson and said, "Why don't you take over and discuss this with them" as Principal C often did. As the meeting continued, it was obvious that it centered totally around the principal's agenda, unlike Principal C's meeting where everyone contributed, and that she called everyone by their first names and they called her Dr. and in fact raised their hands to get a turn to speak. In addition, Principal H made all the jokes, unlike Principal G and Principal C who often took some good-natured teasing themselves.

Principal H labeled herself as relations-oriented but in fact makes her attitudes clear to the staff, emphasizes the job to be done and encourages the use of uniform
procedures, all of which contribute to a primarily task-orientation.

Principal I labels herself as primarily relations-oriented and data collected support this label. A middle-aged woman, who smiles warmly, she has just completed her first year as principal.

In identifying herself as primarily relations-oriented, Principal I notes that she must prod and challenge herself to keep on deadlines and challenge herself to do task-oriented things. She responds to the self-labeling question, "I'm definitely relational. I think as I've said - to me if you have a happy faculty, a faculty that feels some success with their work, with some satisfaction with their work, I think you have better results. I tried to go at it that way. To try to keep the climate, to keep people motivated, to keep people feeling that they're appreciated and that their work has some meaning. So I tend to go at that - at people." This concern for the interests of workers and attempt to provide them with social-emotional "strokes" indicate a relations-orientation.

Principal I, like Principals C and E, who are both primarily relations-oriented, stresses several times during
the interview how hard she tries to listen to the suggestions made by the staff and put those suggestions into operation.

Principal I, who like most of the other principals keeps her office door open as much as possible, adds that she tries to be in her office with the door open especially at the beginning and end of each day when faculty members would be coming to and from their mailboxes. She cites doing this, not to monitor faculty and check up on them like Principal A, who displays task-orientation, but "...to try to be available and open for people," to listen to them.

Principal I consults with staff and listens to them before making decisions. "I have made some decisions and some changes when people have expressed a need or I've seen a need - OK - I try to listen to people, then weigh it."

Principal I describes a series of meetings she had over the academic issue of students who had failed subjects and had not attended summer school, thereby overloading their schedules the subsequent year, further complicating matters and possibly diminishing their chances for success. She held several meetings with the guidance department and administrative team and stated that, "I did a lot of
listening to people." When asked about student issues and discipline, Principal I states, "We have a discipline board and that consists of a counselor, _____ (the dean) and myself. When we have a situation regarding student discipline - again, it's listening to the student, listening to the parent, listening to _____'s (dean) input, listening to the counselors. We poll the teachers for input on a student and we talk, but ultimately it's my decision. I do a lot of listening and praying for wisdom and you do what you can."

Like Principal G, Principal I cites the talents and expertise of those professionals on her staff. In discussing her role as instructional leader, she notes, "I feel that my faculty is extremely talented and their talents continue to amaze me. They're very diverse in their talents, so what I see my role as is helping them utilize those talents in the best way."

Regarding climate setting, Principal I states, "I think teachers really need a lot of affirmation and work so hard. They have so many odds against them, so I try to focus on what people do well and praise it and encourage it." She sees herself, "as a cheerleader to give them encouragement."
Principal I trusts people to do the job and speaks warmly of the two assistant principals she inherited when she took over in November. In discussing the work of the dean of students on student activities, she asserts, "So I rely on her for that and I can; she's wonderful. So that's a big bonus right there, OK. So that part is delegated...I do have confidence in her so."

Principal I includes the other assistant principal, who is the director of admissions, in her sentiments, "Those two people are really - that I feel confident that I can trust their capabilities and then work with them on situations that we need to - and we meet regularly."

Documents provided by Principal I corroborate this primarily relations-orientation. Memos to faculty and staff, letters to parents and principal's columns in parent newsletters, all act to create a comfortable, friendly atmosphere and provide everyone with social-emotional "strokes."

Principal I's introductory memo, upon her arrival in November, sets the tone for her administration, "I have set up a schedule with the Religion Department to visit the students, chat a bit, and begin to get to know them. I also
want the girls to feel that I am accessible, and to have the chance to get to know me. Thank you to the Religion Department for sharing your class time with me for this purpose." Another memo opens, "Many thanks for your cooperation involving the stolen jacket last week. and I certainly appreciated your assistance with the 'search' and your positive feedback and encouragement regarding the incident." And a third memo ends with, "Hope you have all enjoyed the Monday holiday -- well-deserved after all your hard work preparing for exams, grades, etc. Have a great semester. Again, thanks for all you do and all of your support for our students, our school and myself."

A letter to parents states, "Please encourage your daughter in her studies. During this season of many distractions, we ask you to join us in keeping the primary focus of your daughter's efforts on her school work." This is in marked contrast to Principal A's letter stating that, "Parents will be expected to..." and much more similar to Principal C's letter telling parents, "You are special to us and our honorees."

And finally a letter from the principal in the parent newsletter states, "To each parent or guardian who
encouraged your daughter to participate, picked her up after late practices, sewed her a costume, cooked a favorite dish, or volunteered to work at the Fest, we are very grateful. Please know that you contributed in such important ways to the success of this event."

Principal I was observed conducting an administrative team meeting to design the teachers' workshops for the opening of the school year. The principal and two assistant principals sat on couches around a coffee table, even though there was a conference table in the room. Principal I joked often with the others and they returned the teasing much like Principal C's team did, another primarily relations-oriented principal. The session was truly a working session and, when the principal was called out of the room unexpectedly, the two assistant principals continued to work. When Principal I returned she said, "Wonderful, brilliant, let's go for it." The pattern of interaction consists of the principal questioning the assistant principals about what was done last year, before she arrived, and putting their suggestions into operation.

Principal I uses sentences such as, "So does that look all right?" and, "I was working on a few things yesterday
and I want your opinion on them. (These words were close to 
the exact words Principal E, another primarily relations- 
oriented principal, used in her meeting) ..." and, "Is that a 
better way to go?"

Principal I labeled herself as primarily relations- 
oriented and did in fact display enough relations-oriented 
behaviors to merit that label. She listens carefully to 
suggestions made by staff members and puts those suggestions 
into operation, trusts people to do the job and frequently 
provides social-emotional "strokes."

Principal J identifies himself as primarily relations- 
oriented and this label was confirmed by the data collected. 
A young, athletically built man, Principal J laughs easily, 
stops several times while walking down the hall to talk to 
both staff and students and has a sunny, affable 
 disposition.

In self-identifying, Principal J relates what he 
perceived when he first came into the job, "I think of when 
I came in here. I saw what had to be done; first in order 
to get tasks done, we had to have some sort of collaboration 
in the building." So Principal J approaches the tasks 
collaboratively, consulting with staff, trusting people to
do the job and treating all staff members as equals, all relations-oriented behaviors.

Principal J consults with staff through the academic council, the academic departments and the administrative team. Much like Principal E, he asks the faculty what they feel they need in the area of staff development, "I have no problems with bringing in speakers and that, but I want to look at what they feel - the need for them." Principal J has formed a separate staff development committee to plan in-services but has put them under the jurisdiction of the new assistant principal for supervision that was just hired. That assistant principal will consult with him and the academic team and the decision will be made jointly.

Even though Principal J works through committees, he does not chair any committees but the administrative team, attends other meetings sporadically and most often depends upon the minutes of the meetings to keep up-to-date on the activities of the committees. This stance indicates a trust in the staff and a desire to "keep up" which is a relations-oriented stance rather than a desire to "monitor" and to keep the staff engaged in the tasks that they are performing, which is a task-oriented stance.
Like Principal C, a relations-oriented principal who has teachers, "suggest what areas they would like feedback on...," Principal J does the same thing. "If I was going to observe your classroom, I'd say, 'Toni, what do you want me to look for, what's going on in your classroom? Is there something you want me to point out or is there something that is bothering you' and I observe, I look for that and then we talk afterwards."

Principal J is concerned with establishing and maintaining good working conditions for the staff. His school is located in a rough neighborhood and Principal J is concerned with safety for workers as well as students, "Being where we're located, I think it's very important that the students feel safe and secure while they're in school; that their belongings are safe, that their persons are safe. That's as well for teachers too. So I'm very big on security of the building, of the parking lot, of the building, of the facilities, of the lockers, everything."

Principal J has a strong desire to provide social-emotional "strokes" for his staff. He describes an internal publication called the Faculty Bull, "Pretty much every week I have what is called the Faculty Bull - that goes out and
it pretty much is bull - gossip-information. If a teacher
got a degree, I put it there; if a teacher had a baby; if
they got engaged, they got married, went to a workshop and
hear she wants to give me a little blurb on it or she felt
about it, I put it in there. I think it's great because
people like to see their name in print." (sic)

Principal J talks of his struggle with his feelings of
responsibility and his belief in delegating and letting go,
"I have to learn to say - not to try to solve every world
problem. You know, I already solved hunger and now I'm
trying to do world peace. As principals, I think it's our
second nature to say, 'All right, I'll go out and drive the
bus, I'll clean the garbage cans;' I mean OK, it's second
nature for me to do that and it's kind of hard for me not
to, that kind of thing...but some people are coming around
and I'm coming around - to back off. But I think it's
better in the long run, I really do."

Like Principal E who stated, "Then basically there was
a democratic vote on the recommendations that would come out
of the evaluations and discussions," regarding a curricular
issue, Principal J mentions taking a vote on the
administrative team regarding the addition of a history club
to student activities, "I said, guys, so and so wants a history club. I want to get some documentation on it and bring it back to you. I brought it back; we all read it, took a vote on it; it was 8 nothing - NO" (the club was really a war and weapons club in disguise).

Principal J seems willing to negotiate and make changes given the information he receives. When discussing the possible out-of-uniform privilege for Leukemia Day, he says, "Well, I may say tomorrow but if I don't talk to my team, I may find out the dean may say, 'OK it's not a good day'...I mean I can look at the calendar and all that I mean. They may know other things. So when we sit down there we say, 'Leukemia Day is coming up. When's the best day to have it?' I don't believe in just sitting in my office and making decrees."

Documents provided by Principal J corroborate this relations-orientation. Memos to the faculty contain sentences like, "I am very pleased with the new 'LOOK' at ____, however, we still need your help." A message from the principal to parents opens with, "I hope this bulletin finds you enjoying the relaxing summer months," and ends with, "Together, we can provide the solid formulation your son
needs to achieve success in the future."

Principal J was observed chairing an administrative team meeting and displayed primarily relations-oriented behavior. He joked easily and created a comfortable work tempo in which all five administrators teased him and each other. Principal J treated all members as his equals. Like Principal C, another primarily relations-oriented principal, who has each person bring something to put on the agenda, Principal J begins with his list and then each person at the table brings his or her list and the discussion proceeds around the table. Principal J takes notes on what needs to happen after the meeting unlike Principal F, a primarily task-oriented principal, who dictates to one of the assistant principals saying, "Add this to the list" and "When _____ gets back tell him to...."

Principal J uses sentences like, "Could we schedule it this way?" and, "If you can review and then maybe...." Principal J's struggle with delegation seemed to pay off as evidenced by his question, "When is this going to happen? Good, very good. Any questions for the dean?"

Principal J runs a school in the same federation and with the same educational philosophy as that of Principal F.
However, Principal J engages in relations-oriented activities and behaviors and Principal F engages in task-oriented activities.

Principal J identifies himself as primarily relations-oriented and displays that orientation in conversation, in written documents, and in conducting a group meeting. He finds the time to listen to staff members, is friendly and approachable and trusts people to do the job.

Principals B, C, D, E, I and J labeled themselves as being primarily relations-oriented and in fact displayed this orientation during an interview, an examination of documents they provided, and an observation of them conducting a staff meeting. Principals F and H labeled themselves as primarily relations-oriented, but in fact appear to be primarily task-oriented, using the above methods. Principals A and G labeled themselves as primarily task-oriented. As a result of using the above methods, Principal A appeared to be accurately self-labeled as primarily task-oriented. Principal G, on the other hand, appeared to be such a blend of task-orientation and relations-orientation that a final determination of primary leadership orientation could not be made and, therefore, was
labeled as an anomaly.

It is important to note that primarily task-oriented principals display many relations-oriented behaviors and primarily relations-oriented principals display many task-oriented behaviors. An examination of the data revealed, however, that these behaviors were fewer and in less strength than the predominant behaviors which led to the final determination regarding label.

Performance of the Role of Instructional Leader

The ten participants in the study were interviewed regarding their performance of the role of instructional leader. Documents supplied by the principals and observations of meetings conducted by the principals in some cases corroborated what they reported and in other cases added to the reports to provide a more complete picture of this aspect of the role of the principal. Job descriptions supplied by the principals revealed that the school boards held the expectation that the principal would serve as instructional leader for the high school.

For purposes of analysis, the role of instructional leader is further divided into four sections, as dictated by the review of the literature: (1) curriculum and
instruction; (2) school climate; (3) supervision and evaluation of teachers; and (4) staff development.

Principals have been grouped into the following categories: (1) Principals who believe they are primarily task-oriented and also appear to be task-oriented (Principal A was the only principal who fell into this category); (2) Principals who believe they are primarily relations-oriented and also appear to be relations-oriented (Principals B, C, D, E, I and J); (3) Principals who believe they are primarily relations-oriented but appear to be task-oriented (Principals F and H); (4) Principals who believe they are primarily task-oriented but appear to be relations-oriented (no principals fell into this category); and (5) An anomaly - the principal who believes he is primarily task-oriented but displays such a blend of task-oriented and relations-oriented behaviors that a determination as to primary orientation could not be made (Principal G).

Curriculum and Instruction

Principal A, who believes himself to be primarily task-oriented and also appears to be task-oriented, is clearly the instructional leader of the school, providing vision and direction for the school. He develops curriculum compatible
with school goals, is concerned with testing and diagnosis and supervises the educational program and curriculum development. He does not have department chairpeople, but works directly with each department around curriculum and instruction. In addition, he confers with teachers about teaching and supervises instruction. He concerns himself with testing and diagnosis, commenting upon his school's IGAP scores, which are posted on the wall of his secretary's office, and publishes test taking skills in his parent newsletter.

Of the principals who believe they are primarily relations-oriented and also appear to be relations oriented, all six are clearly the instructional leaders of the school; however, the delegation of parts of the job to others vis-à-vis curriculum directors and department chairpeople varies from principal to principal. Only two of the six principals see themselves as providing curricular vision and direction (Principals B and C) and none of the six principals see themselves as the key individual in supplying instructional leadership. Four of the principals take the lead in developing the curriculum compatible with school goals (Principals B, C, E and H) and three principals are
concerned with testing and diagnosis (Principals B, D and I). Four of the principals delegate curriculum development to others, either school improvement coordinators or curriculum directors (Principals B, C, H and J). Four of the principals confer with teachers about teaching (Principals B, D, E and J). All six principals involve department chairpeople in curriculum development and instructional improvement. One principal (Principal J) appears to turn all curriculum responsibility over to the curriculum director and department chairs. Three principals directly supervise instruction (Principals B, C and D) and three principals do not directly supervise instruction (Principals E, I and J). Thus, there is no dominant pattern in this group of principals, as to how curriculum and instruction is developed or supervised.

Both of the principals who believe they are primarily relations-oriented but appear to be task-oriented (Principals F and H) provide vision and direction for the curriculum, supervise curriculum development and involve subject area department chairs in the curriculum development process. However, Principal F delegates the curriculum development and testing and diagnosis to his curriculum
director and Principal H acts as curriculum director and works directly with the department chairpeople in curriculum development and testing and diagnosis. Neither of these two principals works directly with teachers to improve instruction. One principal (Principal F) is not the key individual in supplying instructional leadership supervision and the other principal (Principal H) is the key individual in supplying instructional leadership and supervision, supplying articles for the teachers to read and questioning them about the content. Therefore, it appears that both principals, in this category, supply curricular and instructional leadership, however, Principal F delegates the responsibility and Principal H assumes direct responsibility herself.

The principal who presented himself as an anomaly and is such a blend of task-oriented behaviors and relations-oriented behaviors that a determination could not be made as to primary orientation (Principal G) clearly supplies the vision and over-all direction for curriculum and instruction for the school; however, he delegates the development of curriculum compatible with school goals, testing and diagnosis, supervision of the instructional program and
consultation with teachers about teaching to the curriculum director and department chairpeople. He does not see himself as the key individual in supplying instructional leadership. In this area particularly, he manifests this blend. He talks about school mission and vision and curriculum and instruction in much the same way a primarily task-oriented leader would, but steps back and lets go of those to whom he delegates, in much the same way a primarily relations-oriented leader would.

These data indicate that there is no dominant pattern across groups as to how curriculum development and implementation is handled. All of the principals in the study are involved in curriculum and instruction and utilize subject area departments in this process. However, some principals take a very hands-on approach to curriculum development and others delegate most of the authority and responsibility to their curriculum directors. Whether a principal appears to be primarily task-oriented or primarily relations-oriented seems to have no bearing upon which method of curriculum delivery he or she uses.

School Climate

Regarding school climate, the principal who believes he
is primarily task-oriented and appears to be task-oriented (Principal A) creates a school climate for learning through his closing of the school campus, influence on scheduling of student free time and motivational speeches to the students both individually and in groups.

The principals who believe they are primarily relations-oriented and appear to be primarily relations-oriented (Principals B, C, D, E, I and J) all act to provide a climate for learning in their buildings, yet each principal does this in a different way. Principal B closed the campus and went to every classroom to talk to students about it; Principal C cites clear communication, a sense of order and a balance between sternness and humor as her method; Principal D talks about taking a stance on discipline to show there are consequences to a pattern of disruption; Principal E states that she encourages a family atmosphere in the building; Principal H claims positive interaction between students and faculty creates the climate; and Principal G cites fostering safety and security and a quiet building with everyone in his appointed place to create a climate for learning. Therefore, there is no one method common to any of the six principals in this category.
Principals F and H, both of whom believed they were primarily relations-oriented yet appeared to be task-oriented, act to create a climate for learning in their schools, however, there are differences in how they accomplish it. Principal F uses his presence in the hall, as a substitute and a cafeteria presider to send a clear message that he will not accept behavior not conducive to a good learning environment. Principal H says that she expects a good climate for learning and systematically eliminates things that detract from it.

Principal G, who presents the anomaly, like Principal F, uses his presence to influence climate and constantly reminds people to be where they are supposed to be, like Principal J does.

These data reveal that the principals in all four categories act to set a climate for learning in their building; however, each principal's approach to school climate varies in some way from the other principals in the study. Principals in more than one category acted to close the campus and to use the master schedule as a way to improve school climate; even principals within a category, chose different ways to foster school climate. An analysis
of these data, therefore, reveals that the methods used to foster school climate vary from principal to principal, regardless of primary leadership orientation.

**Supervision and Evaluation**

The principal in the first category (Principal A), who believes he is primarily task-oriented and appears to be primarily task-oriented, observes classrooms, works with teachers around methods of instruction and actively engages in a formal evaluation of teacher performance.

Of the six principals in the second category, who believe they are primarily relations-oriented and also appear to be primarily relations-oriented, six of them observe classrooms and actively engage in a formal evaluation of teacher performance. Three principals (Principal B, C and E) cited instances in which they worked outside of the formal evaluation process. Principal B told the story of going to the superintendent for permission to work outside the process to save a first year teacher and Principals C and E stated that they had asked each teacher to fill out his or her own grid and used that as a basis for evaluation. Principal C noted that the teachers' perceptions about themselves were accurate. Both Principal
C and Principal E said they supervised only a part of the faculty and had their assistant principals supervise the other half.

Four out of the six principals in this category (Principals B, D, E and J) work with teachers around methods of instruction, whereas the other two principals (Principals C and H) do not work with teachers around methods of instruction.

Both of the two principals who believe they are primarily relations-oriented and appear to be primarily task-oriented observe classrooms and actively engage in formal evaluation of teacher performance; however, Principal H cited herself as a primary evaluator of all department chairs and a secondary evaluator of the other teachers. In terms of working with teachers around methods of instruction, Principal H does this and Principal F delegates this to his assistant principal.

Principal G, who presents the anomaly, and is such a blend of task-oriented behaviors and relations-oriented behaviors that a determination of primary orientation cannot be made, observes classrooms and actively engages in a formal evaluation of teacher performance but does not work
with teachers around methods of instruction.

According to the above data, principals in all four categories observe classrooms and conduct formal teacher evaluation. Some of the characteristics of how the principals in the study performed this task crossed categories, such as working with teachers around methods of instruction, but some characteristics, such as being primary or secondary evaluator, were peculiar to only one or two principals. No consistent pattern of how this task was performed was evident, thus indicating that leadership orientation was not relevant to task performance.

**Staff Development**

Principal A, who believes he is primarily task-oriented and also appears to be primarily task-oriented, provides staff development opportunities by either bringing in experts or acting as the expert himself by giving presentations. He gives no indication of funding travel or encouraging his staff to attend workshops elsewhere. He models growth through participation in workshops and displays principal academy certificates on the wall of his office.

All six of the principals in the second category,
those who believe they are primarily relations-oriented, provide staff development opportunities and bring experts in to train faculty members. Two principals (Principals B and D) send their teachers to other schools to observe and bring back information about what other teachers are doing in their classrooms. Three principals (Principals B, C and I) fund travel and workshops. One principal (Principal J) stated that each staff member must go to one workshop or seminar per year to maintain his or her status at the school. None of the principals in this group cited their own attendance at workshops in terms of modeling growth.

Both principals who believe they are primarily relations-oriented and appear to be primarily task-oriented provide opportunities for staff development. Principal F, however, states that the in-service both last year and this year will be with the association of schools run by the same religious order, which in effect closes out the ordinary staff development opportunities most professionals utilize. Principal H brings in experts to work with the faculty and conducts some of the staff development activities herself. Principal F cites taking part in these workshops for administrators, thereby modeling growth; Principal H does
not mention taking part in staff development activities herself.

Principal G, who is such a blend of task-oriented and relations-oriented behaviors that a primary orientation could not be determined, provides staff development opportunities by bringing in speakers from the outside and utilizing the expertise of his own staff members. Principal G does not mention sending staff members to workshops elsewhere or participating in staff development opportunities himself.

These data demonstrate that principals across categories use a variety of in-service methods in their schools. Some principals in each category bring in experts and some principals send teachers outside of the building to workshops. Some principals in various categories use either their own expertise or the expertise on the faculty to conduct in-service. It is important to note that two of the three primarily task-oriented principals were the ones who decided on the in-service topic based on their own expertise; neither principal mentioned giving the faculty any say about the selection of the topic. This would be congruent with their primarily task-oriented leadership
style. It is important to note that principals in all four
categories did, however, provide some opportunity for staff
development in their schools.

**Performance of the Role of Educational Manager**

The ten participants in the study were interviewed
regarding their performance of the role of educational
manager. Documents supplied by the principals and
observations of meetings conducted by the principals in some
cases corroborated what they reported and in other cases
added to the reports to provide a more complete picture of
this aspect of the role of the principal.

Job descriptions provided by the principals reveal that
the school boards held the expectation that the principal
would serve as the educational manager of the high school.
Within the broad category, however, some specific tasks are
assigned to the superintendent in the public schools and the
president or executive director in the private schools. The
supervision of the physical plant and the responsibility for
budgeting and finances are two of these tasks.

For purposes of analysis, the role of educational
manager is further divided into five sections: (1) physical
plant; (2) paperwork; (3) finance and budgeting; (4) hiring
of personnel; and (5) student services. The same categories of principals used in the instructional leader section are used in this section also.

**Physical Plant**

Principal A, who believes he is primarily task-oriented and appears to be primarily task-oriented gives no indication of managing the physical plant; this responsibility belongs to the superintendent.

Of the six principals who believe they are relations-oriented and also appear to be relations-oriented, only two of them (Principals C and E) are responsible for the operation of the physical plant. In both cases the principals also act as president of their schools. One principal (Principal J) stated that he concerns himself with the building even though it is the task of the president, but also states that this is probably due to his nature rather than his job description. Principal B is also involved in the selection of the cafeteria food service company.

Neither Principal F nor Principal H, both of whom believe they are primarily relations-oriented and also appear to be primarily task-oriented, bear any
responsibility for the physical plant. Even though Principal F's job description cites this responsibility, the president of the school, in fact, operates the building. Principal H's superintendent is responsible for her building.

Principal G, who is such a blend of task-oriented behaviors and relations-oriented behaviors that a determination of primary orientation could not be made, is not responsible for the building; his president bears that responsibility. He does note, however, that he maintains a good relationship with the janitors and cafeteria personnel.

There is a clear indication, from these data that the degree of involvement in the operation of the physical plant varies from principal to principal, depending upon the administrative model, job description and relationship with the principal's superior. No consistent pattern emerged across groups, thereby indicating that leadership orientation was not relevant in the performance of this task.

**Paperwork**

Although all principals in North Central Accredited Schools are responsible for filling out reports, only four
of the ten principals mentioned it when interviewed.

Principal A, who believes he is task-oriented and also appears to be task-oriented, cited paperwork as the "thing" he did after everyone went home.

Only two of the six principals who believe they are relations-oriented and appear to be relations-oriented (Principals B and I) mentioned paperwork as part of their role. This suggests that the other four consider it too routine to mention.

Of the two principals who believe they are primarily relations-oriented but appear to be primarily task-oriented, one (Principal F) cites paperwork as part of his job and the other (Principal H) does not.

The principal who is such a blend of relations- and task-oriented behaviors that a determination of primary orientation could not be made (Principal G), did not cite paperwork as part of his role as principal.

An examination of the documents provided and the observations of the principals' conducting meetings clearly reveal that all of the principals in the study perform the necessary paperwork required by their position. The interviews, however, revealed that the majority of the
principals in the study, across categories, regard paperwork as either extraneous to their role of educational manager or such a given that it does not merit mention.

**Finance and Budgeting**

Principal A, who believes he is primarily task-oriented and appears to be primarily task-oriented, is involved in the budget preparation but is not ultimately responsible for the budget; the superintendent and business manager are responsible for this.

None of the six principals who believe they are primarily relations-oriented and appear to be primarily relations-oriented cited involvement in budget and finance issues, even though two of them (Principal C and Principal E) act as president as well as principal of their schools.

Both principals who believe they are primarily relations-oriented but appear to be primarily task-oriented (Principal F and Principal H) are involved in budgeting and finance even though they have presidents and superintendents, respectively. An unexpected finding is that all principals who believe they are primarily relations-oriented and also appear to be primarily relations-oriented, plus these two principals, neglected to
cite involvement in finances. This suggests a lack of focus on their part in this management area.

Principal G, who is a blend of task-oriented behaviors and relations-oriented behaviors and whose primary orientation could not be determined, describes involvement in the budgeting and finances of the school.

It is clear, from an examination of these data, that the responsibility for finance and budgeting belongs to either the superintendents or executive directors or presidents of the schools involved in this study. Only two principals, those who act as president as well as principal are responsible for the finances and budgeting in the school. Other principals are involved in the process but are not ultimately responsible for the finances. Thus, leadership orientation plays no part in the performance of these functions.

**Hiring of Personnel**

Principal A, who believes he is primarily task-oriented and appears to be primarily task-oriented, cites hiring of personnel as a part of his job as educational manager.

Of the six principals who believe they are primarily relations-oriented and appear to be primarily relations-
oriented, five principals do not cite hiring of personnel as part of their role as educational manager. Only Principal C, who acts as president and principal, cites hiring as a part of her role as educational manager. Some principals recommend staffing to the superintendent or president. Two of the principals who did not cite hiring (Principals C and J) do, however, have it in their job descriptions.

Both principals (Principals F and H), who believe they are primarily relations-oriented but appear to be primarily task-oriented, have responsibility for hiring though both of their job descriptions state that they recommend to their presidents and superintendents respectively.

Principal G, who is a blend of task-oriented and relations-oriented behaviors and whose primary orientation could not be determined, is responsible for hiring of staff.

An analysis of the above data reveals that the hiring of personnel is neither a function of leadership orientation nor of administrative model. Some principals bear responsibility for hiring, whereas others recommend to superiors, who bear the responsibility for hiring. No consistent pattern was evident across groups.

Student Services
Principal A, who believes he is primarily task-oriented and appears to be primarily task-oriented, deals with student personnel issues, and disciplinary matters and is involved in scheduling.

Of the six principals who believe they are primarily relations-oriented and who appear to be primarily relations-oriented, all six deal with student personnel issues, including discipline. Four out of the six principals (Principals B, C, D and I) are involved in scheduling; two of the six principals (Principals E and J) are not involved in scheduling matters.

Both of the principals who believe themselves to be primarily relations-oriented and appear to be task-oriented (Principals F and H) are involved in student personnel issues and discipline. Principal F is not involved in scheduling and Principal H is involved in scheduling.

Principal G, who is a blend of task-oriented and relations-oriented behaviors and whose primary orientation could not be determined, is involved in student personnel issues and discipline but not in scheduling.

These data clearly demonstrate that all of the principals in the study are involved in student personnel
issues and discipline. Regardless of primary leadership orientation, principals indicated that they met regularly with their deans and guidance personnel and dealt with the most difficult student issues, personally. Their involvement in scheduling, however, was erratic; some principals did involve themselves while others did not. No patterns or trends were evident regarding this area.

Performance of the Role of Communicator

The ten participants in the study were interviewed regarding their performance of the role of communicator. Documents supplied by the principals and observations of meetings conducted by the principals in some cases corroborated what they reported and in other cases added to the reports to provide a more complete picture of this aspect of the role of the principal.

The principal acts as communicator primarily, but not exclusively, when he or she functions as instructional leader and educational manager. For purposes of analysis, this section deals with four types of communication the principal uses when performing these other two roles: (1) oral communication; (2) written communication; (3) two-way communication; and (4) non-verbal communication.
Oral Communication

Principal A, who believes he is primarily task-oriented and appears to be primarily task-oriented, uses personal conversations and oral communication in both small and large group settings to inform, instruct and influence others. He does not appear to use oral communication to provide frequent staff recognition.

Of the six principals who believe they are primarily relations-oriented and appear to be primarily relations oriented, all of them use personal conversations and oral communication in small group settings to inform and instruct others. Only one principal (Principal D) uses communication to influence others. None of the six principals were observed communicating with others in large group settings. Five of the six principals in this category use oral communication to provide frequent staff recognition. Only one principal (Principal B) shows no indication of using oral communication to provide frequent staff recognition.

Both Principals F and H, who believe themselves to be primarily relations-oriented yet appear to be primarily task-oriented, use personal conversations and oral communication in small group settings to inform, instruct
and influence others. Neither principal uses oral communication to provide frequent staff recognition.

Principal G, who believes he is primarily task-oriented but displays such a blend of task-oriented and relations-oriented behaviors that a determination as to primary orientation could not be made, uses personal conversations and oral communication in small group settings to inform, instruct and influence others. Principal G did not cite nor was he observed communicating with others in a large group setting. He does use oral communication to provide frequent staff recognition.

According to these data, those principals who appear to be primarily task-oriented, use oral communication to influence others as well as to inform and instruct them, whereas those principals who appear to be primarily relations-oriented do not. Those principals who appear to be primarily relations-oriented use oral communication to provide frequent staff recognition, whereas those principals who appear to be primarily task-oriented do not. Thus, primary leadership orientation does determine the purposes of a principal's oral communication.

Written Communication
Principal A, who believes he is primarily task-oriented and who also appears to be primarily task-oriented, uses written communication to inform and instruct constituents.

All six principals who believe they are primarily relations-oriented and also appear to be primarily relations-oriented use written communication to inform and instruct constituencies.

Both Principal F and Principal H, who believe they are primarily relations-oriented yet appear to be primarily task-oriented, use written communication to inform and instruct constituencies.

Principal G, who believes he is primarily task-oriented but displays such a blend of task-oriented behaviors and relations-oriented behaviors that primary orientation cannot be determined, uses written communication to inform and instruct constituencies.

The written communication samples provided by the principals clearly demonstrate that all principals in the study, regardless of leadership orientation, use written communication to inform and instruct others.

Two-Way Communication

Principal A, who believes he is primarily task-oriented
and appears to be primarily task-oriented, both gives and receives information. However, when observed, he constantly interrupted the others, stepping on their lines as they were speaking. This would indicate that Principal A is not a good listener.

All of the six principals who believe they are primarily relations-oriented and appear to be primarily relations-oriented, both give and receive information. Five out of the six principals actually cited listening as an important part of their roles and displayed listening skills when observed. One principal (Principal D) did not cite this but displayed this when observed.

Both Principal F and Principal H, who believe they are primarily relations-oriented but appear to be primarily task-oriented, give and receive information. Both principals displayed listening skills when observed, though they did not indicate a focus on it.

Principal G, who believes he is primarily task-oriented yet displays such a blend of task-oriented and relations-oriented behavior that a determination as to orientation could not be made, both gives and receives information. Principal G also cited listening as an important part of his
role and displayed listening skills when observed.

An analysis of these data indicates that principals across categories both give and receive information, thereby engaging in two-way communication. The concern for listening seems to vary across categories but displays no pattern. Therefore, primary leadership orientation does not seem to play a part in the degree of listening principals engage in.

**Non-Verbal Communication**

Principal A, who believes he is primarily task-oriented and also appears to be primarily task-oriented, leaned forward a great deal and displayed in-your-face behavior when observed.

All six of the principals who believe they are primarily relations-oriented and appear to be primarily relations-oriented, did a great deal of leaning back while others were speaking.

Both Principal F and Principal H, who believe they are primarily relations-oriented but appear to be primarily task-oriented, varied their non-verbal activities between leaning back and leaning forward while others were speaking.

Principal G, who believes he is primarily task-oriented
but is such a blend of task-oriented and relations-oriented behaviors that a determination of orientation could not be made, neither leaned forward or back while others were speaking.

These data demonstrate that all of the principals used non-verbal communication and that those who appeared to be primarily task-oriented leaned forward when talking to small groups and those who appeared to be primarily relations-oriented leaned back when talking to small groups. Interestingly, the principal who presented the anomaly neither leaned forward nor back but sat straight as he spoke with others in a small group. Therefore, primary leadership orientation does play a part in a principal's use of non-verbal communication.

Performance of the Role of Decision Maker

The ten participants in the study were interviewed regarding their performance of the role of decision maker. Documents supplied by the principals and observations of meetings conducted by the principals in some cases corroborated what they reported and in other cases added to the reports to provide a more complete picture of this aspect of the role of the principal.
The principal acts as decision maker primarily, but not exclusively, when he or she functions as instructional leader and educational manager. This section on decision making, therefore, deals with how principals make decisions.

All participants in the study spend time collecting data, conferring with key individuals and groups to get input and making the final decisions themselves. Each principal, however, has a unique approach to decision making that he or she cited.

Principal A, who believes he is primarily task-oriented and also appears to be primarily task-oriented, stated, "...obviously, the more complex, the more long term, the more far reaching, the more you've got to think about it."

Of the principals who believe they are primarily relations-oriented and also appear to be primarily relations-oriented, Principal B said, "When I'm working with people, I try to sit back and listen to everything they have to say." Principal C stated, "I don't make any decisions independently or precipitously." And Principal D noted, "I'm a consensus builder."

Principal E claimed, "The best decisions are made with as much information as possible; the whole team concept has
been developed for that reason." Principal I said, "First of all I try to listen to people and get people's input...then weigh it; ultimately, this job is making that decision." And principal J commented, "...I firmly believe in collaboration prior to the decision. With some things you don't have that choice. Something comes across your desk; it's yes or no; it's now or never and you do it."

Of the two principals who believe they are primarily relations-oriented but appear to be primarily task-oriented, Principal F says, "Well, it's a team process here...there are some things that are, obviously as a principal you might make two hundred decisions a day; there are some things you just handle on your own. You have a pretty good flavor as to where people would be on it." And Principal H asserts, "Never put anything on the table that you have already decided...you have to figure out exactly which decisions are to be collaborative and which ones shouldn't..."

The principal who believes he is primarily task-oriented but is such a blend of task-oriented and relations-oriented behaviors that a leadership orientation could not be determined said, "Well, I think the key thing is just to make decisions...and be ready to suffer the consequences."
An analysis of these data reveals that collecting information and consulting with key individuals and groups comprise the process of decision making for all principals across the four categories and that decision making is a part of the role of the principal. The people who principals consider as key individuals vary from group to group; all principals cited members of their administrative team as key, but principals were divided regarding who the other key individuals were. No patterns or trends were evident in relation to leadership orientation regarding the identification of key individuals.

Summary Analysis of Findings

This study shows that principals perform all four aspects of the role of principal regardless of their primary leadership orientation. It also indicates, however, that methods of implementing the role vary from principal to principal. In some cases, methods reflect primary leadership orientation and in others methods do not reflect primary leadership orientation.

In the role of instructional leader, principals who appear to be both primarily task-oriented and primarily relations-oriented involve subject area departments in
curriculum development and instructional improvement, create a school climate conducive to learning, observe classroom instruction, engage in formal teacher evaluation and provide staff development opportunities. Principals who appear to be primarily task-oriented also provide vision and direction for the school and supervise instruction. Some principals who appear to be primarily relations-oriented do provide vision and direction for the school and supervise instruction and others do not.

The principal whose primary orientation could not be determined involves subject area departments in curriculum development and instructional improvement, creates a school climate conducive to learning, observes classroom instruction, engages in formal teacher evaluation and provides staff development opportunities like the primarily task- and primarily relations-oriented principals do. He provides vision and direction for the school but does not supervise instruction, thereby performing some of the duties primarily task-oriented principals do and some of the duties primarily relations-oriented principals do.

In the role of educational manager, all principals, those who appear to be primarily task-oriented, those who
appear to be primarily relations-oriented and the principal whose primary orientation could not be determined are involved to some degree, in the hiring of personnel, deal with student personnel issues and are concerned with discipline.

In the role of communicator, principals who are both primarily task-oriented and primarily relations-oriented use oral communication to inform and instruct and both give and receive information. Primarily task-oriented principals use oral communications to influence and some primarily relations-oriented principals do use it to instruct and some do not. Primarily relations-oriented principals also use oral communication to provide frequent staff recognition whereas primarily task-oriented principals do not.

The principal whose leadership orientation could not be determined uses oral communication to inform and instruct and to influence, and both gives and receives information as the primarily task-oriented principals do and provides frequent staff orientation as the primarily relation-oriented principals do.

All principals in the study use non-verbal communication; the primarily task-oriented principals lean
forward; the primarily relations-oriented principals lean back and the principal whose orientation could not be determined sits upright.

In the role of decision maker, all principals in the study collect data and consult key individuals and groups when making a decision; however, principals vary as to who those key individuals are. All principals believed decision making to be part of the role of the principal.
CHAPTER IV - SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATION

SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

The purpose of this study was to analyze four aspects of the role of the high school principal to determine if the principal's leadership orientation plays a part in the execution of the duties performed in each category (instructional leader, educational manager, communicator and decision maker). A brief summary, conclusions, recommendations and suggestions for further study are presented in the sections which follow.

Summary

The study was generated to answer the research question: How does the principal who is task-oriented or relationship-oriented approach the following four aspects of his or her role: instructional leadership, educational management, communications and decision making?

Selected literature was reviewed as it related to both the two types of leadership orientation and the four aspects of the role of principal.
A demographic questionnaire was sent to the principals of high schools in the Chicagoland area which were North Central Accredited to determine participation in the study. Of those who agreed to be interviewed, to be observed conducting a meeting and to provide documents, ten principals were selected to represent a balance of characteristics.

As previously noted, most principals incorporate elements associated with both task-orientation and relations-orientation in their leadership style. There are advantages to both approaches. The advantages of task-orientation include, a stronger focus on instructional supervision, more clarity on the communication of school mission and greater influence on the activities of the staff. The advantages of relations-orientation include a willingness to add information to the total picture of teacher performance and a greater concern for listening to the ideas and opinions of others.

The data accumulated and analyzed in the previous chapter yield conclusions, recommendations and finally suggestions for further study.
Conclusions

Two major conclusions drawn from the review of the literature and analysis of the data are stated in reference to the four aspects of the role of the high school principal.

1. Principals' self-identification of leadership orientation is often incongruent with their orientation as demonstrated through observation. A majority of the principals who labeled themselves as primarily relations-oriented were accurate in their self-description. However, some principals who labeled themselves as primarily relations-oriented, on the basis of the volume of personal interactions, were often using these occasions to manipulate people and move along their agendas rather than nurture them, thereby revealing a primarily task-orientation. Principals who identified themselves as primarily task-oriented, were more accurate in their labeling.

2. Although both primarily task-oriented and relations-oriented principals perform all four aspects of the role of the principal, there are major differences among the principals in the way they perform these roles. Principals who are primarily task-oriented, drive in a very
focused way, to accomplish goals they believe are important. They use people to move along their agendas, rather than focusing on the needs and satisfaction of their staffs. They communicate more to lobby and convince others to their way of thinking rather than to listen to the thoughts and opinions of others.

Principals who are primarily relations-oriented, on the other hand, work to determine what the goals are of their staff; they communicate so that they are truly listening to the input of the staff and they provide frequent recognition so that staff will feel comfortable and will grow.

Stemming from these two major conclusions are the following secondary conclusions.

1. The Role of Instructional Leader: Regardless of leadership orientation, principals act as the instructional leaders of the school. In fulfilling this role, they involve subject area departments in curricular and instructional improvement, create school climate, engage in formal teacher evaluation and provide staff development opportunities. Principals who are primarily task-oriented, however, take a more heavy handed approach in supervising instruction and providing vision and direction for the
school, whereas principals who are primarily relations-oriented let others lead the school in these two areas and use strategies outside the formal methods of evaluation to get a more complete picture of teacher performance.

2. The Role of Educational Manager: Regardless of leadership orientation, principals act as the educational managers of the school. The areas of management principals act upon, however, vary and are a function of organizational structure and job description rather than leadership orientation. Therefore, some principals lack sufficient involvement in financial matters, and some principals have too much responsibility for the building.

3. The Role of Communicator: Regardless of leadership orientation, principals act as communicator when performing the roles of instructional leader and educational manager. Both task-oriented and relations-oriented principals use oral and written communication and utilize two-way communication by both transmitting and receiving information. A difference in style, however, exists among the principals; task-oriented principals use oral communication to influence others as well as to inform and instruct others, whereas, relations-oriented principals put
a stronger emphasis on listening to others rather than trying to influence them when they are informing or instructing others.

4. The Role of Decision Maker: Regardless of primary leadership orientation, principals act as decision makers when fulfilling the roles of instructional leader and educational manager. There is no difference in the way task-oriented and relations-oriented principals make decisions; both sets of principals collect data and consult with individuals and groups before making decisions.

Recommendations

On completion of the study, the following recommendations are made:

1. Principals should not alter their leadership orientations in order to become better instructional leaders. Rather, principals who are primarily task-oriented should consider adding strategies to their repertoire which are not part of the formal teacher evaluation process in order to obtain a more complete picture of teacher performance. Principals who are primarily relations-oriented should consider taking more control over the supervision of instruction and being firmer in communicating
their vision and in providing direction for the school.

2. Organizational structures and job descriptions should be examined and modified to give those principals not involved in the finances more involvement and to reduce the time those principals spend managing the building so that they can concentrate on instructional leadership.

3. Task-oriented principals should make a greater effort to listen actively to those who are giving them input. Relations-oriented principals should take a stronger lead and use oral communication to influence others when talking with them, rather than just to inform and instruct them.

4. Principals of all leadership orientations should continue to collect data and consult with individuals and groups before making decisions.

These recommendations would allow principals to capitalize upon the strengths of both orientations.

Suggestions for Further Study

1. A further study could explore the roles of the principal as communicator and decision maker when the principal acts in capacities other than as instructional leader and education manager. Some of these capacities
could be as change agent or as negotiator.

2. A study of elementary school principals, as they perform these four aspects of the role of the principal, could be undertaken to determine if there are similarities or differences between the way high school principals act and elementary school principals act when performing the role of principal.

3. A study of the four aspects of the role of the high school principal using other leadership styles such as situational leadership, could further add to the body of literature on educational leadership.

4. A study of the kinds of decision-making strategies principals use in relation to routine decision making, heuristic decision-making and compromise decision-making could be undertaken.
April 5, 1995

Dear Principal,

I am the principal of St. Scholastica High School, and am completing a Ph.D. in Educational Leadership and Policy Studies at Loyola University under the direction of Drs. Heller, Safer and Gatta.

My dissertation topic is "Leadership Orientation of High School Principals." I have proposed and have been given approval for using North Central Accredited Schools with student populations under 1000. Your high school has been listed in the Summer 1994 NCA Quarterly as falling into this category.

I am asking for your assistance in this study. The enclosed demographic questionnaire is designed to enable me to reduce my sample for personal interviews to a manageable number. I have enclosed a stamp self-addressed envelope for your convenience. I am asking you, at the end of this survey, if you would be willing to be interviewed, if you would be willing to share pertinent documents and if you would be willing to be observed in a meeting with the staff. If you would, then please add the name, address and phone number of your school so that I may schedule a convenient time for the interview. I would appreciate your completing the questionnaire, even if you are declining to be interviewed by April 19th.

I thank you in advance for your cooperation and assure you that all responses will be kept confidential. Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Antonia C. Bouillette
Principal
(Home) 708/446-3424

ACB/jl
May 1, 1995

Dear Principal,

Several weeks ago I asked for your help with my study of "Leadership Orientation of High School Principals" and gave you an April 19th deadline for returning the demographic questionnaire. I did not realize, at the time, how many schools would be closed for spring break. As a result, several questionnaires have not been returned. I want my sample to be truly representative of the principals in the Chicagoland area, so I ask you to help me by returning the questionnaire. I am enclosing another copy of the questionnaire and another stamped, self-addressed envelope for your convenience.

If you have already sent in the original and it crosses this letter in the mail, please ignore this request. Either way, thank you for your assistance and good luck as we work our way toward the end of the school year.

Sincerely,

Antonia C. Bouillette
Principal

ACB/jl
August 18, 1995

Dear Principal,

Thank you so much for agreeing to be interviewed for my doctoral study. I have just completed my data collection and will begin my analysis this week. As I listened to the taped interview, I was amazed at, not only the amount of work you put into the principalship, but the amount of thought and planning you did about the job during your "free" time. I know that your students, as well as your colleagues, reap the benefits of those thoughts and efforts. I too, as researcher, have reaped those benefits and I want you to know how truly grateful I am to you.

As you begin the next school year, may you enjoy the successes you work so hard for and may you pause, at least a little, to take care of yourself.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Antonia C. Bouillette
Principal

ACB/jl
APPENDIX B

DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE
Antonia C. Bouillette  
April 5, 1995  
312/764-5715 (W)  708/446-3424 (H)  

---  

**School**  
---  

**Principal**  
---  

**Address**  
---  

---  

**PRINCIPAL/SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Size</th>
<th>Over 1000</th>
<th>Under 1000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>Suburban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>Nonpublic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coed</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>Single Sex</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Principal Male ___ Female ___  

Highest Degree Earned  
___BA ___ BS ___ MA ___ MS ___ M.Ed ___ Ed.D ___ Ph.D  

Number of Years Administrative Experience as Principal  
___ this school ___ other schools  

Number of Years Administrative Experience other than Principal  
___ this school as ___ other school/s as ___  

---  

Number of Years Teaching Experience  
___ this school ___ other school/s ___  

---  

Would you be willing to participate in a 1 hour interview at your school? ___ Yes ___ No  

Would you be willing to share with me samples of documents related to your role as principal? ___ Yes ___ No  

Would you be willing to permit me to observe you during a meeting with your staff? ___ Yes ___ No  

---  

Signature  

Please return this questionnaire by April 19th in the enclosed stamped envelope. Your cooperation and participation in this study of high school principals is greatly appreciated. I assure you that all responses will be kept confidential. Thank you.  

Antonia C. Bouillette  
1874 Stockton Dr.  
Northfield, IL  60093
APPENDIX C

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE
INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Thank you so much for agreeing to be interviewed.

1. Tell me a little bit about the pictures (or other personal items) on your desk (book shelves).

We're going to talk with one another today about the role of the high school principal. I have about twelve questions I am going to ask you on a variety of topics and if you have no objections, I'm going to tape the interview.

2. Several experts agree that the major role the principal serves is that of instructional leader. How do you perform that role?

3. What kind of activities do you engage in to ensure the delivery of the curriculum? How does the process work?

4. How do you go about setting a climate for learning in your building?

5. What methods do you use to supervise and evaluate
6. How do you work to administer a staff development program in your school?

While this is going on, I know, you perform the role of manager of people and resources in your building.

7. What activities do you engage in to manage these resources and assure basic operations?

8. Please describe how you work with other people to complete these tasks.

9. How do you deal with student issues?

It has been said that the principal is the center of the communications network of the school.

10. What methods of communication do you use in your dealings with teachers...students...other administrators...parents?
The principal is also a decision maker.

11. How do you go about making decisions?

12. Who else is involved helping you make decisions?

13. I am going to give you a definition of two types of leadership orientation, please tell me which one you consider to be your primary mode of leadership.

Task Orientation - Focusing on or a concern for production - for meeting deadlines - for the successful completion of tasks for getting results.

Relations Orientation - Focusing on or a concern for people, for successful interpersonal interactions of administrators, faculty members, staff members.
APPENDIX D

CODING SYSTEM
CODING SYSTEM - LEADERSHIP ORIENTATION

TO ORGANIZATIONAL

TO4 establishes patterns of organization
TO6 encourages the use of uniform procedures
TO7 establishes methods of procedure
TO8 emphasizes the mission of the school
TO9 emphasizes the job to be done
T10 stresses developing plans and procedures to accomplish the task
T11 keeps staff engaged in tasks they are performing
T12 expresses concern for production
T14 emphasizes the meeting of deadlines
T15 arranges conditions of work so that human considerations interfere to a minimum degree
T18 sees to it that the work of staff members is coordinated
CODING SYSTEM - LEADERSHIP ORIENTATION

TO INTERPERSONAL

TO1 keeps to himself
TO2 sees to it that staff members are working up to capacity
TO3 makes his attitudes clear to the staff
TO5 establishes channels of communication
T16 explains what subordinates are to do and when, where and how (one way communication)
T17 speaks in a manner not to be questioned
T19 makes sure that his part in the organization is understood by all members
CODING SYSTEM - LEADERSHIP ORIENTATION

RO ORGANIZATIONAL

RO1 puts suggestions made by the staff into operation
R10 maintains unity in the group with whom he is working
R11 is willing to make changes
R13 trusts people to do the job
R14 is concerned with employee self-esteem
R15 is concerned with establishing and maintaining good working conditions
R16 is concerned with establishing and maintaining fringe benefits
R17 desires job security for his employees
R27 creates comfortable work tempo
CODING SYSTEM - LEADERSHIP ORIENTATION

RO INTERPERSONAL

RO2 makes staff members feel at ease when talking with them
RO3 gets staff approval on important matters before going ahead
RO4 is friendly and approachable
RO5 is concerned with the interests of workers
RO6 respects workers
RO7 takes a personal interest in employees
RO8 believes employees are individuals with need
dispositions and individuality
RO9 treats all staff members as his equals
R12 assures members that their special needs are respected
R18 desires social relationships with colleagues
R19 is concerned for people's feelings
R20 is concerned with his interpersonal interactions with staff
R21 creates a comfortable, friendly atmosphere
R22 looks out for the personal welfare of individual staff members
R23 does little things to make it pleasant to be a member of his staff
R24 is easy to understand when he speaks
R25 finds time to listen to staff members
R26 consults with staff
R28 provides social-emotional "strokes"
R29 explains his actions
### I. Instructional Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IL01</td>
<td>educational leader in the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL02</td>
<td>influences others as they seek solutions to mutual problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL03</td>
<td>sets instructional goals for the school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL04</td>
<td>develops curriculum compatible with school goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL05</td>
<td>promotes instructional processes to support goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL06</td>
<td>displays knowledge and initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL07</td>
<td>acts as motivator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL08</td>
<td>evokes voluntary and active participation from coworkers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL09</td>
<td>majority time spent on curriculum and instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL10</td>
<td>key individual in supplying instructional leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL11</td>
<td>acts to promote student learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL12</td>
<td>provides resources needed for learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL13</td>
<td>coordinates instructional program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL14</td>
<td>controls educational program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL15</td>
<td>is acknowledged as school's leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL16</td>
<td>observes classrooms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL17</td>
<td>confers with teachers about teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL18</td>
<td>is concerned with testing and diagnosis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL19</td>
<td>attends committee meetings on curriculum and instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL20</td>
<td>manipulates class size and composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL21</td>
<td>is involved in scheduling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL22</td>
<td>controls staff assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL23</td>
<td>distributes instructional materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL24</td>
<td>supervises program and curriculum development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL25</td>
<td>creates school climate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL26</td>
<td>develops and improves instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL27</td>
<td>involves subject area departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL28</td>
<td>involves individual faculty members for curriculum development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL29</td>
<td>identifies curriculum and instruction problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL30</td>
<td>analyzes curricular content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL31</td>
<td>analyzes instructional methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL32</td>
<td>correlates curriculum and instruction with objectives and outcomes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| IL33 | possesses knowledge and skill in curriculum and
CODING SYSTEM - JOB PERFORMANCE

instruction
IL34 coordinates activities in school to ensure total curriculum alignment
IL35 addresses curricular issues
IL36 takes central role in curricular matters
IL37 helps staff select and implement curriculum design
IL38 works with teachers around methods of instruction
IL39 provides staff development opportunities
IL40 actively engages in evaluation of teacher performance
IL41 funds travel and workshops
IL42 pays substitutes
IL43 models growth through own participation in staff development
IL44 supervises instruction
IL45 formalizes evaluation process
IL46 provides vision and direction for the school
IL47 maintains high expectations for self, staff and students
IL48 promotes positive teaching and learning environments
CODING SYSTEM - JOB PERFORMANCE

II. Educational Manager

EM01 operates the school plant
EM02 is concerned with discipline
EM03 does paperwork
EM04 deals with student personnel
EM05 deals with finance and budgeting
EM06 manages technology
EM07 is involved in scheduling
EM08 hires personnel
EM09 supervises personnel
EM10 coordinates pupil services
EM11 manages staff development
EM12 establishes goals and objectives
EM13 evaluates progress toward goals
EM14 motivates
EM15 communicates
EM16 makes decisions
EM17 strengthens peers
EM18 strengthens subordinates
CODING SYSTEM - JOB PERFORMANCE

III. Communicator

C01 uses written communication
C02 uses personal conversations
C03 attends meetings
C04 passes information to people
C05 receives information from people
C06 uses communication to inform
C07 uses communication to instruct
C08 uses communication to evaluate
C09 uses communication to influence
C10 uses non-verbal communication
C11 acts as spokesperson for the school
C12 maintains open lines of communication between the school and community groups
C13 represents the viewpoint of the school on a variety of issues
C14 explains school goals, objectives and procedures for achieving them to publics
C15 acts as public relations person
C16 acts as catalyst for responsible change
C17 articulates wishes of parents to school staff
C18 encourages professionals to communicate freely with one another
C19 communicates in one-to-one settings
C20 communicates in small group settings
C21 communicates in large group settings
C22 acts as a good listener
C23 acts as mediator in resolving disputes
C24 provides frequent staff recognition
C25 uses persuasion to promote school goals
C26 uses compromise to promote school goals
CODING SYSTEM - JOB PERFORMANCE

IV. Decision Maker

DM01 recognizes, defines and limits the problem
DM02 analyzes the problem
DM03 evaluates the problem
DM04 establishes criteria for solutions
DM05 collects data
DM06 formulates solutions
DM07 selects solutions
DM08 puts into effect the preferred solution
DM09 makes routine decisions
DM10 makes heuristic decisions
DM11 makes compromise decisions
DM12 makes decisions about curriculum
DM13 makes decisions about teacher selection
DM14 makes decisions about staff development activities
DM15 makes decisions about faculty, staff, and program evaluation
DM16 consults groups before making decisions
DM17 involves others in decisions
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