

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Michael D. Richardson entitled "The Tennessee Principal: A Self Perception." I have examined the final copy of this dissertation for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education, with a major in Educational Administration and Supervision.

Robert K. Roney
Robert K. Roney, Major Professor

We have read this dissertation
and recommend its acceptance:

David M. Wilson

Dewey H. Stollar

Robert M. Alloyd

Accepted for the Council:

Cowminkel
Vice Provost
and Dean of The Graduate School

THE TENNESSEE PRINCIPAL: A SELF PERCEPTION

A Dissertation
Presented for the
Doctor of Education
Degree
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Michael D. Richardson

March 1986

Copyright © Michael D. Richardson, 1986
All rights reserved

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

It is with grateful appreciation that I acknowledge the contributions of the following individuals. First, a special thank you to the Sevier County and Washington County Boards of Education for employment and flexibility during the completion of this study. Thanks to Jim Donegan of The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Computer Center, for his help in the computations of the data. A special thanks to Tim and Kin Richardson for assistance in the completion of the data. Thanks also to my parents for their encouragement. To Dr. C. D. Boy, Sandra Fair, and John H. Bond, a debt of gratitude for their critical reading of the manuscript. Posthumously, to Dan Bradshaw for showing me the true meaning of courage. I also wish to express appreciation to members of my committee; Dr. Dewey H. Stollar, Dr. K. Owen McCullough, and Dr. David Welborn, for tolerating me for all these years. Also, to Mrs. Melba Wilkins for typing, proofing, and critiquing this manuscript. Without her able assistance this project would never have been completed.

Finally, this study is dedicated to two individuals who gave me the support necessary to complete this study. To Dr. Robert K. Roney and my beautiful wife, Leah, this is for you. Thanks.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate the perceptions of Tennessee public school principals toward themselves and their environment. The population for this study was all public school principals employed in Tennessee during 1984-85. A random sample of 316 was selected for participation in the study.

The typical Tennessee principal was a married white male almost 45 years of age. Principals had served their current school for almost 8 years and the principalship for 11 years. Almost one-half held a master's degree as their highest degree. Almost three-fourths supported merit pay for administrators, and almost one-half held additional jobs. They also desired additional income for their 53.5 hour work week. The average annual salary was \$26,601 with West Tennessee and urban principals receiving the highest salaries.

Principals perceived their current role to be a school manager, but over 80 percent reported their ideal role should be an instructional leader. The most important reason for becoming a principal was to improve income. Almost three-fourths obtained their principal's certification prior to entering the profession.

Approximately 50 percent found little value in their undergraduate programs. One-third thought their graduate programs helpful and almost half were indifferent to in-service programs. Almost three-fourths had applied for Career Ladder certification; however, almost one-half reported no system of principal evaluation. Almost two-thirds expressed

satisfaction with their own job performance and the quality of education in Tennessee.

Principals exerted their greatest authority in determining extra-curricular activities and the evaluation of instruction. They perceived little authority in the selection and retention of personnel. Chief among the constraints faced by principals were lack of time, lack of financial resources, and the excessive amount of paper work.

The Better Schools Program was perceived to have three major strengths: the Tennessee Instructional Model, bringing public recognition to education, and financial rewards. The major weaknesses were a lack of communication, inconsistency, and burdensome paper work.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	4
Purpose	6
Importance of the Study	8
Assumptions	11
Limitations and Delimitations	11
Definitions of Terms	12
Questions to be Answered	14
Procedures	15
Organization of the Study	17
II. A REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND RESEARCH	18
Introduction	18
Roles of the Principal	22
Constraints on the Principalship	32
Training and Certification	46
Demographic Data	56
Better Schools Program	59
Georgia	70
III. FINDINGS, ANALYSIS, AND DISCUSSION OF THE DATA.	75
Introduction	75
Data Collection	76

CHAPTER	PAGE
III. (Continued)	
Principals' Demographic Profile	78
Working Conditions	88
Principals' Tasks and/or Roles and Their Preparation to Handle Them	99
Principals' Satisfaction	117
Principals' Influence and Constraints	128
Principals' View of Better Schools Program	134
IV. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	139
Introduction	139
Summary	139
Conclusions	143
Recommendations	143
BIBLIOGRAPHY	145
APPENDIXES.	169
APPENDIX A: LETTERS OF PERMISSION AND APPROVAL	170
APPENDIX B: TENNESSEE ADMINISTRATOR QUESTIONNAIRE	173
APPENDIX C: COVER LETTER AND FOLLOW-UP POSTAL CARD	181
VITA	184

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I.	Number and Percent of Returned and Usable Responses of Principals in the State of Tennessee for the 1984-85 School Year	77
II.	Highest Degree of Principal Respondents in the State of Tennessee for the 1984-85 School Year	79
III.	Age, Sex, and Marital Status of Principal Respondents In the State of Tennessee for the 1984-85 School Year	80
IV.	Marital Status of Principal Respondents in the State of Tennessee for the 1984-85 School Year	81
V.	Analysis of Age and Years of Service as a Principal as Reported By Principal Respondents in the State of Tennessee for the 1984-85 School Year	82
VI.	Race of Principal Respondents in the State of Tennessee for the 1984-85 School Year	84
VII.	Geographic Distribution of Principal Respondents in the State of Tennessee for the 1984-85 School Year	85
VIII.	Location of Responding Principals in the State of Tennessee for the 1984-85 School Year	86
IX.	Number of Months Worked to Determine Salary of Responding Principals in the State of Tennessee for the 1984-85 School Year	89

TABLE

PAGE

X.	Mean Average Annual Salary By School Classification as Reported By Principal Respondents in the State of Tennessee for the 1984-85 School Year	90
XI.	Mean Average Annual Salary By Grand Divisions of the State as Reported by Principal Respondents in the State of Tennessee for the 1984-85 School Year	91
XII.	Mean Average Annual Salary By Location as Reported By Principal Respondents in the State of Tennessee for the 1984-85 School Year	93
XIII.	Number and Percent of Principal Respondents Who "Moon Lighted" in the State of Tennessee in the 1984-85 School Year	94
XIV.	Number and Percent of Principal Respondents Favoring Merit Pay in the State of Tennessee for the 1984-85 School Year	95
XV.	Mean Hours Worked Per Week According to School Classification as Reported By Principal Respondents in the State of Tennessee for the 1984-85 School Year	96
XVI.	Number and Percent of Principal Respondents Reporting a Job Description in the State of Tennessee for the 1984-85 School Year	97

TABLE

PAGE

XVII.	Current Ranking of the Perceived Most Important Role of the Principal as Reported By Principal Respondents in the State of Tennessee for the 1984-85 School Year	100
XVIII.	Current Ranking of the Perceived Second Most Important Role of the Principal as Reported By Principal Respondents in the State of Tennessee for the 1984-85 School Year	102
XIX.	Current Ranking of the Perceived Third Most Important Role of the Principal as Reported By Principal Respondents in the State of Tennessee for the 1984-85 School Year	103
XX.	Ideal Ranking of the Perceived Most Important Role of the Principal as Reported By Principal Respondents in the State of Tennessee for the 1984-85 School Year	105
XXI.	Ideal Ranking of the Perceived Second Most Important Role of the Principal as Reported By Principal Respondents in the State of Tennessee for the 1984-85 School Year	106
XXII.	Ideal Ranking of the Perceived Third Most Important Role of the Principal as Reported By Principal Respondents in the State of Tennessee for the 1984-85 School Year	107

TABLE

PAGE

XXIII.	Reason for Becoming Principal as Reported By Principal Respondents in the State of Tennessee for the 1984-85 School Year	109
XXIV.	Number and Percent of Principal Respondents Obtaining Certification Prior to Becoming a Principal in the State of Tennessee for the 1984-85 School Year	111
XXV.	Comparison of the Three Most Important Current Roles of the Principal as Reported By Principal Respondents in the State of Tennessee for the 1984-85 School Year	112
XXVI.	Comparison of the Three Most Important Ideal Roles of the Principal as Reported By Principal Respondents in the State of Tennessee for the 1984-85 School Year	113
XXVII.	Comparison of the Current and Ideal Roles of the Principal Using the Chi-Square Test as Reported By Principal Respondents in the State of Tennessee for the 1984-85 School Year	114
XXVIII.	Degree of Satisfaction of Principal Respondents to Undergraduate, Graduate, and In-service Training Programs in the State of Tennessee for the 1984-85 School Year	118
XXIX.	Perceived Satisfaction of In-service Programs as Reported By Principal Respondents in the State of Tennessee for the 1984-85 School Year	120

TABLE	PAGE
XXX. Level of Satisfaction with Administrator Certification Standards of Principal Respondents in the State of Tennessee for the 1984-85 School Year	121
XXXI. Methods Used by Principal Respondents to Renew Certificates in the State of Tennessee for the 1984-85 School Year	122
XXXII. System of Principal Evaluation Reported By Respondents in the State of Tennessee for the 1984-85 School Year	123
XXXIII. Respondent Principals Level of Satisfaction Regarding the Quality of Public Education in the State of Tennessee for the 1984-85 School Year	125
XXXIV. Overall Job Satisfaction of Principal Respondents in the State of Tennessee for the 1984-85 School Year	126
XXXV. Authority of Principals to Affect Certain Activities as Reported By Principal Respondents in the State of Tennessee for the 1984-85 School Year	129
XXXVI. Major Job Constraints Faced By Principals as Reported By Principal Respondents in the State of Tennessee for the 1984-85 School Year	131
XXXVII. Major Strengths of the Better Schools Program as Perceived By Principal Respondents in the State of Tennessee for the 1984-85 School Year	135

TABLE

PAGE

XXXVIII. Major Weaknesses of the Better Schools Program as Perceived By Principal Respondents in the State of Tennessee for the 1984-85 School Year	136
---	-----

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

In the early 1980's quality education became a national concern for many educators, parents, and politicians.¹ With the publication of A Nation At Risk in 1983, external pressure was placed on educators and politicians to stop the rise of mediocrity alleged in the report.² A Nation At Risk was only the beginning. Over 30 national reports proposing some type of education reform followed in rapid succession. Additionally, at the state level, over 300 task forces and/or commissions were empowered to study educational reform.³

A Nation At Risk developed five separate recommendations to improve education.⁴ One of those categories was the critical leadership role of principals in articulating effective schools. Nationwide the research trend has been toward a renewed appreciation for the principal's role in quality education.⁵ As stated by Klopff, Scheldon and Brennan,

¹Phil Vik, "A Response to A Nation At Risk: More Looking and Less Leaping," NASSP Bulletin, March 1984, p. 53.

²Patricia Albiorg Graham, "Wanting it All," The Wilson Quarterly, New Year's 1984, pp. 47-77.

³Patricia K. Cross, "The Rising Tide of School Reform Reports," Phi Delta Kappan, November 1984, p. 168.

⁴A Nation At Risk (Washington, D.C.: National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983).

⁵Roger Lanchance, "A Nation At Risk--Principal's View- point," NASSP Bulletin, March 1984, p. 47.

"The principal of a school is its leader, and on the effectiveness of its leader depends the effectiveness of a school."⁶ Ronald Edmonds, in his Search for Effective Schools Project, concluded that effective schools "have strong administrative leadership without which the disparate elements of good schooling can neither be brought together nor kept together."⁷

During the past few years, educational researchers and practitioners have analyzed the effect of the building principal on the school's effectiveness. Typically, they have not found that the principal determined whether a school--whatever its potential--was as effective as it should have been. Sweeney wrote:

Effective schools have effective leaders. Much of what the school does to promote achievement is within the principal's power to influence and control.

Implications are that school effectiveness is enhanced by principals who emphasize achievement, set instructional strategies, provide an orderly school atmosphere and frequently evaluate pupil progress.

Many other researchers have reaffirmed that principals who emphasize instruction,⁹ who are assertive and demand

⁶Gordon J. Klop, Ethel Scheldon, and Kevin Brennan, "The Essentials of Effectiveness: A Job Description for Principals," Principal, March 1982, p. 32.

⁷Ronald Edmonds, "Effective Schools for the Urban Poor," Educational Leadership, October 1979, p. 23.

⁸James Sweeney, "Research Synthesis on Effective School Leadership," Educational Leadership, February 1982, p. 352.

⁹Gordon Cawalti, "Effective Instructional Leadership Produces Greater Learning," Thrust for Educational Leadership, January 1980, pp. 8-9.

results,¹⁰ and who are able to develop and maintain an atmosphere conducive to teaching and learning,¹¹ make schools better than the school would be without such leadership. In summary, Brookover, et al., stated:

The principal acts as the instructional leader who effectively communicates the mission of the school to staff, parents, and students and who understands and applies the characteristics of instructional effectiveness in working with the school communities.¹²

Hodgkinson concludes:

. . . It is now clear that the individual school site is the basic unit of educational change and improvement. This makes the school principal the most vital leader in the improvement of public schools.¹³

With educational reform being at the forefront of current thought, researchers are obligated to direct attention toward those personnel and processes within the profession which could impact school improvement.¹⁴ Consequently, this investigation replicates

¹⁰R. David Farley, "Principal Effectiveness: It's No Mystery," Principal, September 1982, p. 48.

¹¹W. Elizie Danley, Sr., and Barbara G. Burch, "Teacher Perceptions of the Effective Instructional Leader," Clearing House, October 1978, p. 48.

¹²Wilbur B. Brookover, C. Beady, P. Flood, J. Schweitzer, and J. Wisenbaker, School Social Systems and Student Achievement: Schools Can Make A Difference (Brooklyn, N.Y.: Praeger Publishers, 1979), p. 204.

¹³Harold L. Hodgkinson, "What Principals Can Do to Manage Schools in the '80s," NASSP Bulletin, February 1982, p. 42.

¹⁴John I. Goodlad, "A Study of Schooling: Some Implications for School Improvement," Phi Delta Kappan, April 1983, p. 555.

a study conducted by the Professional Standards Commission of Georgia reported in The Principal: A Critical Element in Quality Education.¹⁵

Permission was obtained from the Commission for their cooperation in the preparation of this research as illustrated in Appendix A.

I. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Most current educational researchers believe the performance of the principal to be the most crucial element in quality education; and, although a few disagree,¹⁶ most do not debate the vital role performed by the principal in new educational initiatives, particularly in Tennessee.¹⁷

The passage of the Professional Negotiations bill in 1978,¹⁸ coupled with the Comprehensive Education Reform Act of 1984, placed the Tennessee school principal in a critical position.¹⁹ Today's principal has been given responsibility for implementing negotiated

¹⁵The Principal: A Critical Element in Quality Education (Atlanta, Georgia: The Professional Standards Commission, 1983).

¹⁶Ibid., p. 1.

¹⁷Russell L. French, "Dispelling the Myths About Tennessee's Career Ladder Program," Educational Leadership, December 1984-January 1985, pp. 9-13.

¹⁸Michael D. Richardson, "Dilemmas of A Principal in Negotiations," Tennessee School Boards Association Bulletin, November-December 1981, pp. 18-19.

¹⁹C. H. Stedman, "Tennessee's Master Plans for Teachers, Supervisors, and Principals," Journal of Teacher Education, February 1983, pp. 55-58.

contracts²⁰ and providing instructional leadership²¹ Both duties are added to those management functions typically assigned to the principal.²¹

As the principal's function grows increasingly complex, the data needed to manage and assess complexities become more indispensable. Research indicates that the nation's school administrators are mature, with at least 40 percent being over 50 years of age.²³ Logically, this expands the administrator vacancies available within the next 15 years.

Before vacancies occur, new techniques should be developed to select and train potential administrators. However, before programs can be developed for selection and training, current principals should be queried concerning the effectiveness of contemporary programs. Consequently, if prevailing training methods are deemed appropriate by principals, use them; if changes are desired, the data base should be available to justify the changes.

Since little formative evaluation data currently exists concerning Tennessee principals, this study proposed to fill that void.

²⁰Jerry C. Knoll, "The Principal Belongs with Management in Professional Negotiations," TASCD Journal, Fall 1979, pp. 32-37.

²¹John Ralph Pisapia and Jack D. Sells, "Administrator Protections in Negotiated Contracts," NASSP Bulletin, November 1978, pp. 43-54.

²²James M. Kelley and James A. Wold, "The Scope of Teacher Negotiations: A Perspective for Tennessee Educators," TASCD Journal, Fall 1979, pp. 5-13.

²³Nancy R. Needham, "Principals: The New Breed," NEA Today, December 1984, pp. 10-11.

If, in fact, Tennessee is in the vanguard regarding educational reform and improvement and no data base is available related to principals, it could be concluded that a problem exists with education policy being developed and administered without a valid data base. Therefore, the problem investigated by this study has wide implications for Tennessee educators, politicians, and citizens.

II. PURPOSE

Although much had been written on the national level regarding the importance of the school principal in school reform, data applicable to Tennessee's principals did not exist in sufficient quality to justify comparison. It was the purpose of this study to generate acceptable data for comparisons with other studies, especially Georgia's 1983 study.

With the passage of the Comprehensive Education Reform Act of 1984, Tennessee was at the forefront of national thought and attention.²⁴ It was imperative that researchers gather and analyze the maximum possible data relating to personnel involved with the Better Schools Program.²⁵ The data have implications for researchers, educators and politicians.

Three main purposes were served by this research. First, data were needed to identify strengths and weaknesses, as perceived by principals, of the Better Schools Program. Although much discussion had

²⁴Chris Pipho, "Stateline: Getting Schools on the Scoreboard," Phi Delta Kappan, December 1984, p. 237.

²⁵French, p. 10.

taken place in open meetings, little objective data had been collected and analyzed. Were Tennessee principals satisfied with the implementation of the program? Could principals make pertinent recommendations to assist State Department of Education personnel in further implementation?

A second purpose of the study was to generate findings that could be used by researchers and administrators planning programs for future Tennessee school principals.²⁶ The data could be of benefit to the State Department of Education, the Tennessee Higher Education Commission, and the teacher education institutions of higher education in the state as they attempt to provide increased training and educational opportunities for current and potential principals.²⁷

Third, the study had implications for the design and implementation of inservice programs for practicing administrators.²⁸ Also, it should be valid for assisting personnel decisions on the local level by setting standards for the selection of future principals.

²⁶Roland S. Barth, "The Professional Development of Principals," Educational Leadership, October 1984, p. 93.

²⁷Leonard O. Pellicer, Kenneth R. Stevenson and Thomas A. Surratt, "Do It First, Then Talk About It: A Principalship Practicum," Phi Delta Kappan, February 1984, p. 429.

²⁸Gordon J. Klopff, The Principal and Staff Development in the School (New York, New York: Bank Street College of Education, 1979), pp. 58-77.

III. IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

The functions of the school principal continue to gain greater complexity.²⁹ The responsibilities placed on the principal are diverse and demanding, often appearing to run at cross purposes with each other.³⁰ Concurrently, educators and the general public have recognized the importance of the principal as educational leader.³¹ While management functions are a necessary ingredient in the principal's responsibilities, another role, educational leader, has clearly become the buzz word of the 1980's.³²

Today's principals are searching for definitions, procedures, and competencies that are viable for the contemporary educational leader who operates within a complex, diverse and often hostile society.³³ This does not imply that the principal is more important than other educators.

²⁹Gene Huddle, "How Complex is the Principal's Job? What Actions Can Principals Take To Be More Effective?," NASSP Bulletin, December 1984, pp. 62-67.

³⁰Gene Hall, William L. Rutherford, Shirley M. Hord, and Leslie L. Huling, "Effects of Three Principal Styles on School Improvement," Educational Leadership, December 1982, pp. 47-49.

³¹Russell Gersten, Douglas Carnine, and Susan Green, "The Principal as Instructional Leader: A Second Look," Educational Leadership, December 1982, pp. 47-49.

³²Kenneth Cotton, and W. G. Savard, The Principal As Instructional Leader. Research on School Effectiveness Project: Topic Summary Report (Portland, Oregon: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 1980), p. 4, ED 214 702.

³³Terrel H. Bell, "American Education At A Crossroads," Phi Delta Kappan, April 1984, pp. 532-534.

It does signify a belief that it is the principal who must bring together the divergent programs and personalities to create and manage an effective school.³⁴

According to Postman and Weingartner:

When you are making soft revolution, you need not concern yourself with every problem in the universe, only one or two. The easiest way to dissipate the desire for a particular change is to convince yourself that the changes do not get at the general problem . . . some people do not like reform. They are wrong. When piecemeal reform is inadequate, the reason is that not enough pieces have yet been reformed.³⁵

It was the premise of this investigation that the passage of Tennessee's Comprehensive Education Reform Act (CERA) of 1984 was as Postman and Weingartner described, "piecemeal reform." CERA had placed Tennessee at the forefront of educational reform³⁶ and provided a huge impetus for educational change,³⁷ but additional studies were required to illustrate the needed reform in areas not completely addressed by CERA.

Silberman stated that reform had to be planned.

After all the dashed hopes of the postwar period--after all the "revolutions" that failed, the "breakthroughs" that never occurred, the "new directions" that led nowhere--it may

³⁴James L. Hager and L. E. Scarr, "Effective Schools--Effective Principals: How To Develop Both," Educational Leadership, February 1983, p. 39.

³⁵Neil Postman and C. Weingartner, The Soft Revolution (New York, New York: Delacorte, 1971), p. 3.

³⁶Eugene Bartoo, "Cycles of School Criticism," Tennessee Educational Leadership, Fall 1983, p. 56.

³⁷Anne Roney, "Of Babies, Bathwater, and Bandwagons," Tennessee Educational Leadership, Fall 1983, pp. 37-41.

be time to worry less about finding the right answers and more about asking the right questions.³⁸

Consequently, this research was more concerned with asking the right questions of the principals than finding any right answers. The importance of the research was in "converting chaotic messes into manageable problems."³⁹

Some courageous educational reform leaders had previously stepped forward with bold, if not new, ideas.⁴⁰ However, new data were needed to sustain the efforts if the status quo was to be modified and viable progress sustained. The quantity and quality of scholarly efforts had to increase.⁴¹ Therefore, this investigation should be an important contribution to the data base relative to principals' opinions. Educational reform had the potential for providing educators with a respected foundation if the recent reforms were built on sound, conceptual, and valid research.⁴² This study was designed to broaden that knowledge base.

³⁸Charles E. Silberman, Crisis in the Classroom. (New York, New York: Random House, 1970), p. 9.

³⁹James S. Bruner, The Relevance of Education (New York, New York: Norton, 1971), p. 32.

⁴⁰Governor James B. Hunt, Jr., "Education for Economic Growth: A Crucial Investment," Phi Delta Kappan, April 1984, p. 539.

⁴¹Stewart C. Purkey and Marshall S. Smith, Effective Schools-- A Review. (Madison, Wisconsin: The University of Wisconsin, June 1982), p. 5.

⁴²Kenneth A. Tye and Barbara Benham Tye, "Teacher Isolation and School Reform," Phi Delta Kappan, January 1984, pp. 319-322.

IV. ASSUMPTIONS

Several basic propositions were assumed in this study:

1. Tennessee school principals would give accurate and valid responses to the questions;
2. Different types of education and training procedures could be measured by the Tennessee Administrator Questionnaire;
3. The Tennessee Administrator Questionnaire was reliable for gathering information relative to the principals' perceptions of themselves; and,
4. Principals were likely to respond to a questionnaire which concerned their profession and their welfare.

V. LIMITATIONS AND DELIMITATIONS

This study was limited and delimited by the following:

1. A random sample of Tennessee principals was used in lieu of the total population.
2. The original questionnaire was developed for administrators in the State of Georgia.
3. The original questionnaire had to be modified slightly for use with Tennessee principals.
4. This study was delimited to principals employed in the public schools of Tennessee.
5. The questionnaire was lengthy, over six pages, which could affect the response rate.

VI. DEFINITIONS OF TERMS

Certain terms used in this study were defined as follows:

Better Schools Program. The Better Schools Program was contained in the CERA legislation but was limited to instructional aspects. The Tennessee Instructional Model (TIM), career ladder, computer skills, etc., were a part of the Better Schools Program which was a part of the larger legislation, CERA.

Career ladder. Career ladder denotes an incremental pay scale which rewards teachers for favorable evaluations. The career ladder was originally conceived as a part of differentiated staffing and was contained in Tennessee's Better Schools Program. Career ladder implied steps in the career path for participants which would grant additional compensation for reaching the steps.

CERA. The Comprehensive Education Reform Act (CERA) was passed by the Tennessee Legislature in 1984. It contained the Better Schools Programs encompassing career ladders for professional personnel, computer skills, Tennessee Instructional Model (TIM) and other reform elements. CERA also contained reform legislation regarding the role and function of the State Board of Education and the Commissioner of Education.

Effective school. An effective school was defined as a school that had an optimum learning environment. This environment encompassed the cognitive, affective, social, and aesthetic development of its students.

Effective principal. An effective principal was defined as a principal who created and fostered an effective school.

Merit pay. Merit pay denoted a monetary compensation plan for professional school employees which granted differential salaries based on quality of services provided. Unlike career ladder, merit pay was evaluated on a year-to-year basis not as a career path.

NASSP. The National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) was defined as the parent group of Tennessee Association of Secondary School Principals (TASSP). NASSP was initiated as an organization to enhance the role of the high school principal.

NEA. The National Education Association (NEA) was defined as the national parent of Tennessee Education Association (TEA). It had the largest membership of any professional teachers association and/or union.

Principal. For the purposes of the study, principal was defined as any person serving as the administrative head of a public school in Tennessee. The principal was the primary administrator at the local building level.

SDE. The Tennessee State Department of Education (SDE) was defined as an executive department of government under the direction of a Commissioner who was appointed by the Governor. The State Department of Education was charged with the responsibility of overseeing the state's public schools and initially implementing the Better Schools Program.

TASSP. The Tennessee Association of Secondary School Principals (TASSP) was designed to foster an appreciation for the duties, responsibilities and contributions of Tennessee's high school principals. TASSP was also defined as the state affiliate of NASSP.

TAQ. The Tennessee Administrator Questionnaire (TAQ) was developed for this study after permission was granted to modify the Administrator Questionnaire used in Georgia. The TAQ was a revision of the Georgia questionnaire field-tested on Tennessee educators.

TEA. The Tennessee Education Association (TEA) was defined as a state affiliate of the National Education Association (NEA), the professional association and/or union of the teachers.

TIM. The Tennessee Instructional Model (TIM) was developed as a response to the need for instructional improvement by teachers and was contained in the Better Schools Program. It was developed by Tennessee educators but relied heavily on the work of Dr. Madeline Hunter of the University of California at Los Angeles and other "effective school" researchers.

VII. QUESTIONS TO BE ANSWERED

Tabulations, rankings, and chi-square analyses were used to answer the following broad questions.

1. What was the demographic profile of the typical principal?
2. What did the principals perceive to be the working conditions in their schools?
3. What were the tasks and/or roles of the principals, and how well were they prepared to handle the tasks?
4. What were the levels of satisfaction for the principals as related to their college training, in-service, certification, quality of public schooling, and overall job satisfaction?

5. What amount of influence did principals exert in decision making regarding their schools? What constraints did they encounter?

6. What were the principals' perceptions of the strengths and weaknesses of the Better Schools Program?

VIII. PROCEDURES

The Tennessee Administrator Questionnaire was originally developed by researchers with the Georgia Professional Standards Commission. According to their statement it "was designed after an in-depth review of the literature on the principalship and after consultation with a number of representatives in the field of education."⁴³ They then administered the questionnaire to a sample group for correction and clarification. Forty-nine questions originally constituted the questionnaire. For the purpose of the current investigation, supplementary questions were added and modifications made to fit the Tennessee situation. The new Tennessee Administrator Questionnaire was then field tested using students enrolled in Educational Supervision and Administration classes at East Tennessee State University in the Spring of 1985. Revisions and corrections resulted in the TAQ included in Appendix B. A cover letter and follow up postal card are included as Appendix C.

A list of all Tennessee public school principals was obtained from the Tennessee State Department of Education. The Tennessee

⁴³The Principal, p. 6.

Administrator Questionnaire was mailed to a randomly selected number (316) of the principals.

The Tennessee Administrator Questionnaire contained questions of two types, open-ended and forced-choice. A subject number was assigned to each of the questionnaires to ensure respondent confidentiality and to facilitate follow-up if needed.

The Statistical Analysis System (SAS) was used with the data. Tabulations and analyses were completed for certain of the questions. Chi-squares were considered significant at the .05 level of significance.

The information provided by the respondents, as herein presented, was divided into six sections.

1. A personal data profile and demographic characteristics of the typical principal were obtained by tabulation.

2. Tabulations were compiled relative to the working conditions of Tennessee principals.

3. Rankings and tabulations were used to determine the tasks and/or roles of the Tennessee principal.

4. Rankings, tabulations, and analyses were used to determine levels of satisfaction for the principals in regard to those areas questioned.

5. Tabulations were used to determine the perceived influence of principals and the constraints they encountered.

6. Tabulations and syntheses were used to report the open-ended questions contained in the Tennessee Administrator Questionnaire relating to the Better Schools Program.

IX. ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

Chapter I contained an introduction, statement of the problem, purpose, importance of the study, assumptions, limitations, definitions of terms, questions to be answered, procedures, and organization of the study.

Chapter II presents an extensive review of the literature.

Chapter III is a factual reporting analysis and discussion of the data.

Chapter IV includes a summary, conclusions, and recommendations.

A bibliography and appendixes are attached to help support the study.

CHAPTER II

A REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND RESEARCH

The purpose of this chapter was to review literature concerning the principal. Literature was reviewed from books, research journals, magazines, periodic literature, and dissertations concerning most aspects of the principalship. Each of the areas covered could be the subject of indepth study. Also reviewed was the companion study of principals in Georgia.⁴⁴ The chapter was organized to include the roles of a principal, the constraints of the principalship, training and certification of principals, demographic data, and reactions to the Better Schools Program in Tennessee.

I. INTRODUCTION

Educational researchers recently turned their attention to the broad sociological processes at work in contemporary American schools. They uncovered the silhouette of an expansive new theory of school effectiveness. The new concept theorized that the success of a school was substantially determined by the underling structure of expectations and norms in the school. Typically, this sociological system

⁴⁴The Principal: A Crucial Element in Quality Education
(Atlanta, Georgia; The Professional Standards Commission, 1983).

exerted a powerful influence on the behavior of faculty and students and ultimately determined a school's success.⁴⁵

Researchers found that the staffs of effective schools stressed the importance of educational objectives. The degree to which the objectives were stressed was more important than the details of the objectives. However, effective schools did more than stress educational goals; they expected all students to reach the goals and clearly communicated this expectation to the students.⁴⁶

The conclusion of Brookover, et al.,⁴⁷ studying high achieving schools in Michigan was:

⁴⁵Harold Dodge, "Determining Appropriate Goals for Secondary Schools: The Precursor of Effectiveness," NASSP Bulletin, October 1983, p. 167; John I. Goodlad, "The Problem of Getting Markedly Better Schools," in Bad Times, Good Schools edited by Jack Frymier (West Lafayette, Indiana: Kappa Delta Pi, 1983), pp. 59-60; G. Thomas Houlihan, "Using the Right Variable in Measuring School Effectiveness," NASSP Bulletin, October 1983, p. 178; Benjamin S. Bloom, Human Characteristics and School Learning (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1976), pp. 202-203; W. John Smyth, "New Directions in the Study of the Principalsip," Canadian Administrator, November 1982, p. 3.

⁴⁶Karolyn J. Snyder, "Preparing Principals to Manage Productive Schools: A Neglected Dimension of Teacher Education," Journal of Teacher Education, March-April 1984, p. 138; Ken Wilson, "An Effective School Principal," Educational Leadership, February 1982, pp. 359-360; Roald F. Campbell, "Time for Vigorous Leadership in the Public Schools," in Bad Times, Good Schools edited by Jack Frymier (West Lafayette, Indiana: Kappa Delta Pi, 1983), p. 21; James W. Keefe, "School Applications of the Learning Style Concept" in Student Learning Styles (Reston, Virginia: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1979), pp. 130-131; Candace Pondexter, An Effective School: A Case Study. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the California Educational Research Association, November 1983, pp. 4-5.

⁴⁷Wilbur B. Brookover, Charles Beady, Patricia Flood, John Schweitzer and Joe Wisenbaker, School Social Systems and Student Achievement: Schools Can Make a Difference (New York: Praeger, 1979), p. 143.

. . . Teachers and principals in higher achieving schools express the belief that students can master their academic work . . . principal expectations are expressed in such a way that the students perceive that they are expected to learn and the school academic norms are recognized as setting a standard of high achievement. These norms⁴⁸ . . . are expressed in the instructional activities . . .

Much had been written in the last decade concerning the "effective schools" movement and the principal's role in an effective school. However, researchers had a difficult time accurately assessing an effective school and even more difficulty in defining educational leadership in an effective school.⁴⁹

The deeper processes inculcated in effective schools involve self-reinforcing norm-behavior cycles that operate in social groups. Organizations or groups develop norms of behavior which dictate how members of the organization are expected to behave. By interacting with others in the organization, individuals learn what is considered appropriate behavior and what is not appropriate. When the individual behaves in accordance with the norms, the norms are confirmed and reinforced. In this cyclical manner norms are reinforced and perpetuate themselves. In effective schools improving student achievement is the

⁴⁸Wilbur B. Brookover, Charles Beady, Patricia Flood, John Schweitzer and Joe Wisenbaker, School Social Systems and Student Achievement: Schools Can Make a Difference (New York: Praeger, 1979), p. 143.

⁴⁹Wilbur B. Brookover, et al., "Elementary School Social Climate and School Achievement," American Educational Research Journal, Spring 1978, p. 301; Robert Benjamin, Making Schools Work (New York: The Continuum Publishing Company, 1981), p. 12; John H. Ralph and James Fennessey, "Science or Reform: Some Questions About the Effective Schools Model," Phi Delta Kappan, June 1983, pp. 689-694; Larry Cuban, "Effective Schools: A Friendly but Cautionary Note," Phi Delta Kappan, June 1983, p. 695.

norm, and the resulting behaviors are conducive to the attainment of that norm.⁵⁰

However, the most crucial factor identified by effective schools research was the role of the principal. According to Lipham, "the leadership of the principal is crucial to the school's success with students." Hustin stated that "strong principal participation in the classroom instructional program" is a critical element of school success. A major characteristic of effective schools, according to Edmonds is "the principal's leadership and attention to the quality of instruction."⁵¹

The basic question to be answered by all studies of effective schools is, "Why is one school more effective than another?" Among all the variables examined by a number of studies, the leadership of the

⁵⁰ Jack W. Brittain and John H. Freeman, "Organizational Poliferation and Density Dependent Selection" in The Organizational Life Cycle edited by John R. Kimberly and Robert H. Miles (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1980), pp. 331-334; Alvin Zander, Groups At Work (San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1981), pp. 40-42; Frank Friedlander, "Performance and Interactional Dimensions of Organizational Work Groups," Journal of Applied Psychology, April 1966, pp. 258-259; Alan C. Filley, Robert J. House, and Steven Kerr, Managerial Process and Organizational Behavior (Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1976), pp. 13-14, 286; Sheryl Denbo and Marlene Ross, The Effective Principal: Achieving Equity and Excellence in Schools (Washington, D.C.: American University, The Mid-Atlantic Center of Sex Equity, June 1983), p. 12, ED 244 009.

⁵¹ William D. H. Georgiades, Excellence in Schooling: Effective Styles for Effective Schools. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, Las Vegas, February 1974, p. 2, ED 246 543; James J. Lipham, Effective Principal, Effective School (Reston, Virginia: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1981), p. 1; Gilbert R. Hustin, "Exemplary Schools and the Search for Effectiveness," Educational Leadership, October 1979, p. 11; Ronald R. Edmonds, "Programs of School Improvement: An Overview," Educational Leadership, December 1982, pp. 6-7.

principal typically emerged as a key factor in school success. If the principal is a key factor in school success, what are the roles or functions that a principal fulfilled to be an effective leader.⁵²

II. ROLES OF THE PRINCIPAL

Many conceptions exist in the research literature concerning the role of the principal. Views of the principal as instructional leader, administrator, community leader, disciplinarian, and organizational change agent dominate the literature. Probably most principals incorporate elements of each view into their personal frame of action. However, the most prevalent belief exposed by the research literature was of "principal-as-leader."⁵³

⁵²Ray Cross, "What Makes An Effective Principal?," Principal, March 1981, p. 19; James Henthorn, Principal Effectiveness--A Review of the Literature (Blasingame, California: Association of California School Administrators, 1980), p. 52; Raphael O. Nystrand, "Leadership Theories for Principals," Theory Into Practice, Autumn 1981, p. 260.

⁵³James G. March, "American Public School Administration: A Short Analysis," School Review, February 1978, p. 233; Harry T. Zechman, "Are Principals Competent in the Instructional Leadership Domain?," NASSP Bulletin, December 1977, p. 22; Raymond E. Wochner, editor, Competency-Based Preparation of Educational Administrators. Tasks, Competencies, and Indicators of Competencies (Tempe, Arizona: Arizona State University, Bureau of Educational Research Services, 1977), pp. 77-82, ED 145 510; Jean Wellisch, Anne MacQueen, Ronald Carriere, and Gary Duck, "School Management and Organization in Successful Schools," Sociology of Education, February 1978, pp. 212-214; Neil Postman, "Order in the Classroom!," Atlantic Monthly, September 1979, pp. 35-38; William J. Kritek, "Lessons from the Literature on Implementation," Educational Administration Quarterly, Fall 1976, pp. 86-87; Cecil G. Miskel, "Principal's Perceived Effectiveness, Innovation Effort, and the School Situation," Educational Administration Quarterly, Winter 1977, p. 31; William D. Greenfield, "Research on School Principals: An Analysis" in The Effective Principal (Reston, Virginia: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1982), p. 14.

The historical conflict between the instructional leadership role and managerial aspects of the principalship has had a major impact on the entire profession.⁵⁴ Initially, a careful distinction between leadership and management must be made. House and Mitchell defined management as: "a process . . . whereby subordinates are brought to execute prescribed formal duties and to accomplish certain given objectives."⁵⁵ By contrast, leadership had been defined earlier by House as "a process whereby one person exerts social influence over the members of a group."⁵⁶

Bennis summarized his views by stating that a leader was a person with "power over others" who exercises this power for the "purpose of influencing their behavior."⁵⁷ However, no one certain leadership trait or behavior was sufficient to improve teacher satisfaction or performance regardless of the situation.⁵⁸

Another view of the conflict between management and leadership was incorporated in situational leadership research which "does not

⁵⁴ Arthur Blumberg and William D. Greenfield. The Effective Principal: Perspectives on School Leadership (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1980), p. 18.

⁵⁵ Robert J. House and T. R. Mitchell, "Path-Goal Theory of Leadership," Journal of Contemporary Business, April 1974, pp. 71-72.

⁵⁶ Robert J. House, "A Path-Goal Theory of Leader Effectiveness," Administrative Science Quarterly, Fall 1971, pp. 323-324.

⁵⁷ Warren G. Bennis, "Leadership Theory and Administrative Behavior: The Problem of Authority," Administrative Science Quarterly, Summer 1959, pp. 261-264.

⁵⁸ Kent D. Peterson, Making Sense of Principal's Work. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association in Los Angeles, April 1981, p. 5.

seek to identify universal leader characteristics."⁵⁹ Instead, the research was directed toward the discovery of situational variables "which cause or permit leader behaviors . . . to be effective."⁶⁰ This theory was based on the recognition that the behavior of principals and the situation must be considered in order to understand the effects of principal roles on behavior. Logically, the role of the principal was to maintain that delicate balance between spontaneity and structure as well as between invention and tradition.⁶¹

One of the major ironies in education was the evolution of the principal's role. At one time the principal was a teacher with little or no knowledge of administration. In today's educational framework the exact opposite may be true--a principal being an administrator with "limited knowledge of the technology of teaching."⁶²

Yet many current researchers and principals expect the principal to be the instructional leader in the school. Much of this

⁵⁹Fred B. Fiedler, "The Leadership Game: Matching the Man to the Situation," Organizational Dynamics, Spring 1977, p. 9.

⁶⁰M. Donald Thomas, "The Complexities of Educational Leadership," NASSP Bulletin, December 1977, p. 38.

⁶¹James R. Tanner, "Management Development for School Principals: A National Priority," in Training Educational Leaders: A Search for Alternatives (Washington, D.C.: Institute for Educational Leadership, George Washington University, 1974), p. 89; Gene L. Schmidt, "What Motivates School Administrators?," NASSP Bulletin, November 1977, p. 49.

⁶²David W. Johnson and Roger T. Johnson, "The Principal's Role," Curriculum Report, October 1984, p. 4; John A. Ross, "Strategies for Curriculum Leadership," The Australian Administrator, October 1981, pp. 3-4, ED 213 142.

expectation and promise relates directly to recent developments in effective schools research.⁶³

Mattson defines instructional leadership as providing clarity to the organization of the school--clarity of goals, of functions and of interrelationships.⁶⁴ The principal would then be a facilitator of sources, connections and networks,⁶⁵ not a master teacher. Mattson concluded that "the primary function of the principal is to articulate in a clear and potent manner the discrepancy between the existing status of schools and the preferred status of schools."⁶⁶

Ronald Edmonds concluded his Search for Effective Schools Project by stating that effective schools must ". . . have strong administrative leadership without which the disparate elements of good schooling can neither be brought together nor kept together."⁶⁷

⁶³Mary Jo Kramer, Applying the Characteristics of Effective Schools to Professional Development (Manchester: Connecticut, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, March 1980), p. 2, ED 210 322; A. Lorri Manasse, "Effective Principal: Effective at What?," Principal, March 1982, p. 28.

⁶⁴Robert Mattson, Educational Effectiveness (Eugene, Oregon: Center for Educational Policy and Management, University of Oregon, 1983), p. 4.

⁶⁵Don Hellriegel and J. W. Slocum, Jr., "Managerial Problem-Solving Styles," Business Horizons, December 1975, pp. 29-32.

⁶⁶Mattson, p. 7.

⁶⁷Ronald Edmonds, "Effective Schools for the Urban Poor," Educational Leadership, November 1979, pp. 25-26.

However, the inquiry of administrative leadership often led to an analysis of the personal or human qualities of the principal: level of energy, goal orientation, use of power, decision style, and social or interpersonal skills. The personal traits approach had enjoyed wide publication and substantial support from principal groups.⁶⁸

Mattson stated a need to differentiate between the ideal and perceived roles of the principals.⁶⁹ This limited research effort was not developed to settle the principal role conflicts between instructional leadership and administrative manager.⁷⁰ However, a synthesis of the literature was presented for clarification.

Beginning with Wolcott, ethnographic studies demonstrated that principals did not spend substantial amounts of time in instructional

⁶⁸Seymour B. Sarason, "The Principal and the Power to Change," The National Elementary Principal, July-August 1974, p. 49; Gary P. Latham and Gary A. Yukl, "A Review of the Research on the Application of Goal Setting in Organizations," Academy of Management Journal, November 1975, p. 832; James H. Balderson, "Principal Power Bases: Some Observations," Canadian Administrator, April 1975, pp. 1-5, ED 115 902; John C. Henderson and Paul C. Nutt, "The Influence of Decision Style on Decision Making Behavior," Management Science, April 1980, pp. 99-114; Robert L. Heichberge, "Creating the Climate for Humanistic Change in the Elementary School with Principal as Change Agent," Education, Winter 1975, p. 110; Susan S. McCoy and Geralyn R. Shreve, "Principals--Why Are Some More Successful Than Others in Implementing Change?," NASSP Bulletin, September 1983, pp. 96-99; Michael Lipsky, Street-level Bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the Individual in Public Services (New York: Basic Books, 1980), pp. 196-213; Benjamin Epstein, Principals: An Organized Force for Leadership (Reston, Virginia: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1974), p. 32, ED 090: 697.

⁶⁹Mattson, p. 4.

⁷⁰Richard V. Hatley and Buddy R. Pennington, "Role Conflict Resolution Behavior of High School Principals," Educational Administration Quarterly, Autumn 1975, pp. 66-84.

vigilance. Rather their activities were directed toward maintaining order in the schools.⁷¹

According to Pinero, the instructional leadership domain of the principal is as old as the principalship itself but "has seldom been supported in practice."⁷² Even international studies have advocated an instructional role for the principal. An Australian, W. John Smyth reported that student achievement was higher in schools where principals "felt strongly about instruction." He did conclude however, that observations and studies of principals exemplified they had little involvement with the teaching and learning processes in the classroom. Instead, principals were busy "running the school smoothly and efficiently."⁷³ In other words, they were more concerned with administration and less with instruction.

Cusick reported that principals spent most of their time with administration. He reached this conclusion after spending considerable time in two high schools in the midwest. Cusick's time in the schools led him to deduce that principals were efficient at preserving

⁷¹Harry Wolcott, The Man in the Principal's Office: An Ethnography (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1973), p. 117; Robert J. Krajewski, "The Elementary Principal's Role: A Perspective," The Educational Catalyst, Winter 1975, pp. 11-15; Joseph F. Rogus, "How Principals Can Strengthen School Performance," NASSP Bulletin, January 1983, pp. 5-7.

⁷²Ursula C. Pinero, "Wanted: Strong Instructional Leaders," Principal, March 1982, pp. 16-19.

⁷³W. John Smyth, "The Principal As An Educational Leader: To Be or Not To Be?," The Australian Administrator, February 1980, pp. 21-28.

discipline and maintaining an orderly environment. Consequently, teachers were the curriculum decision makers with little or no input from principals.⁷⁴ Teachers often taught subjects contrary to official curriculum guides and made decisions in conformance with their own standards.⁷⁵ Cusick characterized the schools as having ". . . a complete lack of coordination and a refusal to address important educational issues."⁷⁶

Nystrand summarized much of the recent research on the principal and suggested that the principal must be an administrative leader. Specifically, he emphasized that principals understand their own leadership style and how it affected others in the school.⁷⁷

Findings from a number of studies indicated that a principal should identify clear and attainable goals and persist toward them. They should also seek multiple strategies for attaining the goals. Information networks should be a source of information for the principals. Also, the goals identified should be in the public interest. Finally, the principal must take into account the counter

⁷⁴Phillip A. Cusick, "Secondary School Structure: A Critical Dilemma," NASSP Bulletin, December 1981, pp. 40-50.

⁷⁵David Selden, "The Function of the Teacher in Education and Its Reform," Journal of Teacher Education, Spring 1975, pp. 30-34; Eric W. Vetter, "Role Pressures and the School Principal," NASSP Bulletin, November 1976, p. 22.

⁷⁶Cusick, p. 49.

⁷⁷Nystrand, pp. 260-263.

influences of community, organization, and society.⁷⁸ However, goal setting and goal attainment are management functions of the principal and are crucial to the improvement of the school's instructional program.⁷⁹

The most important function of a principal should be improvement of teaching and learning. The ability of the principal to lead the staff in planning, implementing, and evaluating improvements in the school's instructional program is considered the most important factor in determining the success of a school.⁸⁰ Research studies illustrate

⁷⁸James G. March, "American Public School Administration: A Short Analysis," School Review, February 1978, p. 233; David A. Squires, William G. Huitt and John H. Segars, Effective Schools and Classrooms: A Research-Based Perspective (Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1974), pp. 6-7; Jon Merrow, Richard Foster and Nolan Estes, "Networking: A White Paper on the Preparation of School Administrators," The National Elementary Principal, July-August 1974, pp. 8-18; Bernard Spodek, "The Pressure to Conform," The National Elementary Principal, May-June 1974, p. 19; Shirley M. Hord, L. L. Huling and Suzanne M. Stiegelbauer, An Analysis of Interventions in School Improvements Efforts. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal 1983, p. 8.

⁷⁹Robert J. Krajewski, "Texas Principals-Implications for Perceived Roles," NASSP Bulletin, December 1977, pp. 16-19; Madeline Hunter, "Knowing, Teaching, and Supervising," in Using What We Know About Teaching edited by Philip L. Hosford (Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1984), pp. 183-184.

⁸⁰David J. Kroeze, "Effective Principals as Instructional Leaders: New Directions for Research," Administrator's Notebook, September 1983, p. 3; Kenneth A. Leithwood and Deborah J. Montgomery, "Patterns of Growth in Principal Effectiveness." A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans 1984, p. 69.

that effective principals: (1) are committed to instructional improvement and set instructional strategies,⁸¹ (2) have knowledge of instructional activities and emphasize achievement,⁸² (3) monitor the use of class time and provide an orderly atmosphere,⁸³ (4) have positive attitudes toward staff and students and support teachers,⁸⁴ and (5) encourage instructional improvement projects and coordinate instructional programs.⁸⁵

Whether principals devote more time to management or instruction may not be as crucial as once thought.⁸⁶ Several studies indicate that principals have ample opportunities, both formal and informal, to provide instructional leadership.⁸⁷

⁸¹Stephen K. Miller, "The Effective School," The Practitioner, October 1984, pp. 1-5.

⁸²Robert Lynn Canady and Phyllis R. Hotchkiss, "School Improvement Without Additional Cost," Phi Delta Kappan, November 1984, p. 183.

⁸³James Traub, "Principals in Action," Harper's, May 1983, pp. 12-13.

⁸⁴Jim Sweeney and Robert Pinckney, "Faculty Management: The Principal's Most Important Role," Spectrum, Fall 1983, pp. 3-6.

⁸⁵G. A. Lorzau, "The Role of the Principal Today," North Central Association Quarterly, Fall 1977, p. 98.

⁸⁶Shirley A. Jackson, "Instructional Leadership Behaviors: Differentiating Effective from Ineffective Low-Income Urban Schools," Urban Education, April 1983, pp. 59-70.

⁸⁷James L. Hager, and L. E. Sean, "Effective Schools--Effective Principals: How to Develop Both," Educational Leadership, February 1983, pp. 38-40; Michael Cohen and A. Lorri Manasse, "Effective Principals," School Administrator, November 1982, pp. 14-16; Daniel L. Duke, "What Can Principals Do? Leadership Functions and Instructional Effectiveness," NASSP Bulletin, October 1982, pp. 10-12.

The roles of the school principals are as varied as the students they serve. Several factors impinge directly on the roles of the principal. Among them are role ambiguity, goal setting behaviors, leadership behaviors and initiative, management behaviors, instructional management, symbolic leadership, personal characteristics, leadership styles, and situational influences. All of these are operationalized in the roles of a principal.⁸⁸

In conclusion, administrators and the public must ask a key question, "Do they really want a principal to be primarily an instructional leader, or do they expect the principal to be a

⁸⁸Ellen Look and Richard Manatt, "Evaluating Principal Performance with Improved Criteria," NASSP Bulletin, December 1984, pp. 76-81; Kenneth E. McIntyre and Ed A. Grant, "How Principals, Teachers, and Superintendents View the Principalship," NASSP Bulletin, February 1980, pp. 44-49; David L. Clark and Linda S. Lotto, "Principals in Instructionally Effective Schools" in The Role of the Principal edited by Deborah Burnett Strothey (Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa, 1983), pp. 158-160; William L. Renfro and James L. Morrison, "Anticipating and Managing Change in Educational Organizations," Educational Leadership, September 1983, p. 50; A. Ross Thomas, "The Complexities of Educational Leadership," NASSP Bulletin, December 1977, pp. 34-40; Gary Yukl, "Managerial Leadership and the Effective Principal," in The Effective Principal, (Reston, Virginia: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1982), pp. 2-4; Gordon Cawalti, "Effective Instructional Leadership Produces Greater Learning," Thrust, for Educational Leadership, January 1980, p. 8; Thomas Stephens, "Innovative Teaching Practices: Their Relation to System Norms and Rewards," Educational Administration Quarterly, Winter 1974, pp. 35-43; Roland Barth and Terrace E. Deal, "The Principalship: Views from Within and Without," in The Effective Principal (Reston, Virginia: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1982), pp. 30-33; M. A. Awender, "The Principal's Leadership Role: Perceptions of Teachers, Principals and Superintendents," Education, Spring 1981, pp. 172-179; A. Ross Thomas, "The Organizational Climate of Schools," International Review of Education, October 1976, pp. 441-456.

manager of people and things? Was the expressed belief in instructional leadership only lip service? When will boards of education reward instructional excellence and not just reinforce the principal of the well-managed, efficiently operated school?"⁸⁹

The distinction between instructional leadership and management could be artificial. Effective principals must wear both hats. They are both instructional leaders and efficient managers.⁹⁰ While researchers dissected the principalship for greater understanding of its complexity; ultimately, the parts must be reassembled to reflect the immense interrelationships inherent in the operation of effective schools.

III. CONSTRAINTS ON THE PRINCIPALSHIP

Schools have been a reflection of public priorities. As the public desired or needed broader objectives, the schools were asked to shape the curriculum toward accomplishing those objectives. Historically, the public outlined some very broad objectives for schools. When farmers were needed, schools developed departments of

⁸⁹Rya Punkerson, "Wasted Days and Wasted Nights," NASSP Bulletin, December 1977, pp. 26-29.

⁹⁰Manasse, p. 28.

agriculture and industrial arts.⁹¹ When education became broadly recognized as beneficial, enrollment of adolescents increased from 51 percent in 1930 to 76 percent in 1950 and 93 percent in 1970.⁹² The proliferation of the automobile created driver education programs.⁹³ Concerns about the aesthetics increased offerings in music and art.⁹⁴ The resulting scare of Sputnik caused a new stringency in science and mathematics.⁹⁵ Abundant leisure time resulted in large-scale student activities and athletic programs.⁹⁶ The ever-increasing need for career awareness led to a rapid growth in work-study and service-learning

⁹¹Larry Cuban, "Transforming the Frog into a Prince: Effective Schools Research, Policy, and Practice at the District Level," Harvard Educational Review, May 1984, pp. 148-149; John I. Goodlad, What Schools Are For (Los Angeles: University of California, Institute for Development of Educational Activities, Inc., 1979), pp. 8-9; Lawrence A. Cremin, "Public Education and the Education of the Public," Teachers College Record, September 1975, p. 11; Wellford Wilms, Public and Proprietary Vocational Training: A Study of Effectiveness (Lexington, Massachusetts: D.C. Heath Co., 1975), pp. 161-167.

⁹²Wilbur B. Brookover, Charles Beady, Patricia Flood, John Schweitzer, and Joe Wisenbaker, School Social Systems and Student achievement: Schools Can Make a Difference (New York: Praeger, 1979), p. 8.

⁹³Harold G. Shane, "Some Educational Consequences of Contemporary Social Disorientation," in Bad Times, Good Schools edited by Jack Frymier (West Lafayette, Indiana: Kappa Delta Pi, 1983), p. 30.

⁹⁴Arthur D. Roberts and Gordon Cawalti, Redefining General Education in the American High School (Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1984), pp. 5-10.

⁹⁵Marshall Gordon, "Conflict and Liberation: Personal Aspects of the Mathematics Experience," Curriculum Inquiry, Fall 1978, p. 252.

⁹⁶Seymour B. Sarason, The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change (Boston, Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon, 1982), p. 37.

programs.⁹⁷ Typically, the schools responded to public sentiment and tried to be "all things to all people."⁹⁸ However, the primary focus of schools during the past decade was on better buildings, more modern curricula, and on a higher quality teaching staff.⁹⁹

Goal ambiguity has been the major problem encountered by school principals as they confronted this complex situation of public needs. Schools and their principals could be effective if the goals of the public and the school district were clear. However, when goals are not clear, the restraints placed upon the principal lead to some very real conflicts.¹⁰⁰

Often temporary and divergent demands have been placed upon principals by a mobile, pluralistic society. Consequently, principals were forced to divert attention from long-range, substantive matters, to the immediate issues of the public. The burden of attempting to

⁹⁷Lawrence Iannaccone, "Community Education and Turning Point Election Periods," in Community, Educational, and Social Impact Perspectives edited by Donna Hager Schoeny and Larry E. Decker (Charlottesville, Virginia: Mid-Atlantic Center for Community Education, University of Virginia, 1983), p. 108.

⁹⁸Peter Shrag, "End of the Impossible Dream," Saturday Review, September 1970, p. 68.

⁹⁹Raphael O. Nystrad and Frederick Bertolaet, "Strategies for Allocating Human and Material Resources," Review of Educational Research, October 1967, pp. 448.

¹⁰⁰Michael and Dolores Giammatteo, Forces on Leadership (Reston, Virginia: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1981), pp. 39-41; Lipham, p. 5; Jacob W. Getzels and Egon G. Guba, "Social Behavior and the Administrative Process," School Review, Winter 1957, pp. 81-84.

respond to such a broad spectrum of divergent demands proved exhausting to even the most dedicated and insightful principal.¹⁰¹

Principals have not always been consulted on the formulation of policies that would affect the school programs and operations. Obviously, the principal is the person most responsible for carrying out the policies in the school. As such, principals are public symbols for the schools. The qualities exhibited by the principal have a significant impact on the character of the school. How a principal balances the contradictory, if not conflicting, professional and bureaucratic requirements of the organization has tremendous impact on the entire school.¹⁰²

The determination of the degree of autonomy between the local school and the school district presents continual problems for principals. Similarly, the degree of autonomy given to the teacher versus the needs of the entire school causes another source of conflict.¹⁰³

¹⁰¹Goodlad, pp. 74-75; Ralph B. Kimbrough, "The Behavioral Characteristics of Effective Educational Administrators," Educational Administration and Supervision, November 1959, pp. 337-348.

¹⁰²Patricia A. Brieschke, "Principals in Schools: Insubordination in Discretionary Decision Making," Educational Forum, Winter 1985, pp. 158-159; O. L. Davis, "Pointing the Right Direction: Toward the Invention of Our Futures," in Bad Times, Good Schools edited by Jack Frymier (West Lafayette, Indiana: Kappa Delta Pi, 1983), pp. 101-103; Anne E. Trask, "Principals, Teachers, and Supervision: Dilemmas and Solutions," Administrator's Notebook, December 1964, pp. 1-4.

¹⁰³Conrad Briner and Lawrence Iannaccone, "Selected Power Relationships in Education," Educational Administration Quarterly, Autumn 1966, pp. 193-194; Edwin M. Bridges, "Teacher Participation in Decision Making," Administrator's Notebook, May 1964, pp. 1-4.

In organizational relationships involving schools, the concepts of decentralization versus centralization have been of paramount concern. Researchers and theorists in organizational behavior have believed schools to be a loosely-coupled bureaucracy rather than an authoritarian bureaucracy. However, schools, as social systems, form a structured bureaucracy.¹⁰⁴ They consist of "hierarchical positions, authority relations, specialized functions, and rules and regulations."¹⁰⁵ Researchers also speculated that there were "qualitative and quantitative separations between the institutional, managerial, and technical" levels of a school organization. Due to the wide disparity in school size, structure, control, and location few specific solutions to this dilemma could be generalized. Consequently, the principal dealt with an anomaly: a highly structured environment and a loosely-coupled

¹⁰⁴ Patricia Cayo Sexton, The American School: A Sociological Analysis (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1967), p. 71; William A. Firestone and Bruce L. Wilson, Using Bureaucratic and Cultural Linkages to Improve Instruction: The High School Principal's Contribution (Eugene, Oregon: Center for Educational Policy and Management, University of Oregon, 1983), p. 1; Max G. Abbott, "The Social Psychology of Organizations," Educational Administration Quarterly, Winter 1967, pp. 100-102; Gary J. Hoban, "The School without a Principal" in the Power to Change: Issues for the Innovative Educator edited by Carmen M. Culver and Gary J. Hoban (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973), pp. 145-146.

¹⁰⁵ Charles E. Bidwell, "The School as a Formal Organization," in Handbook of Organizations edited by James G. March (Chicago, Illinois: Rand-McNalley, 1965), pp. 976-977.

bureaucracy. As a general rule, the key to efficiency and effectiveness involved cooperation rather than confrontation.¹⁰⁶

Blumberg stated that:

. . . There is hardly a study in the entire literature which fails to demonstrate that satisfaction in work is enhanced or that other generally acknowledged beneficial consequences accrue from a genuine increase in workers' decision-making powers.¹⁰⁷

The participation of principals in decision making has often been limited to "rubber-stamping" a decision or developing strategies for implementing a decision that a superior had already made. For the principal, this model does not facilitate either satisfactory participation or power equalization.¹⁰⁸

Wood stated that principals who have the opportunity to have pertinent input in decision making are more likely to be committed to the organization, have increased decision quality, increased job satisfaction and increased productivity. The apparent discrepancy in administrative authority is caused by organization inefficiency rather

¹⁰⁶ Alan F. Brown and John H. House, "The Organizational Component in Education," Review of Educational Research, October 1967, pp. 399-403; Gerald H. Moeller and W. W. Charters, Jr., "Relations of Bureaucratization to Sense of Power Among Teachers," Administrative Science Quarterly, March 1966, pp. 456-457; David A. Erlandson, "An Organizing Strategy for Manager Change in the Schools," NASSP Bulletin, April 1980, p. 7.

¹⁰⁷ Peter Blumberg, Industrial Democracy: The Sociology of Participation (London, England: Constable, 1968), p. 123.

¹⁰⁸ Daniel L. Duke, Bruce Showers, and M. Imber, "Teachers and Shared Decision Making: The Costs and Benefits of Involvement," Educational Administration Quarterly, Winter 1980, p. 98; Mitchel Mulder, "Power Equalization through Participation," Administrative Science Quarterly, March 1971, pp. 31-38.

than efficiency.¹⁰⁹ True organizational efficiency would decentralize power and allow principals to be more competitive and autonomous.¹¹⁰

The effectiveness of principals is not considered as bipolar. No principal is considered completely effective or totally ineffective. Principals give evidence of degrees of effectiveness. Many of the obstacles encountered by principals are symptoms of larger, more fundamental problems. For example, the apparently unending "routine management tasks" that principals encounter which divert their attention from instructional leader, indicated a much larger problem.¹¹¹

In summary, principals typically encountered five distinct classifications of constraints: (1) those difficulties associated with teachers; (2) the roles of a principal; (3) personal and professional characteristics of principals; (4) constraints imposed by central-level administration; and (5) public or community pressures.¹¹²

Difficulties associated with teachers were shown to include: (1) inconsistency in professional preparation; (2) autonomy of teachers; (3) lack of desire for change or participation in in-service; (4) deficiency in skill and knowledge of appropriate teaching practices;

¹⁰⁹Carolyn J. Wood, "Participatory Decision Making: Why Doesn't It Seem to Work?," The Educational Forum, Fall 1984, p. 62.

¹¹⁰Sexton, p. 71.

¹¹¹Kenneth A. Leithwood and Deborah J. Montgomery, "Obstacles Preventing Principals from Becoming More Effective," Education and Urban Society, November 1984, pp. 73-74.

¹¹²Leithwood and Montgomery, p. 75.

and (5) constraints imposed by collective bargaining contracts.¹¹³

Seen as obstacles to improvement were: (1) insufficient administrative and managerial skills; (2) incorrect perception of principal place in the educational system; (3) shortage of knowledge about instructional techniques and theories of learning; (4) lack of leadership skills; (5) shortage of desire to bring about change; (6) unwillingness to change; and (7) inappropriate reasons for becoming a principal.¹¹⁵

¹¹³Mary Anne Johnston, "Providing for the Intellectual and Philosophical Development of Prospective Teachers," Phi Delta Kappan, January 1984, pp. 361-362; J. E. Deal and L. D. Celotti, "How Much Influence Do (And Can) Educational Administrators Have on Classrooms?," Phi Delta Kappan, July 1980, pp. 471-473; Robert J. Krajewski, "Instructional Improvement: A Co-op Venture," Kappa Delta Pi Record, February 1979, pp. 58-59; Kenneth A. Leithwood and R. A. MacDonald, "Reasons Given By Teachers for Their Curriculum Choices," Canadian Journal of Education, June 1981, pp. 111-112; Susan Moore Johnson, Teacher Unions and the Schools (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Institute for Educational Policy Study, Harvard University, 1982), pp. 3-5.

¹¹⁴Deborah Burnett Strother, "The Many Roles of the Effective Principal," Phi Delta Kappan, December 1983, p. 293; Kent D. Peterson, "The Principal's Tasks," Administrator's Notebook, December-January 1977-78, pp. 1-4.

¹¹⁵Caroline Hodgen Persell and Peter W. Cookson, Jr., "The Effective Principal in Action." Paper prepared for National Institute of Education, Washington, D.C., October 1982, pp. 13-15; Robert L. Crowson and Cynthia Porter-Gehrie, "The School Principalship: An Organizational Stability Role." Paper presented at American Educational Research Association, Boston, 1980, p. 9; John Hill and Mary Schlueter, "Some Schools Develop Future Educational Leaders," Kappa Delta Pi Record, Winter 1985, pp. 55-57; Kenneth A. Leithwood and Deborah J. Montgomery, "The Role of the Elementary Principal in Program Improvement," Review of Educational Research, Fall 1982, pp. 310-311; William L. Rutherford, Gene E. Hall and B. W. Newlove, "Describing the Concerns Principals Have About Facilitating Change." Paper presented at American Educational Research Association, New York, 1982, p. 3; Robert L. Crowson and Cynthia Porter-Gehrie, "The Discretionary Behavior of Principals in Large City Schools," Educational Administration Quarterly, Spring 1980, pp. 45-46; Israel Scheffler, "On the Education of Policymakers," Harvard Educational Review, May 1984, p. 159.

From the central level, several obstacles were evident: (1) bureaucratic structure resistant to change; (2) time-consuming and rigid policies; (3) inadequate resources, both financial and human; and (4) the typically conservative nature of school boards.¹¹⁶

Finally, the community was viewed as presenting the following obstacles: (1) lack of, or over-zealous interest by parents; (2) participation of special interest groups; (3) the largely conservative views of school programs; and (4) community expectations of the schools.¹¹⁷

According to a study by McPherson, Salley, and Baehr, one of the huge barriers for principals was time. They concluded that "the job of principal is increasingly defined in terms of administrative rather than instructional functions."¹¹⁸

¹¹⁶William L. Renfro and James L. Morrison, "Anticipating and Managing Change in Educational Organizations," Educational Leadership, September 1983, pp. 50-54; Larry Cuban, "Effective Schools: A Friendly But Cautionary Note," Phi Delta Kappan, June 1983, pp. 695-696; Allan Odden, "Financing Educational Excellence," Phi Delta Kappan, January 1984, pp. 311-318; Gerald R. Boardman and Myrna Cassel, "How Well Does the Public Know Its School Boards?," Phi Delta Kappan, June 1983, p. 740.

¹¹⁷India Podsen, "My Child Has Poor Study Habits: Academic Excellence Begins at Home," American Education, August-September 1984, pp. 30-32; Diane G. Berreth, "The Politics of Policy Making," Educational Leadership, October 1984, pp. 50-51; Keith G. Goldhammer and Gary Becker, Elementary School Principals and Their Schools (Eugene, Oregon: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, 1971), p. 32; John Keedy, "Norm Setting as a Component of Principal Effectiveness." (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1982), p. 87.

¹¹⁸R. Bruce McPherson, Columbus Salley, and Melany Baehr, "What Principals Do: Preliminary Implications of 'A National Occupational Analysis of School Principalship'," Consortium Currents, Fall 1975, pp. 1-10.

In a 1977 study of secondary principals, Byrne, Hines and McCleary, found that time was a crucial road block to efficiency. Ninety percent of the respondents listed "time taken up by administrative detail" as a significant obstacle to performance. "Lack of time" was reported by 86 percent of the respondents as a constraint. Also listed in the study were two other significant constraints. First, "inability to obtain funds" was reported by 79 percent of the respondents although it was not included in the initial 1965 study. Also, 66 percent stated that "insufficient space and physical facilities" was a significant road block to efficiency.¹¹⁹

In a study reported by Sykes, the average teacher devoted 46 hours per week to instructional duties. A majority, 59 percent, also reported spending 7 or more hours per week in extra-curricular duties. It was theorized that principals spend even more time on these duties. Perhaps the most demoralizing constraint on the principal's function was the public's impression of their role as an educator. In a 1969 study, 75 percent of the citizens responding stated they would like for their child to be a teacher. That figure dropped to 67 percent in 1972 and to 43 percent in 1983.¹²⁰

According to Byrne, Hines, and McCleary one of the major constraints encountered by the principal was collective bargaining. In

¹¹⁹David R. Byrne, Susan A. Hines, and Lloyd E. McCleary, The Senior High School Principalship (Reston, Virginia: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1978), p. 25.

¹²⁰Gary Sykes, "The Deal," The Wilson Quarterly, New Year's 1984, p. 74.

a 1977 follow-up of a 1965 study of secondary principals, Byrne, et al., found that 41 percent of the respondents viewed collective bargaining as a problem for them. This was compared to no respondents viewing collective bargaining as a problem for them in the 1965 study. More than half (59 percent) of the 1977 respondents viewed "teacher contract specifications" as a constraint to the principal. Sixteen percent viewed the contract as a major constraint while 43 percent saw the contract as a minor constraint.¹²¹

In a study by Cain, the principal illustrated an inability to "identify and establish a viable role" in collective bargaining. She illustrated that both organizational decision making and principal responsibilities had changed with extensive role conflict for the principal as the "middle-man." The study concluded that principals preferred to be on the management team in bargaining.¹²²

Sargent reported that female principals perceived less constraints than male principals on their functions in pupil services as a result of collective bargaining. Additionally, younger principals, age 45 or below, perceived more constraint in personnel supervision than did those over age 45. Secondary school principals reported constraints in personnel supervision. Finally, elementary principals

¹²¹Byrne, Hines, and McCleary, pp. 41-42.

¹²²Regina Ann Cain, "Collective Negotiation Attitudes and Principal Leadership Style," Dissertation Abstracts, 41A, 1980, pp. 862-863A.

stated that collective bargaining did not place any constraints on their roles.¹²³

According to the findings of Diederich, significant changes had occurred in the role of the principal as a result of bargaining. Within areas of responsibility, principals perceived significant changes in school program, staff personnel, management, pupil personnel, community relations, and professional development. They also viewed certain aspects of the administrative process to have changed including, planning, organization, influencing, evaluation, decision making, coordination, and communication. They perceived the changes to be primarily the result of contractual agreements. Finally, the principals believed that the changes resulted "from legislated collective negotiations" and were not the "result of the negotiations process or the environment in which negotiations occurred."¹²⁴

Abramowitz and Tenebaum reported that one of the major constraints on the principal's effectiveness was the advent of collective bargaining . The dissatisfaction arose due to the

¹²³Eugene Elmore Sargent, "The Effects of Teacher Collective Bargaining Upon the Role of Selected Elementary and Secondary Principals," Dissertation Abstracts, 40A, 1980, pp. 3368-3369A.

¹²⁴Wayne Francis Diederich, "The Effect of Collective Negotiations on Selected Areas of the Principal's Role as Perceived by Connecticut High School Principals," Dissertation Abstracts, 39A, 1978, pp. 7073-7044A.

decreased authority coupled with increasing responsibility.¹²⁵

A replication of Cooper's 1975 study showed that a growing phenomenon in public education was the unionization of principals. There was a 67 percent increase in the number of districts which bargained with principals between 1975 and 1979. In 1979, 21 states had statutes granting principals the right to negotiate.¹²⁶

Negotiated contracts left many principals with a belief that their power and influence was eroded. Obviously, the principal was in a virtual no-man's land. Without an effective voice of their own, principals were left to their own ingenuity and the graciousness of other organizations as they attempted to fulfill their professional needs. The role ambiguity led to conflict which was a major source of principal stress. The ability of the principal to deal with the constraints of collective negotiations was related to the maintenance of proper staff relations.¹²⁷

¹²⁵Susan Abramowitz and Ellen Tenebaum, High School '77: A Survey of Public Secondary School Principals (Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, 1978), pp. 18-19.

¹²⁶Bruce S. Cooper, "Collective Bargaining for School Administrators Four Years Later," Phi Delta Kappan, October 1979, pp. 130-131.

¹²⁷John Marlowe, "Why I Almost Joined a Principals' Union," The American School Board Journal, April 1980, pp. 49-50; John Ralph Pisapia and Jack D. Sells, "Administrator Protections in Negotiated Contracts," NASSP Bulletin, November 1978, p. 107; Jerry C. Knoll, "The Principal Belongs with Management in Professional Negotiations," TASCD Journal, Fall 1979, pp. 32-36; Harry E. Randles, "The Principal and Negotiated Contracts," National Elementary Principal, November-December 1975, pp. 57-61; David Stern and Kate Bagley, "How Participants in Collective Bargaining for Public School Teachers in California Perceive the Interests of Teachers in Relation to Other Groups," Journal of Collective Negotiations in the Public Sector, Spring 1981, p. 72.

Another crucial element of effective schools was a low rate of teacher turnover. In a study by Bridge, et al., the conclusion was that "teacher turnover is negatively related to both verbal and mathematics achievement." However, the cause-and-effect cycle was obvious. Teachers in a district or school of low-achieving students may well become discouraged, and the most discouraged may choose to seek positions elsewhere. Consequently, disruption caused by high turnover rate negatively influenced student achievement.¹²⁸

An important leadership responsibility of the principal was the constant renewal of the staff. Keeping faculty aware of contemporary issues affecting education could help revitalize the staff, renew their capability and decrease the likelihood of turnover.¹²⁹

¹²⁸Michael D. Lift and Douglas C. Tank, Stress, Dissatisfaction, and Intention to Leave Teaching in Experienced Public School Teachers. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada, April 1983, p. 3; R. Gary Bridge, Charles M. Judd, and Peter M. Moock, The Determinants of Educational Outcomes: The Impact of Families, Peers, Teachers, and Schools (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Ballinger Publishing Company, 1979), p. 211; Gene Hall and Susan Loucks, "Teacher Concerns as a Basis for Facilitating and Personalizing Staff Development," Teachers College Record, January 1978, pp. 46-47; D. W. Chapman and S. M. Hutcheson, "Attention from Teaching Careers: A Discriminant Analysis," American Educational Research Journal, September 1982, p. 103; Wayne C. Fredrick and Herbert J. Walberg, "Learning as a Function of Time," Journal of Educational Research, March-April 1980, pp. 199-201.

¹²⁹W. W. Charters, Jr., "The Relation of Morale to Turnover Among Teachers," American Educational Research Journal, May 1965, pp. 163-173; Linda Darling-Hammond and Arthur E. Wise, "Teaching Standards or Standardized Teaching?," Educational Leadership, October 1983, pp. 66-69;

A nationwide teacher survey indicated that the majority of teachers possess a Master's degree and average approximately 13 years of service.¹³⁰ However, according to Schlechty and Vance fewer of the academically able young teachers were continuing in the teaching profession.¹³¹

Levin found that experienced teachers were generally more effective than novice teachers.¹³² In a study of effective schools the Rand Corporation reported that teachers with five or more years of experience in a specific school was one characteristic of an unusually effective school.¹³³

IV. TRAINING AND CERTIFICATION

Principals combat complex obstacles in training to become effective school leaders.¹³⁴ Culbertson and Thompson stated that effective managers are not taught through a formal education program the concepts needed to be successful in management.¹³⁵ Further

¹³⁰Nationwide Teacher Opinion Poll, 1983 (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1983), p. 6.

¹³¹Phillip C. Schlechty and Victor S. Vance, "Do Academically Able Teachers Leave Education? The North Carolina Case," Phi Delta Kappan, March 1981, pp. 106-112.

¹³²H. M. Levin, "How Important is Teacher Experience?," Integrated Education, May 1971, pp. 25-26.

¹³³A Statistical Search for Unusually Effective Schools (Santa Monica, California: Rand Corporation, 1973), p. 127.

¹³⁴Joseph C. Fields, "Principals and Management Training Needs," NASSP Bulletin, February 1982, p. 37.

¹³⁵Katherine Culbertson and Mark Thompson, "An Analysis of Supervisory Training Needs," Training and Development Journal, February 1980, p. 58.

Livingston concluded: "In fact, the tasks that are more important in getting results usually are left to be learned on the job, where few managers ever master them simply because no one teaches them."¹³⁶

According to research by Fields,¹³⁷ principals "must rely upon the training received from universities, professional associations, and on-the-job experience" for assistance in management methods.¹³⁷

Historically, school organization has not changed rapidly. However, schools could change and be run efficiently and managed effectively--if the principal was well trained as a skillful manager.¹³⁸

Anthony suggested that the management of educational organizations was mediocre and might never change. He believed that schools "are absent of the profit measure, absent of competition, are political, have weak governing boards, strong tradition, and low management salaries. Anthony's conclusion, that improvement was directly related to the quality of management, has obvious implications for the training of principals."¹³⁹

¹³⁶J. Sterling Livingston, "Myth of the Well Educated Manager," Harvard Business Review, January-February 1971, pp. 76-77.

¹³⁷Fields, p. 39.

¹³⁸Caroline Hodges Persell and Peter W. Cookson, Jr., "The Effective Principal In Action," in The Effective Principal (Reston, Virginia: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1982), pp. 24-25.

¹³⁹Robert N. Anthony, "Can Non-Profit Organizations Be Well Managed?" in Managing Non-Profit Organizations, edited by Diane Borst and Patrick J. Montana (New York: Amacom, 1977), p. 8.

In research conducted by Bellon and Bellon, they concluded that all unsuccessful school programs listed administrators' lack of preparation as a major constraint on program success.¹⁴⁰

Antley found that effective decision making correlated highly with operational knowledge of the principalship. Her findings had implications for the pre-service and in-service training of administrators.¹⁴¹

Pharis stated that the emphasis of educational training should shift from trainers to the learner. He pointed out that most educational training had a tendency to predetermine content. This idea was based on the assumption that principals did not have the ability to design their own training programs. He concluded that the prevalent emphasis on course "content" and impersonal relationship in training served to ignore the purpose of training--the needs of the principal as a learner.¹⁴²

March was convinced that "insofar as education is failing, the educational administrator is subject to indictment." He concluded that:

¹⁴⁰Elner C. Bellon and Jerry J. Bellon, "Merit Pay and Other Incentive Programs: Characteristics, Considerations, and Expectations," Tennessee Educational Leadership, Fall 1983, p. 75.

¹⁴¹Elizabeth Martin Antley, "Creativity in Educational Administration," Journal of Experimental Education, Summer 1966, pp. 21-27.

¹⁴²William L. Pharis, "Nine False Assumptions: A Critical View of Preparation Programs," The National Elementary Principal, July-August 1974, pp. 26-28.

If we develop techniques and training that will improve the capabilities of educational administration to deal with experts, solve problems in the absence of goals, to treat data from a decision perspective, to manage conflict and coalition, and to allocate time, it will be an impressive set of contributions¹⁴³ appropriate . . . to the training of principals.

Gallo presented a convincing argument for in-service programs to meet the practical needs of principals. He advocated the formulation of "guidelines for in-service education of career administrators" to come to grips with the realities of education.¹⁴⁴

Brainard outlined a Kettering Foundation program for individualizing in-service education. The program was based on the belief that learning styles, needs, and learning rates for administrators are unique to the individual.¹⁴⁵

In research reported by Brown, there was little relationship between either teaching, experience, or academic training and the skills required to be a principal. He theorized that due to the poor preparation of administrators, in-service education was critical. School districts, universities, and state departments of education had all sponsored in-service programs but none had created effective

¹⁴³James G. March, "Analytical Skills and the University Training of Educational Administrators," Education and Urban Society, August 1974, p. 382.

¹⁴⁴Vincent A. Gallo, Should We Abolish or Retain the Principalship? (Eugene, Oregon: Oregon School Study Council, College of Education, 1970), pp. 2-9, ED 081 076.

¹⁴⁵Edward Brainard, "Individualizing Administrator In-service Education," Thrust for Educational Leadership, April 1973, pp. 29-33.

programs. He suggested the creation of a new institution for administrator in-service training.¹⁴⁶

A natural outgrowth of Brown's research was the academy concept currently used in several states, including Tennessee. The Tennessee Academy for School Leaders' first session was July 1984. The Academy's purpose was to "promote the belief that the educational leader is first and foremost an instructional leader." To accomplish that purpose the Academy was required to "help develop and reinforce competencies in leaders that contribute to educational effectiveness."¹⁴⁷

Another related concept was the development of principal assessment centers. The assessment center was designed to assist "new administrators to improve administrative and interpersonal skills." A major reason for using assessment centers was research which provided no convincing evidence that teaching performance was related to effective administrative performance. A three-year validity project reported that the assessment center "experiences were valid predictions

¹⁴⁶Charles E. Brown, "The Principal as Learner," The National Elementary Principal, July-August 1974, pp. 19-29.

¹⁴⁷Charles Carrick, Tennessee Academy for School Leaders: An Overview (Nashville, Tennessee: State Department of Education, 1984), p. 3.

of job success for administrative personnel."¹⁴⁸ However, according to the project's founder, Paul Hersey, the assessment center was designed to accomplish three purposes: (1) use as a counseling tool for potential principals; (2) use in university preparation programs; and (3) use as a "reservior" for prospective principals.¹⁴⁹ The concept was important because of the potential for "significantly modifying and strengthening administrative development" of principals throughout the country. It provided a common base for individual and collective growth of principals.¹⁵⁰

In a survey of principals, Walters found that principals believed that most administrative "competencies were perceived to be acquired primarily on the job." Although principals reported that most skills were acquired on the job, they believed that preparation programs were of "some assistance."¹⁵¹ Latham and Saari reported

¹⁴⁸"The 'Spy Principle' Works for Selecting Principals," Education USA, March 24, 1982, pp. 245-246; NASSPS' Assessment Center: A New Step," NASSP Newsleader, November 1982, p. 1; Charles Jaffee, James Bender, and O. L. Calvert, "The Assessment Center Technique: A Validation Study," Management of Personnel Quarterly, Fall 1970, pp. 9-14; E. M. Bridges and M. E. Baehr, "The Future of Administrator Selection Procedures," Administrator's Notebook, May 1971, pp. 1-4; Dennis Tesolowski and Thomas E. Morgan, "Selecting Educational Administrators: The Assessment Center Technique," NASSP Bulletin, February 1980, pp. 107-115.

¹⁴⁹Paul W. Hersey, "The NASSP Assessment Center Develops Leadership Talent," Principal, February 1982, pp. 370-371.

¹⁵⁰Marie E. Kelley, "Same Faces, New Skills," Principal, February 1982, pp. 372-373.

¹⁵¹Donald L. Walters, Perceptions of Administrative Competencies, A Survey of School Principals and Superintendents, 1979, p. 37, ED 172 361.

that although preparation programs may be helpful, leadership training programs rarely showed long-term behavior change.¹⁵²

McCabe and Compton reported a survey of principals who perceived university preparation programs to be deficient and ineffective. They also believed that administrative roles could be more effectively learned by informal means rather than formal means. Four informal means were identified by the authors: (1) learning from or modeling the behavior of superordinates; (2) obtaining administrator certification; (3) on-the-job training; and (4) the performance of simple administrative duties.¹⁵³

Another technique for the training of administrators was the intern programs.¹⁵⁴ Dobb reported a survey of over 1,000 school districts which indicated that approximately two-thirds preferred to hire principals who had completed an internship program.¹⁵⁵

Higley suggested that principals generally agree on the need for in-service training but disagree on the means of implementation.

¹⁵²Gregory P. Latham and L. M. Saar: "Application of Social-Learning Theory to Training Supervisors Through Behavior Modeling," Journal of Applied Psychology, May 1979, pp. 239-246.

¹⁵³Dennis P. McCabe and Jack Compton, Role Acquisition and Competency Development of Educational Administrators in the Lower Rio Grande Valley, 1974, pp. 22-75, ED 130 383.

¹⁵⁴Leland D. Melvin, "Preparing Future Principals," NASSP Bulletin, December 1977, pp. 54-58.

¹⁵⁵Heather S. Doob, Internship Programs in Educational Administration (Washington, D.C.: Educational Research Service, 1974), pp. 20-28, ED 098 706.

In reviewing the literature, Higley found that most of the institutions providing in-service were inflexible. University administration departments tended to believe that the traditional course content was sufficient training. However, most principals thought such programs destroyed leadership potential.¹⁵⁶ Mayer found that universities had largely neglected the leadership training and human relations training so urgently needed by principals.¹⁵⁷

Finally, some researchers contend that in-service for principals should include the entire teaching staff. According to Brimm and Tollett, principals and teachers believed that in-service was more effective when the entire school staff was "simultaneously engaged in a given activity."¹⁵⁸ Wayson purposed an in-service program for principals and teachers in local schools.¹⁵⁹ Goodlad maintained that the inter-relationships within the school was critical to student learning. His theoretical base was that the target for improvement should be the school, not the individual principal, rather the principal and

¹⁵⁶ Jerry Higley, Inservice Training for Staff and Administrators (Arlington, Virginia: National Association of Elementary School Principals, 1972), pp. 28-32.

¹⁵⁷ Laurence T. Mayher, "Administrator Unions: Do They Strengthen or Weaken the Principalship?," NASSP Bulletin, January 1984, p. 40.

¹⁵⁸ Jack L. Brimm and Daniel J. Tollett, In-Service Education in Tennessee (Nashville, Tennessee: Tennessee School Board Association, 1974), p. 28

¹⁵⁹ William W. Wayson, "A Proposal to Remake the Principalship," The National Elementary Principal, September-October 1974, pp. 28-44.

the teachers.¹⁶⁰ Caldwell and Wood stated that school needs had to be translated into individual needs, not the reverse.¹⁶¹

Lachance summarized much of the literature: "Preparation for the principalship remains by and large haphazard." Further, he stated that most preparation programs were "unimpressive and impractical."¹⁶²

If principals were asked to participate in pre-service and in-service training in addition to initial preparation programs, how would the results be evaluated? According to Barraclough, principals "have always been evaluated in one way or another." In his analysis of research, Barraclough summarized two approaches to principal evaluation. One, which he classified as the "performance standards approach," evaluated the principal against a predetermined set of standards. The other approach, "job targets," evaluated the principal against performance objectives specific to the individual principal. Barraclough maintained that the "job targets" method was superior, although more time consuming. He concluded that regardless of the method used, evaluation should be used to improve principal performance.¹⁶³

¹⁶⁰John I. Goodlad, "Staff Development: The League Model," Theory Into Practice, October 1972, pp. 207-214.

¹⁶¹Sara D. Caldwell and F. H. Wood, "Inservice Readiness: Do We Have the Cart Before the Horse?," The Developer, June 1981, p. 211.

¹⁶²Roger Lachance, A Nation, p. 47.

¹⁶³Terry Barraclough, Evaluation of School Administrators (Eugene, Oregon: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, University of Oregon, 1974), pp. 2-3, ED 094 448.

Genck and Klingenberg advocated use of a principal job description to make evaluation beneficial.¹⁶⁴ Arikado and Musella stated that the description should contain specific "responsibilities and competencies" for the principal. Next, a list of objectives were determined by the principal in conjunction with the superordinates. After the objectives were identified, the principal was evaluated on the basis of successful implementation of the objectives.¹⁶⁵

Campbell listed five administrative functions that could be evaluated. He stated that the functions of definition of goals, instructional programs, allocation of staff, use of resources and teacher evaluation could be defined and evaluated in behavioral terms.¹⁶⁶ Grant reported that in-service training and programs were the two lowest rated areas of principal performance.¹⁶⁷

Gaslin reported a system using teachers for principal evaluation. He stated that the method of formative evaluation was more beneficial to principals than the summative evaluation models. Gaslin's

¹⁶⁴Frederic H. Genck and Allen J. Klingenberg, The School Board's Responsibility: Effective Schools Through Effective Management (Springfield, Illinois: Illinois Association of School Boards, 1978), p. 65.

¹⁶⁵Marjorie Arikado and Donald Musella, "Toward An Objective Evaluation of the School Principal," OCLEA, January 1975, pp. 13-15, ED 110 937.

¹⁶⁶Roald E. Campbell, "The Evaluation of Administrative Performance." Paper presented at the annual convention of the American Association of School Administrators, Atlantic City, February 1971, pp. 7-10, ED 050 452.

¹⁶⁷Ed A. Grant, "Priority-Performance Congruency in Eight Areas of Key Instructional Responsibilities of Senior High School Principals." (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Texas at Austin, 1978), pp. 132-133.

evaluation instruments were open-ended questions which allowed verbalization of specific concerns.¹⁶⁸

Pharis condemned the checklist form of principal evaluation. He contended that the checklist method emphasized past performance and did not encourage principal improvement. His means of evaluation, similar to a discrepancy model, would be "a comparison of what was expected to happen with what did happen."¹⁶⁹

Redfern stated that the improvement of principal leadership performance was the major goal of systematic evaluation. He acknowledged that principal leadership was difficult to evaluate. The productivity of principals could not be easily measured in quantifiable terms, because ". . . productivity of the principalship is not . . . concrete." He advocated evaluation by performance objectives rather than by "predetermined performance standards."¹⁷⁰

V. DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

Early in the 1980's pressures for equity, for increasing opportunities for women and minorities, had become firmly entrenched.

¹⁶⁸William L. Gaslin, "Evaluation of Administrative Performance by a School's Teaching Staff," NASSP Bulletin, December 1974, pp. 72-81.

¹⁶⁹William L. Pharis, "The Evaluation of School Principals," The National Elementary Principal, February 1973, pp. 36-38.

¹⁷⁰George B. Redfern, "Principals: Who's Evaluating Them, Why, and How?." Paper presented at the annual convention of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, Anaheim, California, March 1972, pp. 6-7, ED 062 693.

Almost half of the principals employed at the time were 55 to 65 years of age. It was expected that these would subsequently retire in the next decade.¹⁷¹ In the 1977 NASSP study, the average principal was approximately 45 years of age.¹⁷² In a study of female principals, Fancher and Buxton found that the majority were age 40-60. No female principals were age 27 or younger. Only 2 percent were 32 or younger and 8 percent were 37 or younger.¹⁷³ Few attained the principalship younger than age 40. In 1973, women represented 50 percent of the high school faculty but only three percent of the principals were women.¹⁷⁴ From 1971 to 1976 the percentage of female principals declined from 15.2 percent to 11.9 percent.¹⁷⁵

In 1979, 83 percent of the nation's elementary teachers were female. At the secondary level, 47 percent were female. However, they only accounted for 12 percent of the public school principals.

¹⁷¹D. Catherine Baltzell and Robert A. Dentler, Selecting American School Principals: A Sourcebook for Educators (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1983), p. 1.

¹⁷²Byrne, Hines and McCleary, p. 32.

¹⁷³Ted A. Fancher and Thomas H. Buxton, "A Job Satisfaction Profile of the Female Secondary School Principal in the United States," NASSP Bulletin, January 1984, pp. 32-39.

¹⁷⁴Twenty-sixth Biennial Salary and Staff Survey of Public School Professional Personnel, 1972-3 (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1973).

¹⁷⁵Martha Harder and Karen Wade, "Superintendents View Women as Capable School Managers. However . . ." Tennessee Educational Leadership, Fall 1984, p. 90.

At the elementary level, 20 percent of all principals were women, while less than 4 percent of the secondary principals were women.¹⁷⁶

Paddock stated that women in the principalship were significantly older than men in that role. Her study further suggested that women made a late decision to seek the principalship.¹⁷⁷

Although women made a later decision to enter the principalship, they were interested in the position. According to Williams and Baugham, 30 to 50 percent of surveyed female teachers expressed an interest in becoming a principal.¹⁷⁸ Fauth believed that entry level criteria for the principal should be established which did not exclude women.¹⁷⁹ However, Fancher and Buxton found that 57 percent of female principals were "sought after" for the principalship. The same percent (57 percent) were married.¹⁸⁰

¹⁷⁶Statistics of Public Elementary and Second School Systems (Fall 1979) (Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics, United States Department of Education, 1980), p. 19.

¹⁷⁷Susan Paddock, "Women's Career in Administration," Dissertation Abstract International, 38, 178, 1978, p. 5834A.

¹⁷⁸Patricia Williams, "Career Aspirations of Selected Women Teachers as Related to Their Perceptions of the Chances of Success in Becoming a School Administrator," Dissertation Abstracts International, 38, 1977, p. 6420A.

¹⁷⁹Gloria C. Fauth, "Women in Educational Administration: A Research Profile," The Educational Forum, Fall 1984, p. 74.

¹⁸⁰Fancher and Buxton, p. 35.

In the NASSP study over 75 percent of the respondents were married but only 32 of 1,131 respondents (2.8 percent) were black. A majority of those were male. Typically, the black principal was older; 60 percent were 40-49 years of age.¹⁸¹

Moonlighting appeared to be an area in need of study. In a study reported by Wisniewski and Kleine, "moonlighting was predominant among Oklahoma teachers."¹⁸²

V. BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

The occasional reassessments of America's educational system typically have left constructive developments.¹⁸³ History has yet to record the results concerning the 1980's educational reform acts. However, with the passage of the Comprehensive Educational Reform Act of 1984, Tennessee was in the vanguard of educational thought and reform. Foremost in the reform legislation was the concepts of merit pay and a career ladder program for teachers and principals.

¹⁸¹Byrne, Hines and McCleary, "The Senior High," p. 34.

¹⁸²Richard Wiesniewski and Paul Kleine, "Teacher Moonlighting: A Unstudied Phenomenon," Phi Delta Kappan, April 1984, pp. 553-55.

¹⁸³Fred H. Wood, Gil Johnson and Jon Paden, "Will This New Round of Recommendations for High Schools Make a Difference?," Educational Leadership, March 1984, p. 69.

A common definition of merit pay stated that it was a "monetary compensation plan" which provided salaries for similar jobs based on the "quality of their work performance."¹⁸⁴ The assumptions inferred by merit pay are that it: (1) rewards for past performance; (2) acts as motivation for improvement; and (3) serves as an incentive to stay in teaching.¹⁸⁵

The merit pay concept was based on the factory or labor model. However, industry has not been totally devoted to the concept, as reported by Meyer:

. . . People do not work just for money. Many people work much harder on their vocational pursuits than they do on their jobs . . . if we held the interest and challenge of work constant, highly paid persons would not put out any more effort than those who are less well paid. Within the laboring classes there seems to be almost an inverse relationship between pay and effort. When pay becomes the important goal, the individual's interest tends to focus on that goal rather than on the performance of the task itself.¹⁸⁶

¹⁸⁴Daphne White, "Can Merit Pay Work in Education?," Educational Educator, Winter 1983, p. 8.

¹⁸⁵Wilbur B. Brookover, Laurence Beamer, Helen Efthim, Douglas Hathaway, Lawrence Lezotte, Stephen Miller, Joseph Passalacqua, and Louis Tornatzky, Creating Effective Schools (Holmes Beach, Florida: Learning Publications, 1982), pp. 80-81; Linda Darling-Hammond and Arthur E. Wise, "Teaching Standards or Standardized Teaching," Educational Leadership, October 1983, pp. 66-68; Fenwick W. English, "Still Searching for Excellence," Educational Leadership, December 1984-January 1985, pp. 34-35.

¹⁸⁶Herbert H. Meyer, "The Pay-for-Performance Dilemma," Organizational Dynamics, Winter 1975, pp. 40-41.

Belcher reported:

. . . People with low perceptions of their ability to control their environment are less likely to hold expectancies of effort-performance-reward relationships even in the face of reality

He concluded that typically organizations added increases to current salary and the question became, was the difference worth the effort?¹⁸⁷ Merit pay was conceived as essentially one dimensional, while excellence in human behavior is multi dimensional. Therefore, pay-for-performance is a difficult and complex task.¹⁸⁸

Merit pay was not found to increase the motivation of teachers. As demonstrated by Lortie, educators draw their motivation from intrinsic rewards. Education was perceived as being barren of significant extrinsic rewards such as money, prestige and power. The primary reward was a sense of impact on students.¹⁸⁹ Sergiovanni reported similar results in a New York study. A sense of accomplishment was the teacher's greatest motivation. He also found

¹⁸⁷David W. Belcher, "Pay for Performance," Compensation Review, Third Quarter 1980, pp. 16-17.

¹⁸⁸White, p. 11; Thomas J. Sergiovanni, "Leadership and Excellence in schooling," Educational Leadership, February 1984, p. 4.

¹⁸⁹Don C. Lortie, "The Balance of Control and Autonomy in Elementary School Teaching, in The Semi-Professors and Their Organization: Teachers, Nurses, Social Workers, edited by Amitai Etzioni (New York: The Free Press, 1969), pp. 51-53.

that recognition and responsibility were important contributors to motivation.¹⁹⁰

Deci took the argument a step further and stated that merit pay programs were more harmful than beneficial. The internal motivation was shifted from the job to the rewards, thereby subverting self-satisfaction, and became the reason for the activity. Theoretically, the worker viewed the rewards as more important than the work and sought ways to obtain the reward with the least effort.¹⁹¹

Meyer added that almost all employees perceive themselves to be above-average performers. He speculated that when they failed to receive expected merit pay increases, they became frustrated.¹⁹²

Numerous studies have reported the merit pay dilemma. The Merit Pay Task Force of the U.S. House of Representatives approved of the concept but suggested more study.¹⁹³ The U. S. House of Representatives Republican Research Committee called for a "merit pay system."¹⁹⁴ Schrag suggested that merit pay provided incentive for

¹⁹⁰Thomas J. Sergiovanni, "Factors Which Affect Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of Teachers," The Journal of Educational Administration, May 1967, pp. 80-82.

¹⁹¹Edward L. Deci, "The Hidden Cost of Rewards," Organizational Dynamics, Winter 1976, pp 61-62.

¹⁹²Meyer, p. 45.

¹⁹³U. S. House of Representatives, Merit Pay Task Force Report (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1974), pp. 6-7.

¹⁹⁴Jerry Lewis, Ideas for Tomorrow, Choices for Today (Washington, D.C.: House Republican Research Committee, 1985), p. 19.

good teachers.¹⁹⁵ Even, Frymier (an educator) compared public schools to the differentiated scale used in universities and declared that merit pay was workable.¹⁹⁶ However, most merit pay systems have proven unsuccessful.¹⁹⁷

In research reported by Albrecht, principals were not enthusiastic in their support of merit pay. Only 53 percent of the respondents believed in the use of merit pay, while 26.7 percent were opposed to its use. In the southeast 29.5 percent of the principals opposed merit pay. Principals of the smallest schools were more concerned (32.4 percent opposed, with 46.1 percent favoring) than the average. The largest schools were most supportive (13 percent opposed, with 52.5 percent favoring).¹⁹⁸

English, reporting the findings of a recent study, indicated that merit pay alone: (1) would not enable schools to solve all their current problems; (2) had not proven successful in the private sector; (3) had demonstrated factors of inefficiency and had been self-defeating; and (4) given the goals of motivation and recognition of

¹⁹⁵Francis Schrag, "It's Time for Merit Pay," Learning, March 1985, p. 28.

¹⁹⁶Jack Frymier, "Merit Pay-Yes! Vouchers-No!," Educational Forum, Fall 1981, p. 6.

¹⁹⁷Richard Doremus, "What Ever Happened to . . . Kalamazoo's Merit Pay Plan?," Phi Delta Kappan, February 1982, p. 409.

¹⁹⁸James E. Albrecht, A National Study of Principals' Attitudes Toward School Improvement Recommendations (Cedar Falls, Iowa: University of Northern Iowa, 1985), p. 17.

educational talent, merit pay represented a "simplistic popular approach to a very complex problem."¹⁹⁹

Due to low salaries and lack of prestige associated with teaching, many educators have left the field. As bureaucratization took hold in American Schools, teacher salaries slipped from 49 percent of educational expenditures in 1972 to only 38 percent in 1982. Furthermore, as fewer of the educational dollars were spent on teachers, fewer dollars were also spent on education. Public elementary and secondary education expenditures dropped from 5.5 percent of personal income in 1972 to 4.6 percent in 1982. The major inducement for seeking unionization and collective bargaining revolved around the desire for increased benefits, particularly salary. Numerous state legislatures enacted compulsory collective bargaining legislation believing that it would insure "meritorious compensation for outstanding teachers." Typically, however, the benefits never occurred. Monetary compensation has not increased significantly during the tenure of collective bargaining agreements. Schools systems and state legislatures perceived a need to make salaries more competitive. Some politicians had also

¹⁹⁹Fenwick W. English, Incentives for Excellence in America's Schools (Alexandria, Virginia: American Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1985), p. 24.

indicated support for new taxes to make salaries more competitive with business and industry.²⁰⁰

If merit pay was designed to reward excellence, career ladders were developed to provide opportunities for teacher growth. The Tennessee career ladder concept was funded through the Comprehensive Education Reform Act (CERA) and contained five steps for teachers and three for principals, assistant principals, and supervisors.²⁰¹ However, the educational landscape has been strewn with the bones of previous career ladder plans, back to differentiated staffing in the 1960's. Like the earlier models, many of the current career ladder

²⁰⁰Linda Darling-Hammond, Beyond the Commission Reports: The Coming Crisis in Teaching (Santa Monica, California: The Rand Corporation, 1984), p. 7; C. Emily Feistritzer, The Condition of Teaching: A State by State Analysis (New York: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1983), p. 50; Susan J. Rosenholtz and Mark A. Smylie, Teacher Compensation and Career Ladders: Policy Implications from Research. Paper Commissioned by the Tennessee General Assembly's Select Committee on Education, December 1983, pp. 18-19; Feistritzer, p. 52; Harold Kasper, "The Effects of Collective Bargaining on Public School Teachers' Salaries," Industrial and Labor Relations Review, October 1970, pp. 57-58; The Effect of Collective Bargaining on Teacher Salaries (Vienna, Virginia: Public Service Research Council, 1982), p. 14; D. C. Zuelke and L. E. Frohreich, "The Impact of Comprehensive Collective Negotiations on Teachers' Salaries: Some Evidence from Wisconsin," Journal of Collective Negotiations in the Public Sector, Spring 1977, pp. 87-88; Richard Wynn, "The Relationship of Collective Bargaining and Teacher Salaries, 1960 to 1980," Phi Delta Kappan, December 1981, p. 242.

²⁰¹John Parish, "Excellence in Education: Tennessee's 'Master' Plan," Phi Delta Kappan, June 1983, pp. 772-724; Russell L. French, "Dispelling the Myths About Tennessee's Career Ladder Program," Educational Leadership, December 1984-January 1985, pp. 9-13.

models were legislated. They were "top-down models with little input from teaching professionals."²⁰²

The top down, mandated, state-wide reform expanded the bureaucracy of school management. At a time when industry was dismantling its top-down structure, schools were forced into greater centralization.²⁰³ Prash concluded; "policy makers determined to protect the freedom and autonomy of building administrators must start with a mind set that states policy in brief, general terms."²⁰⁴

Recent reform initiatives came largely from state governments: governors and state legislatures led the current wave of reform efforts. Governors were conspicuous by their presence, in contrast to their absence in the 1950's and 1960's. Of all the reforms, the growth of state authority was the most significant. The predominant thought in the 1950's was for power imbedded in local school boards. The 1960's ushered in a period of federal involvement which has dramatically declined. But the trend of the 1980's was toward an influential and powerful state government. Legally, states have constitutional responsibility for education.²⁰⁵

²⁰²H. Jerome Friedberg, "Master Teacher Programs: Lessons from the Past," Educational Leadership, December 1984-January 1985, pp. 16-21.

²⁰³John C. Prash, "Reversing the Trend Toward Centralization," Educational Leadership, October 1984, p. 27; David K. Hurst, "Of Boxes, Bubbles, and Effective Management," Harvard Business Review, May-June 1984, p. 482.

²⁰⁴Prash, p. 27.

²⁰⁵Rod Chandler, "Upgrading a School System with Fair State Funding," American Education, August-September 1984, pp. 27-28.

A review of educational reform history demonstrates that "systematic interventions in schools are not always successful either in form or outcome." Some researchers have stated that "structural and procedural characteristics of schools . . . militate against this sort of top-down change."²⁰⁶

When change is mandated from top-down, the changes are usually made; but token compliance typically over-shadows fundamental changes. Research studies illustrate that schools perform the top-down directness "but seldom move beyond simple compliance unless . . . internally motivated." According to Cuban, local school improvement plans are more effective than "the heavy-handed, top-down approach."²⁰⁷

Kirst stated that the top-down change caused a "major change in the relationship of the states to schools. He speculated that "state mandates" were "more common than technical assistance."²⁰⁸

Ironically, technical assistance has been unpopular with many current state legislatures. Legislators do not understand the need for technical assistance "to support local change efforts."²⁰⁹ Statewide

²⁰⁶Steward C. Purkey and Marshall S. Smith, "Too Soon to Cheer? Synthesis of Research on Effective Schools," Educational Leadership, December 1982, p. 67.

²⁰⁷Larry Cuban, "School Reform by Remote Control: SB 813 in California," Phi Delta Kappan, November 1984, p. 214.

²⁰⁸Michael W. Kirst, "The Changing Balance in State and Local Power to Control Education," Phi Delta Kappan, November 1984, pp. 189-190.

²⁰⁹Karen Louis and Ronald Corwin, "Organizational Decline: How State Agencies React," Educational and Urban Society, February 1984, p. 180.

technical assistance in New York allowed state department representatives to work with local schools enabling a tie between school-based reforms and statewide goals and objectives.²¹⁰

Local boards of education have the authority and responsibility for operating school systems, but schools cannot be run from the top down. The viabilities and effectiveness of a school system is directly related to the proportion of decision making allowed principals and teachers.²¹¹ Keppel reported that "local decision making" was the most critical element in educational policy. Regardless of the "centralizing effect" of reforms accountability, federal involvement, and equal opportunity programs, the local school was still responsible for delivering educational services to students.²¹²

Mitchell and Encarnation postulated seven methods that states use to control educational policy: (1) structural organization; (2) generation of revenue; (3) allocation of resources; (4) definition of the instructional program; (5) certification of personnel; (6) assessment of school progress; and, (7) curriculum development.²¹³

²¹⁰Gordon M. Ambach, "State and Local Action for Education in New York," Phi Delta Kappan, November 1984, p. 204.

²¹¹Willard R. Lane, "Authority and Responsibility--A Need to Reshuffle the Deck," The Executive Review, March 1983, p. 7.

²¹²Francis Keppel, "Social Context of Educational Policy," Journal of Education Finance, Summer 1977, p. 5.

²¹³Douglas Mitchell and Dennis Encarnation, "State Policy Mechanisms for Influencing School Performance," Educational Researcher, May 1984, pp. 4-11.

Most of the topics were covered by current reforms, especially teacher education and certification. A major problem of the reforms existed as state standards were perceived as "ends rather than means."²¹⁴

The voice not heard in educational reform has been the principal. "Indeed, their opinions have seldom been sought." Little was done to involve those in the best position to offer advice.²¹⁵ However, by not "acting" in ways to formulate and articulate reforms, principals have invited "intrusion from the outside."²¹⁶ Kirst stated that states were playing a large role in reform due to lack of initiative at the local level and from professional organizations.²¹⁷

English concluded that principals were the group in the "middle." They were expected to develop policies from the central level and yet implement all the reforms within the school.²¹⁸ Where did this leave principals? According to Barth:

²¹⁴Henderick D. Gideonse, "State Education Policy in Transition: Teacher Education," Phi Delta Kappan, November 1984, p. 205; Cross, p. 172.

²¹⁵James E. Albrecht, "How Do Principals View School Improvement Recommendations," NASSP Bulletin, December 1984, p. 99.

²¹⁶Ronald S. Barth, "Can We Make a Match of Schools and Universities," Educational Week, November 28, 1984, p. 24.

²¹⁷Kirst, p. 191.

²¹⁸Fenwick W. English, Samuel Francis, and James Schmunk, "The Dilemma of Being in the Middle: A Contemporary View of the Principalship," NASSP Bulletin, February 1962, pp. 96-100.

It's unthinkable that any other profession undergoing close scrutiny by so many would find description and analysis of practice, and prescription for improving practice, coming only from outsiders looking in. Where are the voices of insiders looking in?²¹⁹

VI. GEORGIA

This section is a synthesis of data presented for comparison with the companion study of principals in Georgia. The entire review was abstracted from The Principal: A Crucial Element in Quality Education.²²⁰

In Georgia the typical public school principal was white (82.8 percent), male (83 percent), married (89.7 percent), and 46.24 years of age. Typically the elementary principal was older (46.82 years of age) than the high school principal (45.97 years of age) or the middle school principal (44.54 years of age).

Also, 23.2 percent of the elementary principals were female, while 76.8 percent were male. At the middle level 12.75 percent were female, while 87.25 were male. Only 2.75 percent females were high school principals. Males numbered 97.25 percent in high school principalship.

Black principals numbered 17.2 percent, with the greatest number of black principals at the middle school level (28.2 percent).

²¹⁹Roland S. Barth, "Outside Looking In-Inside Looking In," Principal's Center Newsletter, Fall, 1984, p.3.

²²⁰The Principal:, pp. 20-41.

Only 10.1 percent of the high school principals were black, while 17 percent of the elementary principals were black.

Of the Georgia principals 22.6 percent represented schools in an urban environment; 31.8 percent were from a rural-farming section; and 28.8 percent represented a rural-non-farming area. The respondents were also equally divided within the five geographic regions of the state.

Regarding school size, the Georgia study divided the schools according to the quartile method. The smallest size, 30-350 students, was reported by 23.8 percent of the respondents. The next larger size, 360-500 students, was reported by 25.4 percent of the principals. Schools with a student population of 510-740 were the next size representing 25.6 percent of the respondents. The largest size, 750-2,250 was reported by 25.2 percent of the principals.

The largest percentage of teachers in Georgia schools had between 10 and 14 years of service, representing 43.6 percent. Similarly, 33.9 percent had 5 to 9 years service at a particular school. Only 19.3 percent had 15 or more years of service, and 3.2 percent had less than 5 years experience.

The primary reason listed for becoming a principal was the desire to be in a leadership position (28.5 percent). Other primary reasons were salary (22.2 percent), desire to improve the academic performance of students (21.1 percent), encouragement of others (11.7 percent), and desire to make educational improvements for teachers (9.3

Georgia principals worked an average of 53 hours at school per week and earned an average of \$31,450.00 per year. High school principals typically received the highest salary regardless of location, while principals in the urban and suburban schools reported larger salaries than those in rural areas. Salary was positively correlated to school size.

Principals averaged 7.06 years at their present school. Approximately one-fifth of the principals (18.7 percent) also reported a second job. Approximately 60 percent of the principals held a master's degree, 34 percent a specialist degree, and 6.9 percent had a doctorate.

Most principals completed the requirements for certification before becoming a principal--83.3 percent of high school, 82.5 of middle and 72.6 percent of elementary school principals. Almost one-fourth of the principals held life certificates (23.6 percent). Of those who did have to renew their certificates, 61.6 percent used college courses and 19 percent used local staff development or inservice. Principals also reported that they were mostly or entirely satisfied (72.3 percent) with certification standards. Only 9.1 percent were mostly or entirely dissatisfied.

Most of the Georgia principals were entirely or mostly satisfied (52.9 percent) with the quality of in-service. However, over one-fourth (28.4 percent) were equally satisfied and dissatisfied.

Only 13.1 percent were mostly or entirely dissatisfied while 5.6 percent expressed no opinion.

Principals reported obvious differences between their perceived roles and their ideal roles. Thirty-one percent of the respondents saw their most important current role as instructional leader. However, 54.2 percent believed this to be their ideal role. Similarly, 25.6 percent perceived their current role to be school manager while only 9.4 percent thought this should be their ideal role.

When questioned about the effectiveness of their undergraduate preparation, graduate preparation, and in-service programs, Georgia principals rated graduate preparation as very helpful (46 percent), or somewhat helpful (42 percent). In-service programs were rated next most effective with 44 percent ranking it as very helpful and 50 percent somewhat helpful, while 20 percent ranked it as not helpful. Only 14 percent of the respondents rated their undergraduate preparation very helpful, while 43 percent rated it somewhat helpful and a like number (43 percent) rated it as not helpful.

The major constraints faced by Georgia principals were "state and federal laws and regulations, budgetary restrictions, community apathy, and lack of parental involvement." Only a minor percentage (12.4 percent) reported they had no major constraints.

Over 40 percent of the respondents were either informally evaluated or not evaluated at all. However, over 55 percent reported that they were formally evaluated.

Principals reported that they were mostly or entirely satisfied (71.1 percent) with public education in Georgia. Approximately one-fourth (24.1 percent) were equally satisfied and dissatisfied with the quality of education in Georgia.

Almost all principals were entirely (18.1 percent) or mostly (72.0 percent) satisfied with their overall job performance as principal. Slightly over 9 percent were equally satisfied and dissatisfied and only 0.50 were mostly dissatisfied with their overall job performance.

CHAPTER III

FINDINGS, ANALYSIS, AND DISCUSSION OF THE DATA

I. INTRODUCTION

Data presented in this chapter were collected by use of a questionnaire mailed to a random sample of 316 public school principals in the State of Tennessee. The administrator questionnaire developed by the Professional Standards Commission of Georgia was adapted to Tennessee for use in this study. The modified instrument, the Tennessee Administrator Questionnaire (TAQ), was field tested using students enrolled in Educational Supervision and Administration classes at East Tennessee State University in the Spring of 1985. (See Appendix B.)

Services of the Computing Center, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, were utilized to key punch the data and provide consultation services. The Statistical Analysis System (SAS) provided frequencies, cumulative frequencies, percentages, cumulative percentages, and in one case chi-square analysis. The data are presented in tabular and expository forms with some analysis and interpretation.

Each of the questions to be answered, as outlined in Chapter I, will be dealt with individually and in the order they were presented.

1. What was the demographic profile of the typical principal?
2. What did the principals perceive to be the working conditions in their schools?

3. What were the tasks and/or roles of the principals and how were they prepared to handle the tasks?

4. What were the levels of satisfaction for the principals as related to their college training, in-service, certification, evaluation, quality of public schooling, and overall job satisfaction?

5. What amount of influence did principals exert in decision making regarding their schools? What constraints did they encounter?

6. What were the principals' perceptions of the major strengths and weaknesses of the Better Schools Program?

II. DATA COLLECTION

The Tennessee Administrator Questionnaire was mailed on February 15, 1985, to all principals included in the sample. Included in the mailing was a questionnaire, a cover letter, and a business reply envelope for return of the questionnaire. (See Appendix B.) They were to be returned by March 15, 1985. For the questionnaires not received by March 6, 1985, a follow-up postcard was sent to all non-responders (Appendix C). For the questionnaires not received by April 25, 1985, follow-up telephone calls were made to all non-responders.

Table I shows the number and percent of returned and usable responses from the principals. Questionnaires were mailed to a random sample of 316 principals employed in public school system in the State of Tennessee during 1984-85. After three solicitations, 234 questionnaires (74 percent) were returned. Four were deleted for insufficient or erroneous information.

TABLE I
NUMBER AND PERCENT OF RETURNED AND USABLE RESPONSES OF PRINCIPALS IN THE
STATE OF TENNESSEE FOR THE 1984-85 SCHOOL YEAR

Solicitations	Sample Size	Number Returned	Percent Returned	Usable
February 15, 1985				
(Cover Letter and Questionnaire)	316	131	41.32	129
March 6, 1985				
(Postcard)	186	27	14.50	26
April 25-26, 1985				
(Telephone Call)	159	76	47.79	75
TOTALS	316	234	74.05	230

III. PRINCIPALS' DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

Findings

Table II shows the highest degree of the respondents: 5 (2.17 percent) held a bachelor's degree; 111 held a master's degree (48.26 percent); 74 (32.17 percent) held a master's degree plus 45 quarter hours; 34 (14.78 percent) held an educational specialist degree; and 6 (2.16 percent) held a doctorate.

Table III reports a combination of age, sex, and marital status of principal respondents. Thirty-five (15.22 percent) were female, while 195 (84.78 percent) were male.

The age of the respondents is also reported in Table III. Eighty-six elementary principals (37.39 percent) had a mean age of 45.97 years; 76 middle school principals (33.04 percent) had a mean age of 45.46 years; 66 high school principals (28.39 percent) reported a mean age of 42.42 years; and 2 other respondents not fitting into the above categories reported (0.89 percent) a mean age of 32.00 years. The mean age for the entire reporting group was 44.70 years of age.

Table IV shows the marital status of the respondents. Eleven (4.78 percent) were single; 192 (83.48) percent were married; 24 (10.44 percent) were divorced; and 3 (1.30 percent) were widowed.

Table V reports an analysis of the age of the respondents including the number of years a principal had been in the current school. Also included is the total number of years as a principal. The respondents (N=230) had a mean age of 44.70 years of age with the youngest being 24 years of age and the eldest 62 years of age. The

TABLE II
HIGHEST DEGREE OF PRINCIPAL RESPONDENTS IN THE STATE OF
TENNESSEE FOR THE 1984-85 SCHOOL YEAR

Highest Degree	Frequency	Cumulative Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Frequency
Bachelor of Science (B.S.)	5	5	2.17	2.17
Master of Science (M.S.)	111	116	48.26	50.43
Master of Science + (45 hours)	74	190	32.17	82.61
Specialists in Education (Ed.S.)	34	224	14.78	97.39
Doctor of Education (Ed.D.)	6	230	2.61	100.00

TABLE III

AGE, SEX, AND MARITAL STATUS OF PRINCIPAL RESPONDENTS IN THE STATE
OF TENNESSEE FOR THE 1984-85 SCHOOL YEAR

Category	Male			Female			Totals		
	N	Percent Married	Mean Age	N	Percent Married	Mean Age	N	Percent Married	Mean Age
Elementary	62	91.37	44.27	24	86.42	47.83	86	88.64	45.97
Middle	67	86.33	42.12	9	55.55	48.79	76	84.91	45.46
High School	64	80.18	41.93	2	50.00	53.00	66	77.89	42.42
TOTALS	193	84.58	43.74	35	81.73	48.02	228	83.48	44.70

TABLE IV
MARITAL STATUS OF PRINCIPAL RESPONDENTS IN THE
STATE OF TENNESSEE FOR THE
1984-85 SCHOOL YEAR

Marital Status	Frequency	Percent
Single	11	4.78
Married	192	83.48
Divorced	24	10.44
Widowed	3	1.30
Totals	230	100.00

TABLE V

ANALYSIS OF AGE AND YEARS OF SERVICE AS A PRINCIPAL AS REPORTED BY
PRINCIPAL RESPONDENTS IN THE STATE OF TENNESSEE FOR
THE 1984-85 SCHOOL YEAR

Item	Number	Mean	Standard Deviation	Minimum Value	Maximum Value
Age	230	44.70	8.12	24	62
Number of Years as a Principal in Current School	230	7.84	6.31	1	35
Total Number of Years as a Principal	230	11.20	7.00	1	36

respondents had been at their current school for an average of 7.84 years. The minimum years of service was 1 year and the maximum was 35 years in the current school. The respondents had been a principal an average of 11.20 years. The minimum years of total service was 1 year and the maximum 36 years of service as a principal.

Table VI reports the race of the respondents. Twenty-three (10 percent) were black, while 207 (90 percent) were white.

Table VII reports the geographic distribution of the respondents. Ninety-eight (42.61 percent) were from East Tennessee; 81 (35.28 percent) were from Middle Tennessee; and 51 (22.17 percent) were from West Tennessee.

Table VIII reports the location of the respondent's school. Thirty-five (15.22 percent) were from urban areas; 46 (20 percent) were from suburban areas; 105 (45.65 percent) were from rural-farming areas; and 44 (19.13 percent) were from rural non-farming areas.

Discussion

The typical principal was almost 45 years of age and a white male. The age was typical of what might be expected considering the information presented in Chapter II that over 50 percent of the principals in the United States are age 50 or over. Also, the Georgia study reported the average principal to be 46 years of age. The question that should be asked is, "Will the better schools program encourage younger people to enter the principalship, or will it force people to stay in the principalship through tracking?" Obviously, this study was too early to answer these hypothetical questions. However,

TABLE VI
RACE OF PRINCIPAL RESPONDENTS IN THE
STATE OF TENNESSEE FOR THE
1984-85 SCHOOL YEAR

Race	Frequency	Percent
White	207	90.00
Black	23	10.00
Totals	230	100.00

TABLE VII
GEOGRAPHIC DISTRIBUTION OF PRINCIPAL RESPONDENTS IN
THE STATE OF TENNESSEE FOR THE
1984-85 SCHOOL YEAR

Location	Frequency	Percent
East Tennessee	98	42.61
Middle Tennessee	81	35.28
West Tennessee	51	22.17

TABLE VIII
LOCATION OF RESPONDING PRINCIPALS IN THE
STATE OF TENNESSEE FOR THE
1984-85 SCHOOL YEAR

Location	Frequency	Percent
Urban	35	15.22
Suburban	46	20.00
Rural (Farming)	105	45.65
Rural (Non-Farming)	44	19.13

when other data were analyzed an interesting pattern developed. Table V presents an analysis of age and years served as a principal. Principal respondents had served an average of 7.84 years as principal of their current school, which compares favorably with the Georgia (7.06 years) study. They had also served an average of 11.20 total years as a principal. Drawing from the data, we see that the typical respondent became a principal at age 33 which indicated a tendency toward young people as principals. Also, the tenure of the principal was approximately 8 years.

Approximately 85 percent of the respondents were male (compared to 83 percent in Georgia). Ninety percent were white, and about 84 percent were married. All figures compared closely with the Georgia study and the national averages presented in the research.

Approximately 48 percent of the principal respondents held the master's as their highest degree compared to 60 percent for the Georgia principals. Significantly, almost one-third (32.17 percent) held a master's plus 45 quarter hours. Few held either a bachelor's degree (2.17 percent) or a doctorate (2.61 percent).

Approximately 43 percent of the principal respondents were from East Tennessee. This was possibly due to three conditions. First, East Tennessee had a greater total number of schools than the more rural Middle and West Tennessee areas. Second, the researcher was better known in the East Tennessee area which may have caused better responses from principals in that area. Third, the draw of The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, was greater in the East Tennessee area.

Also, approximately 45 percent of the respondents listed rural farming areas as the location of their school. In the Georgia study, 32 percent were from farming areas. Over 35 percent listed urban or suburban as the location of their school as compared to 23 percent in the Georgia study. Tennessee was historically an agricultural, rural, farming state. However, recent developments moved the state to more urbanization which could be reflected in the percentages obtained.

IV. WORKING CONDITIONS

Findings

Table IX shows the months that principals worked to determine salary. Eighty-eight (38.26 percent) worked 10 months; 14 (6.09 percent) worked 10.5 months; 69 (30 percent) worked 11 months; 5 (2.17 percent) worked 11.5 months; and 54 (23.48 percent) worked 12 months).

Table X reports the average annual salary of respondents according to school classification. Eighty-six elementary principals reported a mean annual salary of \$25,912; 76 middle school principals reported a mean annual salary of \$24,892; and 66 high school principals reported a mean annual salary of \$27,694.

Table XI shows the average annual salary of respondents according to the three Grand Divisions of the state. Ninety-eight principals from East Tennessee reported a mean annual salary of \$25,515; 81 from Middle Tennessee reported a mean annual salary of \$26,415; and 51 from West Tennessee reported a mean annual salary of \$26,547. The mean salary for the entire group was \$26,061.

TABLE IX
 NUMBER OF MONTHS WORKED TO DETERMINE SALARY OF RESPONDING
 PRINCIPALS IN THE STATE OF TENNESSEE FOR
 THE 1984-85 SCHOOL YEAR

Months	Frequency Number	Cumulative Frequency Percent	Percent	Cumulative Percent
10	88	88	38.26	38.26
10½	14	102	6.09	44.35
11	69	171	30.00	74.35
11½	5	176	2.17	76.52
12	54	230	23.48	100.00

TABLE X
 MEAN AVERAGE ANNUAL SALARY BY SCHOOL CLASSIFICATION
 AS REPORTED BY PRINCIPAL RESPONDENTS IN
 THE STATE OF TENNESSEE FOR THE
 1984-85 SCHOOL YEAR

Classification	Number	Percent	Mean Salary
Elementary	86	36.00	\$25,912
Middle	76	33.04	\$24,892
High	66	28.39	\$27,694
Other	2	.89	NA
Totals	230	100.00	\$26,061

TABLE XI

MEAN AVERAGE ANNUAL SALARY BY GRAND DIVISIONS OF THE
STATE AS REPORTED BY PRINCIPAL RESPONDENTS
IN THE STATE OF TENNESSEE FOR THE
1984-85 SCHOOL YEAR

Grand Division	Number	Percent	Mean Salary
East	98	42.61	\$25,515
Middle	81	35.22	\$26,415
West	51	22.17	\$26,547
Totals	230	100.00	\$26,061

Table XII shows the average annual salary of the respondents according to the location of the school. Thirty-five urban principals reported a mean annual salary of \$30,023; 46 suburban principals reported a mean annual salary of \$29,041; 105 rural farming area principals reported a mean annual salary of \$24,022; and 44 rural non-farming area principals reported a mean annual salary of \$24,659. The mean salary of all respondents was \$26,061.

Table XIII reports the number of principals who "moon-lighted" or worked a second job. Ninety-three (40.44 percent) of the responding principals reported being employed in a second job; 137 (59.56 percent) reported no second job.

Table XIV shows the number and percent of principal respondents who favored some form of merit pay for Tennessee school administrators. Sixty-four (27.83 percent) opposed merit pay, while 166 (72.17 percent) expressed support for some form of merit pay for school administrator.

Table XV shows the mean hours worked per week as reported by the respondents. Eighty-six elementary principals reported working 50.70 hours per week; 76 middle school principals reported working 52.34 hours per week; and 66 high school principals reported working 58.64 hours per week. Two individual respondents listed other than the above classification and could not be included. The mean hours worked per week for the entire group was 53.51.

Table XVI reports the number and percent of respondents who were covered by a job description. Seventy-seven (33.48 percent) had no

TABLE XII
MEAN AVERAGE ANNUAL SALARY BY LOCATION AS REPORTED
BY PRINCIPAL RESPONDENTS IN THE
STATE OF TENNESSEE FOR THE
1984-85 SCHOOL YEAR

Location	Number	Percent	Mean Salary
Urban	35	15.22	\$30,023
Suburban	46	20.00	\$29,041
Rural; Farming	105	45.65	\$24,022
Rural; Non-Farming	44	19.13	\$24,659

TABLE XIII
NUMBER AND PERCENT OF PRINCIPAL RESPONDENTS WHO
"MOON LIGHTED" IN THE STATE OF TENNESSEE
IN THE 1984-85 SCHOOL YEAR

Moon Lighting	Number	Percent
Yes	93	40.44
No	137	59.56
Totals	230	100.00

TABLE XIV
NUMBER AND PERCENT OF PRINCIPAL RESPONDENTS
FAVORING MERIT PAY IN THE STATE
OF TENNESSEE FOR THE
1984-85 SCHOOL YEAR

Merit Pay	Number	Percent
In Favor	166	72.17
Opposed	64	27.83
Totals	230	100.00

TABLE XV
 MEAN HOURS WORKED PER WEEK ACCORDING TO SCHOOL
 CLASSIFICATION AS REPORTED BY PRINCIPAL
 RESPONDENTS IN THE STATE OF TENNESSEE
 FOR THE 1984-85 SCHOOL YEAR

Classification	Number	Percent	Mean Hours Worked Per Week
Elementary	86	37.39	50.70
Middle	76	33.04	52.34
High	66	28.39	58.64
Other	2	.89	NA
Totals	230	100.00	53.51

TABLE XVI
NUMBER AND PERCENT OF PRINCIPAL RESPONDENTS
REPORTING A JOB DESCRIPTION IN
THE STATE OF TENNESSEE FOR
THE 1984-85 SCHOOL YEAR

Job Description	Number	Percent
Yes	153	66.52
No	77	33.48
Totals	230	100.00

job description, while 153 (66.52 percent) reported some form of job description.

Discussion

One of the major controversies of the Better Schools Program was the concept of merit pay--that teachers should be paid on the basis of quality of work performed. Approximately 72 percent of the principal respondents supported the concept of merit pay for administrators. In comparison, approximately 41 percent of the same group reported that they were "moonlighters," or they worked a second job. Obviously, principal respondents had some feeling for a perceived inadequacy in financial compensation. In comparison, only 18.7 percent of the Georgia principals reported a second job.

Principal respondents also reported that they worked an average of 53.51 hours per week which was considerably more than the typical 40 hour industrial model work week. High school principals reported working an average of 58.64 hours per week as compared to elementary principals working 50.70 hours per week. Typically, high school administration involved more extra-curricular activities which could necessitate the additional time on duty. Middle school principals reported 52.34 hours worked per week which would be logical since they normally have fewer extra-curricula activities than high school administrators. In comparison, Georgia principals worked an average of 53 hours per week.

Although principal respondents reported working over 53 hours per week, the average annual salary reported was \$26,061. Elementary principals earned an average of \$25,912, while high school principals

earned \$27,694. Surprisingly, middle school principals earned the least, \$24,892. Georgia high school principals also received a higher salary than the other classifications.

When salaries were viewed by geographic distribution, East Tennessee principals were found to be the lowest, \$25,515. Middle Tennessee principals were higher, \$26,415; while West Tennessee principals were the highest paid, \$26,547. Principal respondents in the Georgia study earned an average of \$31,450. There was no logical reason for the disparity in salary.

As expected, those principals employed in urban areas reported a higher salary than those in other locations in the state. Urban principal respondents listed a mean annual salary of \$30,023 as compared to rural, farming principal respondents who listed a mean salary of \$24,022. This was similar to Georgia respondents.

Approximately 67 percent of the principal respondents reported having a current job description. Research indicated that principals need a valid job description if they are expected to be most effective.

V. PRINCIPALS' TASKS AND/OR ROLES AND THEIR PREPARATION TO HANDLE THEM

Findings

Table XVII reports the current ranking of principal respondents as to their perceived most important role. Eighty-one (35.22 percent) reported that being a school manager was their most important role; 68 (29.57 percent) ranked instructional leader as most important; 54 (23.48 percent) ranked disciplinarian as most important;

TABLE XVII

CURRENT RANKING OF THE PERCEIVED MOST IMPORTANT ROLE OF THE
PRINCIPAL AS REPORTED BY PRINCIPAL RESPONDENTS
IN THE STATE OF TENNESSEE FOR THE
1984-85 SCHOOL YEAR

Role	Frequency	Percent
Instructional Leader	68	29.57
School Manager	81	35.22
Community Leader	14	6.09
Personnel Leader	13	5.65
Disciplinarian	54	23.48
Professional Developer	0	00.00
Planner	0	00.00
Coordinator of Extra-Curricular Activities	0	00.00

14 (6.09 percent) ranked community leader as most important; and 13 (5.65 percent) ranked personnel leader as most important. No respondent listed professional developer, planner, or coordinator of extra-curricular activities as their most important current role.

Table XVIII reports the current ranking of principals as to their perceived second most important role. Fifty-two (22.61 percent) reported that school manager was their second most important role; 47 (20.44 percent) reported that instructional leader was second in importance; likewise, 47 (20.44 percent) reported that disciplinarian was of second importance; 37 (16.09 percent) listed personnel leader as second in importance; 23 (10.00 percent) ranked community leader as second in importance; 16 (6.96 percent) ranked planner as second in importance; 5 (2.17 percent) ranked coordinator of extra-curricular activities as second in importance; and 3 (1.30 percent) ranked professional developer as the second most important current role of the principal.

Table XIX shows the current ranking of the perceived third most important current role of the principal. Fifty-one (22.17 percent) of the respondents reported that community leader was the third most important role of the principal; 40 (17.39 percent) ranked instructional leader as being third in importance; 40 (17.39 percent) listed school manager as third in importance; 30 (13.04 percent) ranked personnel leader as third in importance; 28 (12.17 percent) ranked disciplinarian as third in importance; 17 (7.39 percent) ranked professional developer as third in importance; 13 (5.65 percent) reported that coordinator of extra-curricular activities was of third

TABLE XVIII

CURRENT RANKING OF THE PERCEIVED SECOND MOST IMPORTANT ROLE
OF THE PRINCIPAL AS REPORTED BY PRINCIPAL
RESPONDENTS IN THE STATE OF TENNESSEE
FOR THE 1984-85 SCHOOL YEAR

Role	Frequency	Percent
Instructional Leader	47	20.44
School Manager	52	22.61
Community Leader	23	10.00
Personnel Leader	37	16.09
Disciplinarian	47	20.44
Professional Developer	3	1.30
Planner	16	6.96
Coordinator of Extra-Curricular Activities	5	2.17

TABLE XIX

CURRENT RANKING OF THE PERCEIVED THIRD MOST IMPORTANT ROLE
OF THE PRINCIPAL AS REPORTED BY PRINCIPAL
RESPONDENTS IN THE STATE OF TENNESSEE
FOR THE 1984-85 SCHOOL YEAR

Role	Frequency	Percent
Instructional Leader	40	17.39
School Manager	40	17.39
Community Leader	51	22.17
Personnel Leader	30	13.04
Disciplinarian	28	12.17
Professional Developer	17	7.39
Planner	11	4.78
Coordinator of Extra-Curricular Activities	13	5.65

importance; and 11 (4.78 percent) ranked planner as being third most important current role of the principal.

Table XX shows the ranking of the perceived most important ideal role of the principal. Of the respondents, 189 (82.17 percent) reported that being an instructional leader should be the most important role for the principal; 18 (7.83 percent) ranked personnel leader as the most ideal role; 13 (5.65 percent) ranked school manager as most important; 6 (2.61 percent) ranked community leader as most important; and 4 (1.74 percent) listed disciplinarian as the most important ideal role for the principal. No respondents listed professional developer, planner or coordinator of extra-curricular activity as the most important ideal role of the principal.

Table XXI reports the ranking of the second most important ideal role of the principal. Of the respondents, 99 (43.04 percent) ranked school manager as second most important ideal role for the principal; 60 (26.09 percent) ranked personnel leader as second most important; 22 (9.57 percent) ranked instructional leader as the second most important; 13 (5.65 percent) ranked community leader as second in importance; 12 (5.22 percent) listed planner as second in importance; 11 (4.78 percent) ranked disciplinarian as second in importance; 11 (4.78 percent) ranked professional developer as second in importance; and 2 (0.87 percent) ranked coordinator of extra-curricular activities as the second most important ideal role for the principal.

Table XXII reports the ranking of the perceived third most important ideal role of the principal. Of the respondents, 51 (22.17 percent) ranked personnel leader as the third most important ideal role

TABLE XX

IDEAL RANKING OF THE PERCEIVED MOST IMPORTANT ROLE OF
THE PRINCIPAL AS REPORTED BY PRINCIPAL
RESPONDENTS IN THE STATE OF
TENNESSEE FOR THE 1984-85
SCHOOL YEAR

Role	Frequency	Percent
Instructional Leader	189	82.17
School Manager	13	5.65
Community Leader	6	2.61
Personnel Leader	18	7.83
Disciplinarian	4	1.74
Professional Developer	0	00.00
Planner	0	00.00
Coordinator of Extra-Curricular Activities	0	00.00

TABLE XXI

IDEAL RANKING OF THE PERCEIVED SECOND MOST IMPORTANT ROLE
OF THE PRINCIPAL AS REPORTED BY PRINCIPAL
RESPONDENTS IN THE STATE OF
TENNESSEE FOR THE 1984-85
SCHOOL YEAR

Role	Frequency	Percent
Instructional Leader	22	9.57
School Manager	99	43.04
Community Leader	13	5.65
Personnel Leader	60	26.09
Disciplinarian	11	4.78
Professional Developer	11	4.78
Planner	12	5.22
Coordinator of Extra-Curricular Activities	2	.87

TABLE XXII

IDEAL RANKING OF THE PERCEIVED THIRD MOST IMPORTANT ROLE
OF THE PRINCIPAL AS REPORTED BY PRINCIPAL
RESPONDENTS IN THE STATE OF
TENNESSEE FOR THE 1984-85
SCHOOL YEAR

Role	Frequency	Percent
Instructional Leader	13	5.65
School Manager	40	17.39
Community Leader	29	12.61
Personnel Leader	51	22.17
Disciplinarian	34	14.78
Professional Developer	17	7.39
Planner	40	17.39
Coordinator of Extra-Curricular Activities	6	2.61

for the principal; 40 (17.39 percent) ranked school manager as third in importance; 40 (17.39 percent) ranked planner as third in importance; 34 (14.78 percent) ranked disciplinarian as third; 29 (12.61 percent) listed community leader as third in importance; 17 (7.39 percent) ranked professional developer as third in importance; 13 (5.65 percent) listed instructional leader as third in importance; and 6 (2.61 percent) ranked coordinator of extra-curricular activities as the third most important ideal role of the principal.

Table XXIII reports the reasons respondents listed for becoming a principal. Of the respondents, 75 (32.61 percent) listed "improved income over previous position" as the primary reason; 35 (15.22 percent) listed this as a secondary reason; and 46 (20 percent) listed improved income as the tertiary reason for becoming a principal. Fifty-three (23.04 percent) ranked "desire to be in a leadership position" as the primary motivation; 29 (12.61 percent) listed this as the secondary motivation; and 36 (15.65 percent) reported leadership position as the third most important reason for becoming a principal. Twenty-nine (12.61 percent) listed "interest in improving student academic performance" as the primary reason for being a principal; 48 (20.87 percent) listed this as a secondary reason; and 26 (11.30 percent) listed this as being the third most important reason for becoming a principal. Twenty-six (11.30 percent) listed "more prestige than previous position" as being of primary importance; 50 (21.74 percent) reported this as a secondary reason; and 26 (11.30 percent) listed this as being the third most important reason for becoming a principal. Twenty-four (10.44 percent) reported

TABLE XXIII

REASON FOR BECOMING PRINCIPAL AS REPORTED BY PRINCIPAL RESPONDENTS IN THE
STATE OF TENNESSEE FOR THE 1984-85 SCHOOL YEAR

Reason	Primary		Secondary		Tertiary		Total	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Percent of Responses (N=690)	Percent of Responses (N=230)
Improved Income Over Previous Position	75	32.61	35	15.22	46	20.00	156	67.82
More Prestige Than Previous Position	26	11.30	50	21.74	26	11.30	102	44.35
Interest in Improving Students' Academic Performance	29	12.61	48	20.87	26	11.30	103	44.78
Desire To Make Educational Improvements for Teachers	11	4.78	29	12.61	39	16.96	79	34.35
Springboard for Superintendent's Role	4	1.74	10	4.35	20	8.70	34	14.78
Desire To Be in a Leadership Position	53	23.04	29	12.61	36	15.65	118	51.30
Encouragement of Others	24	10.44	28	12.17	25	10.87	77	33.48
Other Reasons	8	3.48	1	.44	12	5.22	21	9.13

"encouragement of others" as being of primary importance; 28 (12.17 percent) listed this as a secondary reason; and 25 (10.87 percent) listed this as third in importance for becoming a principal. Eleven (4.78 percent) rated "desire to make educational improvements for teachers" as being of primary importance; 29 (12.61 percent) listed this as a secondary reason; and 39 (16.96 percent) listed this as third in importance for becoming a principal. Eight (3.48 percent) respondents ranked "other reasons" as being of primary importance; 1 (0.44 percent) listed this as a secondary reason; and 12 (5.22 percent) rated this as third in importance for becoming a principal. Four (1.74 percent) ranked "spring board for superintendent's role" as being of primary importance; 10 (4.35 percent) saw this as a secondary motivation; and 20 (8.70 percent) rated this as a third reason for becoming a principal.

Table XXIV shows the number and percent of respondents who reported receiving the principalship certification prior to becoming a principal. Of the respondents, 164 (71.30 percent) were certified prior to becoming a principal while 66 (28.70) percent obtained certification after becoming a principal.

Table XXV compared the first, second and third most important current roles of the principal as reported by the respondents. The ideal role of the principal was compared in Table XXVI, while a composite of all the responses was analyzed in Table XXVII.

Principal respondents perceived their most important current role as a school manager (35.22 percent). However, the roles of instructional leader (29.57 percent) and disciplinarian (23.48 percent)

TABLE XXIV

NUMBER AND PERCENT OF PRINCIPAL RESPONDENTS OBTAINING
CERTIFICATION PRIOR TO BECOMING A PRINCIPAL
IN THE STATE OF TENNESSEE FOR THE
1984-85 SCHOOL YEAR

Certification	Number	Percent
Prior To	164	71.30
After	66	28.70
Totals	230	100.00

TABLE XXV
COMPARISON OF THE THREE MOST IMPORTANT CURRENT ROLES OF THE PRINCIPAL AS
REPORTED BY PRINCIPAL RESPONDENTS IN THE STATE OF TENNESSEE
FOR THE 1984-85 SCHOOL YEAR

Roles	First Most Important		Second Most Important		Third Most Important	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Instructional Leader	68	29.57	47	20.44	40	17.39
School Manager	81	35.22	52	22.61	40	17.39
Community Leader	14	6.09	23	10.00	51	22.17
Personnel Leader	13	5.65	37	16.09	30	13.04
Disciplinarian	54	23.48	47	20.44	28	12.17
Professional Developer			3	1.30	17	7.39
Planner			16	6.96	11	4.78
Coordinator of Extra-Curricular Activities			5	2.17	13	5.65

TABLE XXVI
COMPARISON OF THE THREE MOST IMPORTANT IDEAL ROLES OF THE PRINCIPAL AS
REPORTED BY PRINCIPAL RESPONDENTS IN THE STATE OF
TENNESSEE FOR THE 1984-85 SCHOOL YEAR

Roles	First Most Important Ideal Role		Second Most Important Ideal Role		Third Most Important Ideal Role	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Instructional Leader	189	82.17	22	9.57	13	5.65
School Manager	13	5.65	99	43.04	40	17.39
Community Leader	6	2.61	13	5.65	29	12.61
Personnel Leader	18	7.83	60	26.09	51	22.17
Disciplinarian	4	1.74	11	4.78	34	14.78
Professional Developer			11	4.78	17	7.39
Planner			12	5.22	40	17.39
Coordinator of Extra- Curricular Activities			2	.82	6	2.61

TABLE XXVII

COMPARISON OF THE CURRENT AND IDEAL ROLES OF THE PRINCIPAL USING THE CHI-SQUARE TEST
AS REPORTED BY PRINCIPAL RESPONDENTS IN THE STATE OF
TENNESSEE FOR THE 1984-85 SCHOOL YEAR

Role	Current Ranking		Ideal Ranking		Chi-Square Test
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent	
Instructional Leader	155	20.67	224	30.35	70.6 (1)*
School Manager	173	23.07	152	20.60	3.6 (1)
Community Leader	88	11.73	48	6.50	16.8 (1)*
Personnel Leader	80	10.67	177	23.98	81.5 (1)*
Disciplinarian	129	17.20	49	6.64	58.4 (1)*
Professional Developer	20	2.67	28	3.79	1.4 (1)
Planner	27	3.60	52	7.05	57.6 (1)*
Coordinator of Extra- Curricular Activities	18	2.40	8	1.08	3.7 (1)

*Significant Chi-Square at the 0.05 level.

() Degrees of freedom.

were also prominent. All three roles have been identified in research as being critical to the success of the principal, as both superiors and the public judge a principal by the handling of the school and discipline in the school. But what did principals perceive to be their most ideal role? By an overwhelming number (82.17 percent), principal respondents thought they should be instructional leaders first. By comparison, almost one-half (43.04 percent) perceived the second most ideal role to be school manager.

Table XXVII, page 114, shows a comparison of the current and ideal roles of the principal as reported by respondents of all three levels. The chi-square test was used to determine if there was a significant relationship in the responses of principals between their perceived current roles and ideal roles.

The chi-square revealed a significant relationship at the 0.05 level or less between the perceived current and ideal principal roles for five of the eight categories. The roles personnel leader ($\chi^2 = 81.5$, 1df), instructional leader ($\chi^2 = 70.6$, 1df), disciplinarian ($\chi^2 = 58.4$, 1df), planner ($\chi^2 = 57.6$, 1df), and community leader ($\chi^2 = 16.8$, 1df) were found to be significant. No significance was found for the roles of coordinator of extra-curricular activities ($\chi^2 = 3.7$, 1df), school manager ($\chi^2 = 3.6$, 1df), and professional developer ($\chi^2 = 1.4$, 1df).

Discussion

The ranking of personnel leader was considerably changed from current to ideal. Of the respondents, 80 (10.67 percent) reported the

role of personnel leader in their top three of current roles. Conversely, 177 (23.98 percent) listed the role of personnel leader in their top three of ideal roles. Obviously, many principals believed that principals should have greater involvement in the recruitment and selection of personnel than they do at the present time.

Of the respondents, 129 (17.20 percent) listed the role of disciplinarian in their top three current roles. However, only 49 (6.64 percent) listed disciplinarian in the top three of their ideal roles. Apparently the respondents saw the necessity of maintaining good discipline in the school, but did not necessarily perceive it to be their most ideal role.

According to Table XXVI, page 113, principal respondents perceived only three roles as having validity. First, 30.35 percent of the respondents listed the role of instructional leader as their ideal role. Two other roles, personnel leader (23.98 percent) and school manager (20.60 percent) make up the perceived ideal roles for the principal.

By comparison, 31 percent of the Georgia principals saw their most important current role as instructional leader. Over 25 percent reported their current role to be a school manager. Over 50 percent (54.2) of the Georgia respondents believed their most ideal role to be instructional leader.

Table XXIII, page 109, presents a composite of the reasons respondents listed for becoming a principal. Two reasons were listed more often by respondents, "improved income over previous position" (67.82 percent) and "desire to be in a leadership position" (51.30

percent). The desire for additional income was previously discussed and apparently represents a major concern of principals. In the Georgia study 22 percent listed salary as a primary motivation and 28.5 reported a desire to be in a leadership position. Additionally, the principalship is a leadership position and those people who occupy the position would logically have a desire to be there. However, another hypothetical question could be asked, "Are principals in a leadership position because they desire to be or because of the financial reward?" The results of this study were not sufficient to answer this question. Respondents also reported that 71.30 percent had obtained principal's certification prior to becoming a principal. This indicates a conscious desire to enter the principalship. This compares to the Georgia study where almost 80 percent obtained certification before becoming a principal.

VI. PRINCIPALS' SATISFACTION

Findings

Table XXVIII reports the degree of satisfaction of principal respondents to undergraduate, graduate, and in-service training programs. Of the respondents, 33 (14.34 percent) rated their undergraduate training as very helpful; 88 (38.26 percent) ranked it as somewhat helpful; and 109 (47.40 percent) rated it as not helpful. Seventy-five (32.61 percent) reported their graduate training as very helpful; 130 (56.52 percent) rated it as somewhat helpful; and 25 (10.87 percent) listed it as not helpful. Forty (17.39 percent) respondents rated their in-service programs as very helpful; 144

TABLE XXVIII
DEGREE OF SATISFACTION OF PRINCIPAL RESPONDENTS TO UNDERGRADUATE, GRADUATE,
AND IN-SERVICE TRAINING PROGRAMS IN THE STATE OF TENNESSEE
FOR THE 1984-85 SCHOOL YEAR

Degree of Satisfaction	Undergraduate		Graduate		In-Service	
	Frequency (N=230)	Percent	Frequency (N=230)	Percent	Frequency (N=230)	Percent
Very Helpful	33	14.34	75	32.61	40	17.39
Somewhat Helpful	88	38.26	130	56.52	144	62.61
Not Helpful	109	47.40	25	10.87	46	20.00

(62.61 percent) rated them as somewhat helpful; and 46 (20 percent) listed them as not helpful.

Table XXIX reports the perceived satisfaction of respondents to in-service training. Of the respondents, 11 (4.78 percent) were "entirely satisfied" with the in-service programs; 84 (36.52 percent) were "mostly satisfied;" 76 (33.04 percent) were "equally satisfied and dissatisfied;" 48 (20.87 percent) were "mostly dissatisfied;" 9 (3.91 percent) were "entirely dissatisfied;" and 2 (0.87 percent) did not respond.

Table XXX shows the level of satisfaction with administrator certification standards as perceived by the respondents. Twenty-eight (12.17 percent) were "entirely satisfied" with the certification standards; 92 (40 percent) were "mostly satisfied;" 47 (20.43 percent) were "equally satisfied and dissatisfied;" 62 (26.97 percent) were "mostly dissatisfied;" and 1 (0.43 percent) was "entirely dissatisfied" with the administrator certification standards. Also reported by the respondents was 166 (72.17 percent) who had applied for career ladder certification.

Table XXXI reports the methods used by principal respondents to renew their principalship certification. Of the respondents, 159 (69.13 percent) used "college courses" for renewal; 13 (5.65 percent) used "local staff development" methods; 11 (4.78 percent) used some "other" form; the question was "not applicable" for 28 (12.17 percent); and 19 (8.26 percent) held "life certificates."

Table XXXII reports the system of evaluation used by local school systems to evaluate principals. Of the respondents, 107 (46.52

TABLE XXIX

PERCEIVED SATISFACTION OF IN-SERVICE PROGRAMS AS REPORTED
BY PRINCIPAL RESPONDENTS IN THE STATE OF
TENNESSEE FOR THE 1984-85 SCHOOL YEAR

Degree of Satisfaction	Frequency	Cumulative Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Entirely Satisfied	11	11	4.78	4.78
Mostly Satisfied	84	95	36.52	41.30
Equally Satisfied and Dissatisfied	76	171	33.04	74.35
Mostly Dissatisfied	48	219	20.87	95.22
Entirely Dissatisfied	9	228	3.91	99.13
No Response	2	230	.87	100.00

TABLE XXX

LEVEL OF SATISFACTION WITH ADMINISTRATOR CERTIFICATION STANDARDS
OF PRINCIPAL RESPONDENTS IN THE STATE OF TENNESSEE
FOR THE 1984-85 SCHOOL YEAR

Level of Satisfaction	Frequency	Cumulative Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Entirely Satisfied	28	28	12.17	12.17
Mostly Satisfied	92	120	40.00	52.17
Equally Satisfied and Dissatisfied	47	167	20.43	72.60
Mostly Dissatisfied	62	229	26.97	99.57
Entirely Dissatisfied	1	230	.43	100.00

TABLE XXXI
METHODS USED BY PRINCIPAL RESPONDENTS TO RENEW
CERTIFICATES IN THE STATE OF
TENNESSEE FOR THE 1984-85
SCHOOL YEAR

Method	Frequency	Cumulative Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
College Courses	159	159	69.13	69.13
Local Staff Development	13	172	5.65	74.78
Other	11	183	4.78	79.56
Not Applicable	28	211	12.17	91.73
Life Certificate	19	230	8.27	100.00

TABLE XXXII
SYSTEM OF PRINCIPAL EVALUATION REPORTED BY RESPONDENTS
IN THE STATE OF TENNESSEE FOR THE
1984-85 SCHOOL YEAR

System	Frequency	Percent
No Evaluation	107	46.52
State Evaluation	49	21.30
Other	74	32.18
Totals	230	100.00

percent) reported "no evaluation" system; 49 (21.30 percent) reported using the "state evaluation" model; and 74 (32.18 percent) used some "other" method of evaluation.

Table XXXIII shows the respondent principals' level of satisfaction with the quality of public education in Tennessee. Of the respondents, 10 (4.35 percent) were "extremely satisfied;" 144 (62.61 percent) were "mostly satisfied;" 62 (26.96 percent) were "equally satisfied and dissatisfied," 13 (5.65 percent) were "mostly dissatisfied;" and 1 (0.43 percent) was "extremely dissatisfied" with the quality of public education in Tennessee.

Table XXXIV reports the overall job satisfaction of the principal respondents. Of the respondents, 37 (16.09 percent) were "entirely satisfied" with their overall job performance; 152 (66.09 percent) were "mostly satisfied;" 29 (12.61 percent) were "equally satisfied and dissatisfied;" 6 (2.61 percent) were "mostly dissatisfied;" and 6 (2.61 percent) were "entirely dissatisfied" with their overall job performance.

Discussion

Almost one-half (47.40 percent) of the respondents stated that they considered their undergraduate programs "not helpful" in their role as principal. Since most administrative training programs are at the graduate level, their responses were logical. Also, 205 (89.13 percent) rated their graduate programs as being "somewhat" or "very helpful." Only 10.87 percent rate their graduate training programs as "not helpful." In addition, 184 (80 percent) considered their in-service training programs to be "somewhat" or "very helpful." These

TABLE XXXIII
 RESPONDENT PRINCIPALS LEVEL OF SATISFACTION REGARDING
 THE QUALITY OF PUBLIC EDUCATION IN THE STATE
 OF TENNESSEE FOR THE 1984-85
 SCHOOL YEAR

Level of Satisfaction	Frequency	Cumulative Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Entirely Satisfied	10	10	4.35	4.35
Mostly Satisfied	144	154	62.61	66.99
Equally Satisfied and Dissatisfied	62	216	26.96	93.92
Mostly Dissatisfied	13	229	5.65	99.57
Entirely Dissatisfied	1	230	.43	100.00

TABLE XXXIV
OVERALL JOB SATISFACTION OF PRINCIPAL RESPONDENTS IN THE STATE OF TENNESSEE
FOR THE 1984-85 SCHOOL YEAR

Degree of Satisfaction	Frequency	Cumulative Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Entirely Satisfied	37	37	16.09	16.09
Mostly Satisfied	152	189	66.09	82.18
Equally Satisfied and Dissatisfied	29	218	12.61	94.73
Mostly Dissatisfied	6	224	2.61	97.39
Entirely Dissatisfied	6	230	2.61	100.00

responses have obvious implications for schools of higher education which train Tennessee administrators. By comparison, Georgia principals rated their graduate preparation programs as "very helpful" (46 percent). In-service training programs were rated as "very helpful" by 44 percent of the Georgia respondents. Also, only 14 percent of the Georgia principals rated their undergraduate programs as being "very helpful."

Almost one-half (41.30 percent) of the principal respondents were "mostly" or "entirely satisfied" with the quality of in-service programs. Approximately one-third (33.04 percent) were "equally satisfied or dissatisfied" and another one-fourth (24.78 percent) were "mostly" or "entirely dissatisfied." Obviously, principal respondents have mixed reactions concerning their in-service programs.

Of the respondents, approximately two-thirds (62.17 percent) were either "entirely" or "mostly satisfied" with administrator certification standards in Tennessee. However, over one-fourth (26.96 percent) were "mostly dissatisfied" with the certification standards for administrators. Since certification standards have changed so drastically during the past ten years, this response could be considered logical. Additionally, the confusion regarding career ladder administrator certification could impact their response.

Over two-thirds (69.13 percent) of the respondents reported using college courses as their means of renewing administrator certificates. Only 19 (8.26 percent) of the principals held a life or permanent certificate as compared to 23.6 percent of Georgia principals who held life certificates. This implied that over 90 percent of

current principals will have to renew their certificates or obtain career ladder certification. Logically, this means that large numbers of current administrators will be returning to college and universities for courses to renew their certification.

Additionally, 166 (72.17 percent) have applied for career ladder certification. This figure was inconsistent with the respondents' report of evaluation. Career ladder implied evaluation, from both local and state sources. Yet, almost one-half (46.52 percent) of the principals reported no system of evaluation. By comparison, over 40 percent of the Georgia principals reported an informal or no system of evaluation.

Almost two-thirds of the principals were "mostly satisfied" with their own job performance (66.09 percent) and the quality of public education in Tennessee (62.61 percent). By comparison, 72 percent of the Georgia principals were "mostly satisfied" with their job performance, and 71 percent were "mostly satisfied" with the quality of public education.

VII. PRINCIPALS' INFLUENCE AND CONSTRAINTS

Findings

Table XXXV reports the respondents' perceived authority in affecting certain activities in their individual schools. Using a rating scale of nine as total authority and zero as no authority, principals reported their perceived authority regarding the following activities. Respondents rated "determining extra-curricular programs" with a mean response of 8.14; "evaluating instruction" had a mean

TABLE XXXV
 AUTHORITY OF PRINCIPALS TO AFFECT CERTAIN ACTIVITIES
 AS REPORTED BY PRINCIPAL RESPONDENTS IN THE
 STATE OF TENNESSEE FOR THE
 1984-85 SCHOOL YEAR

Activity	Total = 9 None = 0	Mean Response
Facilitating Change		6.34
Determining Staffing Patterns		4.86
Determining Hiring and Retention		4.27
Determining School Budget		3.94
Allocating School Resources		6.72
Determining School Policies		6.47
Evaluating Instruction		7.84
Formulating School-Discipline Procedures		7.28
Formulating Staff Development Programs		5.92
Determining Extra-Curricula Programs		8.14
Managing Special Education Programs		4.73
Managing Vocational Programs		5.21
Managing Federally-Mandated Programs		5.07

response of 7.84; "formulating school-discipline procedures" was rated as 7.28; "allocating school resources" was rated as 6.72; "determining school policies" rated 6.47; "facilitating change" rated 6.34; "formulating staff development programs" rated 5.92; "managing vocational programs" rated 5.21; "managing federally-mandated programs" rated 5.07; "determining staffing patterns" rated 4.86; "managing special education programs" rated 4.73; "determining hiring and retention" rated 4.27; and "determining school budgets" rated 3.94.

Table XXXVI shows the major job constraints on principals as reported by the principal respondents. "Lack of time" was listed by 146 (63.48 percent) respondents as a major constraint; 112 (48.70 percent) listed "lack of financial resources;" 63 (27.39 percent) listed "paper work;" 55 (23.91 percent) listed "selection and retention of personnel;" 46 (20 percent) listed "state programs;" 41 (17.83 percent) listed "others;" 37 (16.09 percent) listed "poor personnel;" 36 (15.56 percent) listed "lack of staff;" 14 (6.90 percent) listed "central office interference;" 12 (5.22 percent) listed "teaching principalship;" 11 (4.78 percent) listed "local politics;" 8 (3.48 percent) listed "mandated programs;" 7 (3.04 percent) listed "administrative details;" and 6 (2.61 percent) listed "isolation" as a major job constraint.

Discussion

An inconsistency may be observed in the principals' perception of their authority. The second highest ranked response was "evaluating instruction" and yet the second lowest response was "determining hiring

TABLE XXXVI
 MAJOR JOB CONSTRAINTS FACED BY PRINCIPALS AS
 REPORTED BY PRINCIPAL RESPONDENTS IN
 THE STATE OF TENNESSEE FOR THE
 1984-85 SCHOOL YEAR

Constraints	Frequency	Percent of Responses (N=609)	Percent of Respondents (N=230)
Lack of Time	146	23.97	63.48
Lack of Financial Resources	112	18.39	48.70
Paperwork	63	10.34	27.39
Selection and Retention of Personnel	55	9.03	23.91
State Programs	46	7.55	20.00
Others	41	6.73	17.83
Poor Personnel	37	6.08	16.09
Lack of Staff	36	5.91	15.56
Central Office Interference	14	2.30	6.09
Teaching Principalship	12	1.97	5.22
Local Politics	11	1.81	4.78
Mandated Programs	8	1.31	3.48
Administrative Details	7	1.15	3.04
Totals	609	100.00	

and retention." Apparently principals were required to evaluate the performance of teachers but had little input into the initial hiring or retention of personnel. Historically, many sections of Tennessee have used political means of appointing and retaining teachers. However, only 4.78 percent considered "local politics" as a constraint. The responses indicate that principals believe they should be given the responsibility of evaluating teachers coupled with the authority to determine the hiring and retention of those teachers. This supports earlier findings in the study.

Three supplemental programs; vocational, special education and federal programs received a low ranking from the respondents. Since most of the programs carry their own policies and guidelines, principals perceived little authority over these program operations.

Respondents felt they had least authority to determine school budgets. Since Tennessee is a fiscally dependent state, educators, especially building-level administrators, have little opportunity to influence school budget decisions.

Georgia principals ranked the items in a similar fashion. Over half (56 percent) of the Georgia principals desired more authority regarding the school budget. However, most (73 percent) perceived they had adequate authority in Georgia to make hiring and retention decisions.

Principals faced many constraints as they were permitted or required to make changes or to operate their schools. The most obvious constraint listed by the principal respondents was "lack of time." Previously discussed was the amount of time spent working each week.

Obviously it was difficult to give more time than already devoted to the job. This finding is consistent with national studies reported earlier.

The second major constraint was "lack of financial resources."

Financing Tennessee education has been a constant concern over the past decade. Principals perceived they had little authority over the school budget and the lack of finances proved a major constraint to efficient school operations. The third most commonly stated constraint was "paper work" (27.39 percent). For many principals additional paper work simply required more time as most of the paper work was completed after normal school hours. Again, this finding is consistent with earlier studies. The fourth highest stated constraint was the "selection and retention of personnel" by 23.91 percent of the respondents. Apparently the "selection and retention of personnel" was a major concern to principals due to the number of times the concept is mentioned by the respondents both as a constraint and in regard to the perceived authority of principals.

Adequate financing for education in Tennessee must come from both the state and local levels. Principals can exert influence only indirectly in determining the financing for educational programs. However, principals must exert some pressure through a cohesive front. Personnel concerns, likewise, must be addressed by state mandate and local policy. Such limitations and constraints are present when a person accepts a principalship, however without some assistance potential principals may not be so ready to accept the responsibility. The addition of new programs and new responsibilities have influenced

the amount of time and paperwork required of the principal. The Better Schools Program has dramatically increased the paperwork required of the principal. This often directly affects time spent because the paperwork must be completed outside normal working hours.

The major constraints faced by Georgia principals included state and federal laws, budgetary restrictions, community apathy, and a lack of parental involvement.

VII. PRINCIPALS' VIEW OF BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM

Findings

Table XXXVII reports the major strengths of Tennessee's Better Schools Program as perceived by principals. Of the respondents, 124 (53.91 percent) listed the "Tennessee Instructional Model" as the greatest strength; 111 (48.26 percent) listed "public recognition of education;" 99 (43.04 percent) listed "financial rewards;" 38 (76.52 percent) listed "professional growth;" 32 (13.91 percent) listed "recognition for teacher performances;" 29 (12.61 percent) listed "accountability;" 18 (7.83 percent) listed "computer skills;" 17 (7.39 percent) listed "encourages improvement;" 14 (6.09 percent) listed "creativity;" 12 (5.22 percent) listed "evaluation;" likewise, 12 (5.22 percent) listed "aides for primary grades;" 9 (3.91 percent) listed "Basic Skills;" and 7 (3.04 percent) listed "alternative school" as a major strength of the Better Schools Program.

Table XXXVIII reports the major weaknesses of the Better Schools Program as perceived by the principals. Of the respondents, 119 (51.74 percent) ranked "lack of communication" as the major weakness;

TABLE XXXVII

MAJOR STRENGTHS OF THE BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM AS
PERCEIVED BY PRINCIPAL RESPONDENTS IN THE STATE
OF TENNESSEE FOR THE 1984-85 SCHOOL YEAR

Strengths	Frequency	Percent of Responses (N=522)	Percent of Respondents (N=230)
Tennessee Instructional Model	124	23.75	53.91
Public Recognition of Education	111	21.26	48.26
Financial Rewards	99	11.11	43.04
Professional Growth	38	7.28	16.52
Recognition for Teacher Performances	32	6.13	13.91
Accountability	29	5.55	12.61
Computer Skills	18	3.45	7.83
Encourages Improvement	17	3.26	7.39
Creativity	14	2.68	6.09
Aides for Primary Grades	12	2.30	5.22
Evaluation	12	2.30	5.22
Basic Skills	9	1.72	3.91
Alternative School	7	1.34	3.04
Totals	522	100.00	

TABLE XXXVIII

MAJOR WEAKNESSES OF THE BETTER SCHOOLS PROGRAM AS PERCEIVED
BY PRINCIPAL RESPONDENTS IN THE STATE OF TENNESSEE
FOR THE 1984-85 SCHOOL YEAR

Weaknesses	Frequency	Percent of Responses (N=664)	Percent of Respondents (N=230)
Lack of Communication	119	17.92	51.74
Paperwork	111	16.72	48.26
Inconsistency	107	16.11	46.52
Too Much Too Soon	51	7.68	22.17
Takes Time From Teaching	43	6.48	18.70
Competitiveness	34	5.12	14.78
Poor Teachers Rewarded	32	4.82	13.91
Lack of Time to Implement	29	4.37	12.61
Teacher Stress	26	3.92	11.30
Harmful to Teacher Morale	24	3.61	10.43
Eliminates Creativity	21	3.16	9.13
Lack of Planning	21	3.16	9.13
Unreliability	19	2.86	8.26
Politics	15	2.26	6.52
Evaluators	12	1.81	5.22
Totals	664	100.00	

111 (48.26 percent) listed "paper work;" 107 (46.52 percent) listed "inconsistency;" 51 (22.17 percent) ranked "too much too soon;" 43 (18.70 percent) rated "takes time from teaching;" 34 (14.78 percent) rated "competitiveness;" 32 (13.91 percent) listed "poor teachers rewarded;" 29 (12.61 percent) listed "lack of time to implement;" 26 (11.30 percent) listed "teacher stress;" 24 (10.43 percent) listed "harmful to teacher morale;" 21 (9.13 percent) listed "lack of planning;" likewise, 21 (9.13 percent) listed "eliminates creativity;" 19 (8.26 percent) listed "unreliability;" 15 (6.52 percent) listed "politics;" and 12 (5.22 percent) listed "evaluators" as the major weakness of the Better Schools Program.

Discussion

Although principals had had little time to fully assimilate the implications of the Better Schools Program, they did respond to the perceived strengths and weaknesses of the program. The highest rated strength was the Tennessee Instructional Model (TIM) which was listed by 53.91 percent of the respondents. The inconsistency of the in-service programs was previously reported as principals. The Tennessee Instructional Model was considered a representation of a valid in-service program for teachers and principals. Obviously the respondents perceived some lack of fulfillment with current in-service programs and found TIM a valid substitute.

Secondly, respondents listed "public recognition of education" (48.26 percent) as a major strength of the Better Schools Program. As reported in the research, education was brought to the forefront of

public thought in Tennessee and the nation during the decade of the 1980's. Principal respondents apparently viewed this as a positive occurrence.

The respondents listed "financial rewards" (43.04 percent) as the third major strength of the Better Schools Program. The desire of principals for better financial compensation has previously been documented in this study.

Three major weaknesses were identified by the respondents concerning the Better Schools Program. First, "lack of communication" (51.74 percent) was illustrated by such comments as, "the program changes from day to day," "one person says one thing and another person changes it," "you never know who really knows the answers," and "who is really in charge." The lack of communication was directed toward the State Department of Education and not local systems.

"Inconsistency" (46.52 percent) was closely related to "lack of communication" by the type of comments that were made. Principals desired some program stability rather than the continual change exhibited by a typical comment that the entire program was "too much too soon." Principals reported that lack of sufficient planning was responsible for much of the inconsistency.

Principal respondents listed "paper work" (48.26 percent) as the third major weakness of the Better Schools Program. This compared with 27.29 percent who listed "paper work" as the third largest constraint on their job as an administrator. Obviously, principals felt burdened with the amount of paperwork required by implementation of the Better Schools Program.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

I. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this chapter is to summarize the study. Several major conclusions arising out of the study are drawn. Additionally, a final section lists some recommendations.

II. SUMMARY

The early 1980's saw a dramatic rise in public awareness toward education. One of the primary concerns of educational reformers was the leadership role of the school principal. The passage of the Comprehensive Education Reform Act in 1984 placed the Tennessee public school principal in a critical position. Little formative data existed concerning Tennessee principals and their attitudes. Without a valid data base educational policy makers were inconsistent in their proposed reforms.

The Purpose of the Study

This research was conducted for three main purposes. First, data were needed concerning current principals and how to design effective programs for their improvement. Finally, data were needed concerning the principals perceptions of the Better Schools Program. Second, a data base was needed for use in planning programs for future principals.

Procedures

The process of gathering data for this study was directly related to a review of the literature pertaining to the principalship, and a review of a study conducted in 1983 by the Georgia Professional Standards Commission.

For the purpose of this study, the researcher adapted a survey instrument developed by the Georgia Professional Standards Commission. Permission was obtained from the Commission for use and adaptation of the questionnaire to gather the data. The adaptation was then field tested by the investigator with graduate education students at East Tennessee State University. The final version, the Tennessee Administrator Questionnaire, resulted. (See Appendix B.)

Sample

The population for this study was all principals employed in public schools in Tennessee during the 1984-85 school year. From the population of 1,708 principals, a random sample of 316 was selected for participation in the study.

Data Collection

The data for this study were collected by means of the Tennessee Administrator Questionnaire which was mailed to a random sample (N=316) of all public school principals in Tennessee during the spring of 1985.

Treatment of Data

The Statistical Analysis System (SAS) was used to tabulate the data generated by the questionnaire. Services of The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, Computing Center were utilized to key-punch the data on cards. The chi-square test was used to determine significant relationships between the current and ideal roles of the principal respondents.

Analyzing and comparing the processed data revealed the major findings of the study. Based on the major findings of the study, conclusions were drawn. These conclusions allowed implications to be made for the improvement of the principalship in Tennessee.

Findings

The typical Tennessee principal was a married, white male almost 45 years of age. Principals had served their current school almost 8 years and had been a principal for about 11 years. Almost half held a masters as their highest degree. Almost three-fourths supported the concept of merit pay for principals and almost one-half held additional jobs. They also desired additional income for their 53.5 hour work week. Their average annual salary was \$26,601 with West Tennessee and urban principals receiving the highest salaries. Almost one-half of the principals reported their schools were located in rural areas.

Principals perceived their most important current role to be a school manager, but over 80 percent felt their ideal role should be as an instructional leader. The most important reason for becoming a

principal was to improve income. Almost three-fourths had obtained their principal's certification prior to entering the profession.

Approximately 50 percent of the principals found insufficient preparation in their undergraduate programs. One-third thought their graduate programs were very helpful and almost 90 percent believed they were of at least some help. Almost one-half of the principals were indifferent to in-service programs but over 40 percent found them to be more satisfactory than not. They were mostly satisfied with the administrator certification standards. Approximately three-fourths had applied for Career Ladder certification but almost one-half reported no system of evaluation for principals. Almost two-thirds of the principals were satisfied with their own job performance and the quality of education in Tennessee.

Principals exerted their greatest authority in determining extra-curricular activities and in evaluation of instruction. However, they perceived little authority in the selection and retention of personnel. Principals faced many constraints in the operation of a school; chief among them were lack of time, lack of financial resources, and the amount of paper work.

The Better Schools Program was perceived by the principals to have three major strengths: the Tennessee Instructional Model, bringing public recognition to education, and the financial rewards. The major weaknesses were lack of communication, inconsistency, and burdensome paper work.

III. CONCLUSIONS

The findings of this study present evidence to substantiate certain logical conclusions. Based on a thorough review of the literature, a review of the Georgia study, and the data in this study, the following conclusions were reached:

1. Principals desire more financial compensation for the time they work and the magnitude of their responsibility.
2. Discrepancies exist between the current and ideal roles of the principal due to several conditions.
3. Principals may not be adequately prepared for their job based on their perceptions of preparation programs and continuing in-service programs.
4. Principals desire more authority in the selection and retention of personnel.
5. Principals are basically satisfied with their job and the quality of education which implies that principals will likely remain in administration.
6. Specific job requirements could become a deterrence to principals remaining in the job or prospective administrators entering the profession.
7. Lack of time was viewed as a serious impediment to the effectiveness of the principal.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

The conclusions drawn from the data presented in this study have implications for all principals, local school systems,

institutions of higher education, and the state department of education. There are also some implications for further research on the principalship in Tennessee.

1. A study should be undertaken by the state department of education to determine the feasibility of increasing financial compensation for principals.

2. Since there are discrepancies between the current and ideal roles of the principal, assistance should be provided to current and prospective principals to help clarify their roles.

3. Schools of higher education and local school systems should develop strong preparation and continuing in-service programs for current and prospective principals.

4. Principals should be given more authority in the selection and retention of personnel.

5. A longevity study should be conducted to determine the principals' desire to remain in the profession.

6. Personnel should be provided to principals to assist with clerical and minor administrative tasks.

7. A study of principal perceptions should be conducted at regular intervals and compared with past research to determine what changes, if any, have taken place and what additional changes are needed.

8. A more current study should examine the attitudes of principals relative to the Better Schools Program after another year of implementation.

9. A future study should examine the viability of the instructional leadership role for principals.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abbott, Max G. "The Social Psychology of Organizations." Educational Administration Quarterly, Winter 1967, pp. 101-102.
- Abramowitz, Susan and Ellen Tenebaum. High School '77: A Survey of Public Secondary School Principals. (Washington, D.C.: National Institute of Education, 1978).
- Albrecht, James E. A National Study of Principals' Attitudes Toward School Improvement Recommendations. (Cedar Falls, Iowa: University of Northern Iowa, 1985) 17.
- _____. "How Do Principals View School Improvement Recommendations." NASSP Bulletin, December 1984, 99.
- Ambach, Gordon M. "State and Local Action for Education in New York." Phi Delta Kappan, November 1984, 204.
- A Nation at Risk. (Washington, D.C.: National Commission on Excellence in Education), 1983.
- Anthony, Robert N. "Can Non-Profit Organizations Be Well Managed?" in Managing Non-Profit Organizations, edited by Diane Borst and Patrick J. Montana (New York: Amacom, 1977).
- Arikado, Marjorie and Donald Musella. "Toward an Objective Evaluation of the School Principal." OCLEA, January 1975, 13-15. EJ 110 937.
- A Statistical Search for Unusually Effective Schools. (Santa Monica, California: Rand Corporation, 1973).
- Andrew, Milton A. "The Principal's Leadership Role: Perceptions of Teachers, Principals and Superintendents." Education, Spring 1981, 172-179.
- Balderson, James H. "Principal Power Bases: Some Observations." Canadian Administrator, April 1975, 1-5. EJ 115 902.
- Baltzell, D. Catherine and Robert A. Dentler. Selecting American School Principals: A Sourcebook for Educators. (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1983) 1.
- Barracough, Terry. Evaluation of School Administrators. (Eugene, Oregon: ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, University of Oregon, 1974) 2-3. ED 094 448.

- Barth, Roland S. "Can We Make a Match of Schools and Universities?" Education Week, November 28, 1984, 24.
- _____. "Outside Looking In--Inside Looking In." Principal's Center Newsletter, Fall 1984, 3.
- _____. "The Professional Development of Principals." Educational Leadership, October 1984, 93.
- _____ and Terrance E. Deal. "The Principalship: Views from Within and Without." In The Effective Principal (Reston, Virginia: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1982) 30-33.
- Bartoo, Eugene. "Cycles of School Criticism." Tennessee Educational Leadership. Fall 1983, 56.
- Baughman, Marion. "Attitudes and Perceptions of a Selected Sample of Women Senior High School Teachers Toward Becoming School Administrators in the Detroit Public Schools." Dissertation Abstracts International, 38, 1977, 6420A.
- Belcher, David W. "Pay for Performance." Compensation Review, Third Quarter 1980, 16-17.
- Bell, Terrel H. "American Education at a Crossroads." Phi Delta Kappan, April 1984, 532-534.
- Bellon, Elner C. and Jerry J. Bellon. "Merit Pay and Other Incentive Programs: Characteristics, Considerations, and Expectations." Tennessee Educational Leadership, Fall 1983, 75.
- Benjamin, Robert. Making Schools Work. (New York: The Continuum Publishing Company, 1981).
- Bennis, Warren G. "Leadership Theory and Administrative Behavior: The Problem of Authority." Administrative Science Quarterly, Summer 1959, 261-264.
- Berreth, Diane G. "The Politics of Policy Making." Educational Leadership, October 1984, 50-51.
- Bidwell, Charles E. "The School as a Formal Organization." In Handbook of Organizations edited by James G. March. (Chicago, Illinois: Rand-McNalley, 1965).
- Bloom, Benjamin S. Human Characteristics and School Learning. (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1976).

Blumberg, Arthur and William D. Greenfield. The Effective Principal: Perspectives on School Leadership. (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1980).

_____. Industrial Democracy: The Sociology of Participation. (London, England: Constable, 1968).

Brainard, Edward. "Individualizing Administrator In-Service Education." Thrust for Educational Leadership, April 1973, 29-33.

Bridge, R. Gary, Charles M. Judd and Peter M. Moock. The Determinants of Educational Outcomes: The Impact of Families, Peers, Teachers, and Schools. (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Ballinger Publishing Company, 1979).

Bridges, Edwin M. "Teacher Participation in Decision Making." Administrator's Notebook, May 1964, 1-4.

_____. and M. E. Baehr. "The Future of Administrator Selection Procedures." Administrator's Notebook, May 1971, 1-4.

Brieschke, Patricia A. "Principals in Schools: Insubordination in Discretionary Decision Making." Educational Forum, Winter 1985, 158-159.

Brimm, Jack L. and Daniel J. Tollett. In-service Education in Tennessee. (Nashville, Tennessee: Tennessee School Board Association, 1974).

Briner, Conrad and Lawrence Iannaccone. "Selected Power Relationships in Education." Educational Administration Quarterly, Autumn 1966, 193-194.

Brittain, Jack W. and John H. Freeman. "Organizational Proliferation and Density Dependent Selection." In The Organizational Life Cycle edited by John R. Kimberly and Robert H. Miles (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1980).

Broadman, Gerald R. and Myrna Cassel. "How Well Does the Public Know Its School Boards?" Phi Delta Kappan, June 1983, 740.

Brookover, Wilbur B., Laurence Beamer, Helen Efthim, Douglas Hathaway, Lawrence Lezotte, Stephen Miller, Joseph Passalacqua, and Louis Tornatzky. Creating Effective Schools, (Holmes Beach, Florida: Learning Publications, 1982).

_____, Charles Beady, Patricia Flood, John Schweitzer, and Joe Wisenbaker. School Social Systems and Student Achievement: Schools Can Make A Difference. (Brooklyn, N.Y.: Praeger Publishers, 1979).

- _____. "Elementary School Social Climate and School Achievement." American Educational Research Journal, Spring 1978, 301.
- Brown, Alan F. and John H. House. "The Organizational Component in Education." Review of Educational Research, October 1967, 399-403.
- Brown, Charles E. "The Principal as Learner." The National Elementary Principal, July-August 1974, 19-23.
- Bruner, James S. The Relevance of Education. (New York, New York: Norton, 1971).
- Byrne, David R., Susan A. Hines, and Lloyd E. McCleary. The Senior High School Principalship. (Reston, Virginia: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1978).
- Cain, Regina Ann. "Collective Negotiation Attitudes and Principal Leadership Style." Dissertation Abstracts, 41A, 1980, 862-863A.
- Caldwell, Sarah D. and F. H. Wood. "Inservice Readiness: Do We Have the Cart Before the Horse?" The Developer, June 1981, 211.
- Campbell, Roald E. "The Evaluation of Administrative Performance." Paper presented at the annual convention of the American Association of School Administrators, Atlantic City, February 1971, 7-10. ED 050 452.
- _____. "Time for Vigorous Leadership in the Public Schools." In Bad Times, Good Schools edited by Jack Frymier. (West Lafayette, Indiana: Kappa Delta Pi, 1983).
- Canady, Robert Lynn and Phyllis R. Hotchkiss. "School Improvement Without Additional Cost." Phi Delta Kappan, November 1984, 183.
- Carrick, Charles. Tennessee Academy for School Leaders: An Overview. (Nashville, Tennessee: State Department of Education, 1984).
- Cawalti, Gordon. "Effective Instructional Leadership Produces Greater Learning ." Thrust for Educational Leadership, January 1980, 8-9.
- Chandler, Rod. "Upgrading a School System with Fair State Funding." American Education, August-September 1984, 27-28.

- Chapman, D. W. and S. M. Hutcheson. "Attrition from Teaching Careers: A Discriminant Analysis." American Educational Research Journal, September 1982, 103.
- Charters, W. W., Jr. "The Relation of Morale to Turnover Among Teachers." American Educational Research Journal, May 1965, 163-173.
- Clark, David L. and Linda S. Lotto. "Principals in Instructionally Effective Schools." In The Role of the Principal edited by Deborah Burnett Strother. (Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa, 1983).
- Cohen, Michael and A. Lorri Manasse. "Effective Principals." School Administrator, November 1982, 14-16.
- Cooper, Bruce S. "Collective Bargaining for School Administrators Four Years Later." Phi Delta Kappan, October 1979, 130-131.
- Cotton, Kenneth and W. G. Savard. The Principal As Instructional Leader. Research on School Effectiveness Project: Topic Summary Report. (Portland, Oregon: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, 1980). ED 214 702.
- Cremin, Lawrence A. "Public Education and the Education of the Public." Teachers College Record, September 1975, 11.
- Cross, Patricia K. "The Rising Tide of School Reform Reports." Phi Delta Kappan, November 1984, 168.
- Cross, Ray. "What Makes an Effective Principal?" Principal, March 1981, 19.
- Crowson, Robert L. and Cynthia Porter-Gehrie. "The Discretionary Behavior of Principals in Large City Schools." Educational Administration Quarterly, Spring 1980, 45-46.
- _____ and Cynthia Porter-Gehrie. "The School Principalship: An Organizational Stability Role." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, 1980, 9.
- Cuban, Larry. "Effective Schools: A Friendly but Cautionary Note." Phi Delta Kappan, June 1983, 695.
- _____. "School Reform by Remote Control: SB 813 in California." Phi Delta Kappan, November 1984, 214.
- _____. "Transforming the Frog into a Prince: Effective Schools Research, Policy, and Practice at the District Level." Harvard Educational Review, May 1984, 148-149.

- Culbertson, Katherine and Mark Thompson. "An Analysis of Supervisory Training Needs." Training and Development Journal, February 1980, 58.
- Cusick, Phillip A. "Secondary School Structure: A Critical Dilemma." NASSP Bulletin, December 1981, 40-50.
- Danley, W. Elzie, Sr., and Barbara G. Burch. "Teacher Perceptions of the Effective Instructional Leader." Clearing House, October 1978, 78.
- Darling-Hammond, Linda. Beyond the Commission Reports: The Coming Crisis in Teaching. (Santa Monica, California: The Rand Corporation, 1984).
- _____ and Arthur E. Wise. "Teaching Standards or Standardized Teaching?" Educational Leadership, October 1983, 66-69.
- Davis, O. L., Jr. "Pointing the Right Direction: Toward the Invention of Our Futures." In Bad Times, Good Schools edited by Jack Frymier. (West Lafayette, Indiana: Kappa Delta Pi, 1983) 101-103.
- Deal, J. E. and L. D. Celotti. "How Much Influence Do (And Can) Educational Administrators Have on Classrooms?" Phi Delta Kappan, July 1980, 471-473.
- Deci, Edward L. "The Hidden Cost of Rewards." Organizational Dynamics, Winter 1976, 61-72.
- Diederich, Wayne Francis. "The Effect of Collective Negotiations on Selected Areas of the Principal's Role as Perceived by Connecticut High School Principals." Dissertation Abstracts, 39A, 1978, 7073-7044.
- Denbo, Sheryl and Marlene Ross. The Effective Principal: Achieving Equity and Excellence in Schools. (Washington, D.C.: American University, The Mid-Atlantic Center of Sex Equity), June 1983, 12. ED 244 009.
- Dodge, Harold. "Determining Appropriate Goals for Secondary Schools: The Precursor of Effectiveness." NASSP Bulletin, October 1983, 167.
- Doob, Heather S. Internship Programs in Educational Administration. (Washington, D.C.: Educational Research Service, 1974). ED 098 706.

- Doremus, Richard. "What Ever Happened to...Kalamazoo's Merit Pay Plan?" Phi Delta Kappan, February 1982, 409.
- Duke, Daniel L. "What Can Principals Do? Leadership Functions and Instructional Effectiveness." NASSP Bulletin, October 1982, 10-12.
- _____, Bruce Showers and M. Imber. "Teachers and Shared Decision Making: The Costs and Benefits of Involvement." Educational Administration Quarterly, Winter 1980, 98.
- Edmonds, Ronald. "Effective Schools for the Urban Poor." Educational Leadership, October 1979, 23.
- Edmonds, Ronald R. "Programs of School Improvement: An Overview." Educational Leadership, December 1982, 6-7.
- English, Fenwick W. Incentives for Excellence in America's Schools. (Alexandria, Virginia: American Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1985).
- _____. "Still Searching for Excellence." Educational Leadership, December 1984-January 1985, 34-35.
- _____, Samuel Francis, and James Schmunk. "The Dilemma of Being in the Middle: A Contemporary View of the Principalship." NASSP Bulletin, February 1962, 96-100.
- Epstein, Benjamin. Principals: An Organized Force for Leadership. (Reston, Virginia: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1974). ED 090 697.
- Erlandson, David A. "An Organizing Strategy for Manager Change in the School." NASSP Bulletin, April 1980, 7.
- Fancher, Ted A. and Thomas H. Buxton. "A Job Satisfaction Profile of the Female Secondary School Principal in the United States." NASSP Bulletin, January 1984, 32-39.
- Farley, R. David. "Principal Effectiveness: It's No Mystery." Principal, September 1982, 48.
- Fauth, Gloria C. "Women in Educational Administration: A Research Profile." The Educational Forum, Fall 1984, 74.
- Feistritzer, C. Emily. The Condition of Teaching: A State by State Analysis. (New York: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1983).

- Fiedler, Fred B. "The Leadership Game: Matching the Man to the Situation." Organizational Dynamics, Spring 1977, 9.
- Fields, Joseph C. "Principals and Management Training Needs." NASSP Bulletin, February 1982, 37.
- Filley, Alan C., Robert J. House and Steven Kerr. Managerial Process and Organizational Behavior. (Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company, 1976).
- Fireston, William A. and Bruce L. Wilson. Using Bureaucratic and Cultural Linkages to Improve Instruction: The High School Principal's Contribution. (Eugene, Oregon: Center for Educational Policy and Management, University of Oregon, 1983).
- Frederick, Wayne C. and Herbert J. Walberg. "Learning as a Function of Time." Journal of Educational Research, March-April 1980, 199-201.
- French, Russell L. "Dispelling the Myths About Tennessee's Career Ladder Program." Educational Leadership, December 1984-January 1985, 9-13.
- Friedberg, H. Jerome. "Master Teacher Programs: Lessons from the Past." Educational Leadership, December 1984-January 1985, 16-21.
- Friedlander, Frank. "Performance and Interactional Dimensions of Organizational Work Groups." Journal of Applied Psychology, April 1966, 258-259.
- Frymier, Jack. "Merit Pay-Yes! Vouchers-No!" Educational Forum, Fall 1981, 6.
- Gallo, Vincent A. Should We Abolish or Retain the Principalship? (Eugene, Oregon: Oregon School Study Council, College of Education, 1970) 2-9. ED 081 076.
- Gaslin, William L. "Evaluation of Administrative Performance by a School's Teaching Staff." NASSP Bulletin, December 1974, 72-81.
- Genek, Frederic H. and Allen J. Klingenberg. The School Board's Responsibility: Effective Schools Through Effective Management (Springfield, Illinois: Illinois Association of School Boards, 1978).

- Georgiades, William D. H. Excellence in Schooling: Effective Styles for Effective Schools. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, Las Vegas, February 1974. ED 246 53.
- Gersten, Russell, Douglas Carnine and Susan Green. "The Principal as Instructional Leader: A Second Look." Educational Leadership, December 1982, 47-49.
- Getzels, Jacob W. and Egon G. Guba. "Social Behavior and the Administrative Process." School Review, Winter 1957, 81-84.
- Giammatteo, Michael and Delores. Forces on Leadership. (Reston, Virginia: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1981).
- Gideonse, Hendrick D. "State Education Policy in Transition: Teacher Education." Phi Delta Kappan, November 1984, 205.
- Goldhammer, Keith G. and Gary Becker. Elementary School Principals and Their Schools. (Eugene, Oregon: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, 1971).
- Goodlad, John I. "Staff Development: The League Model." Theory Into Practice, October 1972, 207-214.
- _____. "A Study of Schooling: Some Implications for School Improvement." Phi Delta Kappan, April 1983, 555.
- _____. "The Problem of Getting Markedly Better Schools." In Bad Times, Good Schools edited by Jack Frymier. (West Lafayette, Indiana: Kappa Delta Pi, 1983).
- _____. What Schools Are For. (Los Angeles: University of California, Institute for Development of Educational Activities, Inc., 1979).
- Gordon, Marshall. "Conflict and Liberation: Personal Aspects of the Mathematics Experience." Curriculum Inquiry, Fall 1978, 252.
- Graham, Patricia Albjerg. "Wanting it All." The Wilson Quarterly, New Year's 1984, 47-77.
- Grant, Ed A. "Priority-Performance Congruency in Eight Areas of Key Instructional Responsibilities of Senior High School Principals." (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Texas at Austin, 1978).

- Greenfield, William D. "Research on School Principals: An Analysis." In The Effective Principal. (Reston, Virginia: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1982).
- Hager, James L. and L. E. Scarr. "Effective Schools--Effective Principals: How to Develop Both." Educational Leadership, February 1983, 39.
- Hall, Gene and Susan Loucks. "Teacher Concerns as a Basis for Facilitating and Personalizing Staff Development." Teachers College Record, January 1978, 46-47.
- _____, William L. Rutherford, Shirley M. Hord, Leslie L. Huling. "Effects of Three Principal Styles on School Improvement." Educational Leadership, December 1982, 47-49.
- Harder, Martha and Karen Wade. "Superintendents View Women as Capable School Managers. However..." Tennessee Educational Leadership, Fall 1984, 90.
- Hatley, Richard V. and Buddy R. Pennington. "Role Conflict Resolution Behavior of High School Principals." Educational Administration Quarterly, Autumn 1975, 66-84.
- Hauskin, Chester A. "Estimating Sample Size." Journal of Research Services, December 1963, 3.
- Heichberge, Robert L. "Creating the Climate for Humanistic Change in the Elementary School with Principal as Change Agent." Education, Winter 1975, 110.
- Hellriegel, Don and J. W. Slocum, Jr. "Managerial Problem-Solving Styles." Business Horizons, December 1975, 29-32.
- Henderson, John C. and Paul C. Nutt. "The Influence of Decision Style on Decision Making Behavior." Management Science, April 1980, 99-114.
- Henthorn, James. Principal Effectiveness--A Review of the Literature. (Blasingame, California: Association of California School Administrators, 1980).
- Hersey, Paul W. "The NASSP Assessment Center Develops Leadership Talent." Principal, February 1982, 370-371.
- Higley, Jerry. Inservice Training for Staff and Administrators. (Arlington, Virginia: National Association of Elementary School Principals, 1972).

- Hill, John and Mary Schlueter. "Some Schools Develop Future Educational Leaders." Kappa Delta Pi Record, Winter 1985, 55-57.
- Hodgkinson, Harold L. "What Principals Can Do to Manage Schools in the '80s." NASSP Bulletin, February 1982, 42.
- Hoban, Gary J. "The School Without a Principal." In The Power to Change: Issues for the Innovative Educator edited by Carmen M. Culver and Gary J. Hoban (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1973), 145-146.
- Hord, Shirley M., L. L. Huling, and Suzanne M. Stiegelbauer. An Analysis of Interventions in School Improvements Efforts. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, 1983, 8.
- Houlihan, G. Thomas. "Using the Right Variable in Measuring School Effectiveness." NASSP Bulletin, October 1983, 178.
- House, Robert J. "A Path-Goal Theory of Leader Effectiveness." Administrative Science Quarterly, Fall 1971, 323-324.
- _____ and T. R. Mitchell. "Path-Goal Theory of Leadership." Journal of Contemporary Business, April 1974, 71-72.
- Huddle, Gene. "How Complex Is the Principal's Job? What Actions Can Principals Take To Be More Effective?" NASSP Bulletin, December 1984, 62-67.
- Hunt, Governor James B., Jr. "Education for Economic Growth: A Crucial Investment." Phi Delta Kappan, April 1984, 539.
- Hunter, Madeline. "Knowing, Teaching, and Supervising." In Using What We Know About Teaching edited by Philip L. Hosford. (Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1984).
- Hurst, David K. "Of Boxes, Bubbles, and Effective Management." Harvard Business Review, May-June 1984, 482.
- Hustin, Gilbert R. "Exemplary Schools and the Search for Effectiveness." Educational Leadership, October 1979, 11.
- Iannaccone, Laurence. "Community Education and Turning Point Election Periods." In Community, Educational, and Social Impact Perspectives edited by Donna Hager Schoeny and Larry E. Decker. (Charlottesville, Virginia: Mid-Atlantic Center for Community Education, University of Virginia, 1983).

- Jackson, Shirley A. "Instructional Leadership Behaviors: Differentiating Effective from Ineffective Low-Income Urban Schools." Urban Education, April 1983, 59-70.
- Jaffee, Charles, James Bender, and O. L. Calvert. "The Assessment Center Technique: A Validation Study." Management of Personnel Quarterly, Fall 1970, 9-14.
- Johnson, David W. and Roger T. Johnson. "The Principal's Role." Curriculum Report, October 1984, 4.
- Johnson, Susan Moore. Teacher Unions and the Schools. (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Institute for Educational Policy Study, Harvard University, 1982).
- Johnston, Mary Anne. "Providing for the Intellectual and Philosophical Development of Prospective Teachers." Phi Delta Kappan, January 1984, 361-362.
- Kasper, Harold. "The Effects of Collective Bargaining on Public School Teachers' Salaries." Industrial and Labor Relations Review, October 1970, 57-58.
- Keedy, John. "Norm Setting as a Component of Principal Effectiveness." (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1982).
- Keefe, James W. "School Applications of the Learning Style Concept." In Student Learning Styles. (Reston, Virginia: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1979).
- Kelley, James M. and James A. Wold. "The Scope of Teacher Negotiations: A Perspective for Tennessee Educators." TASCD Journal, Fall 1979, 5-13.
- Kelley, Marie E. "Same Faces, New Skills." Principal, February 1982, 372-373.
- Keppel, Francis. "Social Context of Educational Policy." Journal of Education Finance, Summer 1977, 5.
- Kimbrough, Ralph B. "The Behavioral Characteristics of Effective Educational Administrators." Educational Administration and Supervision, November 1959, 337-348.
- Kirst, Michael W. "The Changing Balance in State and Local Power to Control Education." Phi Delta Kappan, November 1984, 189-190.
- Klopf, Gordon J. The Principal and Staff Development in the School. (New York: Bank Street College of Education, 1979).

- _____, Ethel Scheldon, and Kevin Brennan. "The Essentials of Effectiveness: A Job Description for Principals." Principal, March 1982, 32.
- Knoll, Jerry C. "The Principal Belongs with Management in Professional Negotiations." TASCD Journal, Fall, 1979, 32-37.
- Krajewski, Robert J. "Instructional Improvement: A Co-op Venture." Kappa Delta Pi Record, February 1979, 58-59.
- _____. "Texas Principals--Implications for Perceived Roles." NASSP Bulletin, December 1977, 16-19.
- _____. "The Elementary Principal's Role: A Perspective." The Educational Catalyst, Winter 1975, 11-15.
- Kramer, Mary Jo. Applying the Characteristics of Effective Schools to Professional Development. (Manchester: Connecticut Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, March 1980), 2. ED 210 322.
- Kritek, William J. "Lessons from the Literature on Implementation." Educational Administration Quarterly, Fall 1976, 86-87.
- Kroeze, David J. "Effective Principals as Instructional Leaders: New Directions for Research." Administrator's Notebook, September 1983, 3.
- Lachance, Roger. "A Nation at Risk--Principal's Viewpoint." NASSP Bulletin, March 1984, 47.
- Lane, Willard R. "Authority and Responsibility--A Need to Reshuffle the Deck." The Executive Review, March 1983, 7.
- Latham, Gary P. and Gary A. Yukl, "A Review of the Research on the Application of Goal Setting in Organizations." Academy of Management Journal, November 1975, 832.
- _____. and L. M. Saar. "Application of Social-Learning Theory to Training Supervisors Through Behavior Modeling." Journal of Applied Psychology, May 1979, 239-246.
- Leithwood, Kenneth A. and Deborah J. Montgomery. "Obstacles Preventing Principals From Becoming More Effective." Education and Urban Society, November 1984, pp. 73-74.
- _____. and Deborah J. Montgomery. "Patterns of Growth in Principal Effectiveness." A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, 1984, 69.

- _____ and Deborah J. Montgomery. "The Role of the Elementary Principal in Program Improvement." Review of Educational Research, Fall 1982, 310-311.
- _____ and R. A. MacDonald. "Reasons Given By Teachers for Their Curriculum Choices." Canadian Journal of Education, June 1981, 111-112.
- Levin, H. M. "How Important is Teacher Experience?" Integrated Education, May 1971, 25-26.
- Lewis, Jerry. Ideas For Tomorrow, Choices For Today. (Washington, D.C.: House Republican Research Committee, 1985).
- Lift, Michael D. and Douglas C. Tank. Stress, Dissatisfaction, and Intention to Leave Teaching in Experienced Public School Teachers. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada, April 1983, 3.
- Lipham, James J. Effective Principal, Effective School. (Reston, Virginia: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1981).
- Lipsky, Michael. Street-level Bureaucracy: Dilemmas of the Individual in Public Services. (New York: Basic Books, 1980).
- Livingston, J. Sterling. "Myth of the Well Educated Manager." Harvard Business Review, January-February 1971, 76-77.
- Look, Ellen and Richard Manatt. "Evaluating Principal Performance with Improved Criteria." NASSP Bulletin, December 1984, 76-81.
- Lortie, Dan C. "The Balance of Control and Autonomy in Elementary School Teaching." In The Semi-Professors and Their Organization: Teachers, Nurses, Social Workers edited by Amitai Etzioni (New York: The Free Press, 1969).
- Lorzeau, G. A. "The Role of the Principal Today." North Central Association Quarterly, Fall 1977, 98.
- Louis, Karen and Ronald Corwin. "Organizational Decline: How State Agencies React." Education and Urban Society, February 1984, 180.
- Manasse, A. Lorri. "Effective Principal: Effective at What?" Principal, March 1982, 28.
- March, James G. "American Public School Administration: A Short Analysis." School Review, February 1978, 233.

- _____. "Analytical Skills and the University Training of Educational Administrators." Education and Urban Society, August 1974, 382.
- Marlowe, John. "Why I Almost Joined a Principals Union." The American School Board Journal, April 1980, 49-50.
- Martin, Antley Elizabeth. "Creativity in Educational Administration." Journal of Experimental Education, Summer 1966, 21-27.
- Mattson, Robert. Educational Effectiveness. (Eugene, Oregon: Center for Educational Policy and Management, University of Oregon, 1983).
- Mayher, Laurence T. "Administrator Unions: Do They Strengthen or Weaken the Principalship?" NASSP Bulletin, January 1984, 40.
- McCabe, Dennis P. and Jack Compton. Role Acquisition and Competency Development of Educational Administrators in the Lower Rio Grande Valley, 1974, 22-75. ED 130 383.
- McCoy, Susan S. and Geralyn R. Shreve. "Principals--Why Are Some More Successful Than Others in Implementing Change?" NASSP Bulletin, September 1983, 96-99.
- McIntyre, Kenneth E. and Ed A. Grant. "How Principals, Teachers, and Superintendents View the Principalship." NASSP Bulletin, February 1980, 44-49.
- McPherson, R. Bruce, Columbus Salley, and Melany Baehr. "What Principals Do: Preliminary Implications of 'A National Occupational Analysis of the School Principalship.'" Consortium Currents, Fall 1975, 1-10.
- Melvin, Leland D. "Preparing Future Principals." NASSP Bulletin, December 1977, 54-58.
- Merrow, Jon, Richard Foster and Nolan Ester. "Networking: A White Paper on the Preparation of School Administrators." The National Elementary Principal, July-August 1974, 8-18.
- Meyer, Herbert H. "The Pay-for-Performance Dilemma." Organizational Dynamics, Winter 1975, 40-41.
- Miller, Stephen K. "The Effective School." The Practitioner, October 1984, 1-5.
- Miskell, Cecil G. "Principal's Perceived Effectiveness, Innovation Effort, and the School Situation." Educational Administration Quarterly, Winter 1977, 31.

- Mitchell, Douglas and Dennis Encarnation. "Alternative State Policy Mechanisms for Influencing School Performance." Educational Researcher, May 1984, 4-11.
- Moeller, Gerald H. and W. W. Charters, Jr. "Relations of Bureaucratization to Sense of Power Among Teachers." Administrative Science Quarterly, March 1966, 456-457.
- Mulder, Michael. "Power Equalization through Participation." Administrative Science Quarterly, March 1971, 31-38.
- "NASSP's Assessment Center: A New Step." NASSP Newsleader, November 1982, 1.
- Needham, Nancy R. "Principals: The New Breed." NEA Today, December 1984, 10-11.
- Nationwide Teacher Opinion Poll, 1983. (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1983) 6.
- Nystrand, Raphael O. "Leadership Theories for Principals." Theory Into Practice, Autumn 1981, 260.
- _____. "Leadership Theories for Principals." Theory Intro Practice, Autumn 1981, 260-263.
- _____ and Frederick Bertolaet. "Strategies for Allocating Human and Material Resources." Review of Educational Research, October 1967, 448.
- Odden, Allan. "Financing Educational Excellence." Phi Delta Kappan, January 1984, 311-318.
- Paddock, Susan. "Women's Career in Administration." Dissertation Abstract International, 38, 1978, 5834A.
- Parish, John. "Excellence in Education: Tennessee's 'Master' Plan." Phi Delta Kappan, June 1983, 724-772.
- Pellicer, Leonard O., Kenneth R. Stevenson and Thomas A. Surratt. "Do It First, Then Talk About It: A Principalship Practicum." Phi Delta Kappan, February 1984, 429.
- Persell, Caroline Hodges and Peter W. Cookson, Jr. "The Effective Principal." Paper presented for the National Institute of Education, Washington, D.C., October 1982, 13-15.
- _____ and Peter W. Cookson, Jr. "The Effective Principal in Action." In The Effective Principal. (Reston, Virginia: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1982).

Peterson, Kent D. Making Sense of Principal's Work. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association in Los Angeles, April 1981, 5.

_____. "The Principals' Tasks." Administrator's Notebook, December-January 1977-78, 1-4.

Pharis, William L. "Nine False Assumptions: A Critical View of Preparation Programs." The National Elementary School Principal, July-August 1974, 26-28.

_____. "The Evaluation of School Principals." The National Elementary Principal, February 1973, 36-38.

Pinero, Ursula C. "Wanted: Strong Instructional Leaders." Principal, March 1982, 16-19.

Pipho, Chris. "Stateline: Getting Schools on the Scoreboard." Phi Delta Kappan, December 1984, 237.

Pisapia, John Ralph and Jack D. Sells. "Administrator Protections in Negotiated Contracts." NASSP Bulletin, November 1978, 43-54.

Podsen, India. "My Child Has Poor Study Habits: Academic Excellence Begins at Home." American Education, August-September 1984, 30-32.

Pondexter, Candace. An Effective School: A Case Study. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the California Educational Research Association, November 1983, 4-5.

Postman, Neil. "Order in the Classroom!" Atlantic Monthly, September 1979, 35-38.

_____. and C. Weingartner. The Soft Revolution. (New York, New York: Delacorte, 1971).

Prasch, John C. "Reversing the Trend Toward Centralization." Educational Leadership, October 1984, 27.

Punkerson, Rya. "Wasted Days and Wasted Nights." NASSP Bulletin, December 1977, 26-29.

Purkey, Stewart C. and Marshall S. Smith. Effective Schools--A Review. (Madison, Wisconsin: the University of Wisconsin, June 1982).

_____. and Marshall S. Smith. "Too Soon to Cheer? Synthesis of Research on Effective Schools." Educational Leadership, December 1982, 67.

- Ralph, John H. and James Fennessey. "Science or Reform: Some Questions About the Effective Schools Model." Phi Delta Kappan, June 1983, 689-694.
- Randles, Harry E. "The Principal and Negotiated Contracts." National Elementary Principal, November-December 1975, 57-61.
- Redfern, George B. "Principals: Who's Evaluating Them, Why, and How?" Paper presented at the annual convention of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, Anaheim, California, March 1972, 6-7. ED 062 693.
- Renfro, William L. and James L. Morrison. "Anticipating and Managing Change in Educational Organizations." Educational Leadership, September 1983, 50.
- Richardson, Michael D. "Dilemmas of a Principal in Negotiations." Tennessee School Boards Association Bulletin, November-December 1981, 18-19.
- Roberts, Arthur D. and Gordon Cawalti. Redefining General Education in the American High School. (Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1984) 5-10.
- Rogus, Joseph F. "How Principals Can Strengthen School Performance." NASSP Bulletin, January 1983, 5-7.
- Roney, Anne. "Of Babies, Bathwater, and Bandwagons." Tennessee Educational Leadership, Fall 1983, 37-41.
- Rosenholtz, Susan J. and Mark A. Smylie. Teacher Compensation and Career Ladders: Policy Implications from Research. Paper commissioned by the Tennessee General Assembly's Select Committee on Education, December 1983, 18-19.
- Ross, John A. "Strategies for Curriculum Leadership." The Australian Administrator, October 1981, 3-4. ED 213 142.
- Rutherford, William L., Gene E. Hall and B. W. Newlove. "Describing the Concerns Principals Have About Facilitating Change." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, 1982, 3.
- Sarason, Seymour B. The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change. (Boston, Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon, 1982).
- _____. "The Principal and the Power to Change." The National Elementary Principal, July-August 1974, 49.

Sargent, Eugene Elmore. "The Effects of Teacher Collective Bargaining Upon the Role of Selected Elementary and Secondary Principals." Dissertation Abstracts, 40A, 1980, 3368-3369A.

Scheffler, Israel. "On the Education of Policymakers." Harvard Educational Review, May 1984, 159.

Schlechty, Phillip C. and Victor S. Vance. "Do Academically Able Teachers Leave Education? The North Carolina Case." Phi Delta Kappan, March 1981, 106-112.

Schmidt, Gene L. "What Motivates School Administrators?" NASSP Bulletin, November 1977, 49.

Schrag, Francis. "It's Time For Merit Pay." Learning, March 1985, 28.

Seldon, David. "The Function of the Teacher in Education and Its Reform." Journal of Teacher Education, Spring 1975, 30-34.

Sergiovanni, Thomas J. "Factors Which Affect Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction of Teachers." The Journal of Educational Administration, May 1967, 80-82.

_____. "Leadership and Excellence in Schooling." Educational Leadership, February 1984, 4.

Sexton, Patricia Cayo. The American School: A Sociological Analysis. (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1967).

Shane, Harold G. "Some Educational Consequences of Contemporary Social Disorientation." In Bad Times, Good Schools edited by Jack Frymier. (West Lafayette, Indiana: Kappa Delta Pi, 1983) 30.

Shrag, Peter. "End of the Impossible Dream." Saturday Review, September 1970, 68.

Silberman, Charles E. Crisis in the Classroom (New York, New York: Random House, 1970).

Smyth, W. John. "New Directions in the Study of the Principalship." Canadian Administrator, November 1982, 3.

_____. "The Principal as an Educational Leader: To Be or Not To Be?" The Australian Administrator, February 1980, 21-28.

Snyder, Karolyn J. "Preparing Principals to Manage Productive Schools: A Neglected Dimension of Teacher Education." Journal of Teacher Education, March-April 1984, 138.

- Spodek, Bernard. "The Pressure to Conform." The National Elementary Principal, May-June 1974, p. 19.
- Squires, David A., William G. Huitt and John H. Segars. Effective Schools and Classrooms: A Research-Based Perspective. (Alexandria, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1974), pp. 6-7.
- Statistics of Public Elementary and Secondary School Systems (Fall) 1979. (Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics, United States Department of Education, 1980), p. 19.
- Stedman, C. H. "Tennessee's Master Plans for Teachers, Supervisors, and Principals." Journal of Teacher Education, February 1983, pp. 55-58.
- Stephens, Thomas. "Innovative Teaching Practices: Their Relation to System Norms and Rewards." Educational Administration Quarterly, Winter 1974, pp. 35-43.
- Stern, David and Kate Bagley. "How Participants in Collective Bargaining for Public School Teachers in California Perceive the Interests of Teachers in Relation to Other Groups." Journal of Collective Negotiations in the Public Sector, Spring 1981, p. 72.
- Strother, Deborah Burnett. "The Many Roles of the Effective Principal." Phi Delta Kappan, December 1983, p. 293.
- Sweeney, James. "Research Synthesis on Effective School Leadership." Educational Leadership, February 1982, p. 352.
- _____ and Robert Pinckney. "Faculty Management: The Principal's Most Important Role." Spectrum, Fall 1983, pp. 3-6.
- Sykes, Gary. "The Deal." The Wilson Quarterly, New Year's 1984, p. 74.
- Tanner, James R. "Management Development for School Principals: A National Priority." In Training Educational Leaders: A Search for Alternatives. (Washington, D.C.: Institute for Educational Leadership, George Washington University, 1974), p. 89.
- Tennessee State Department of Education, 1983-84 Directory of Public Schools. (Nashville: State Department of Education, 1984), pp. 23-156.
- Tesolowski, Dennis and Thomas E. Morgan. "Selecting Educational Administrators: The Assessment Center Technique." NASSP Bulletin, February 1980, pp. 107-115.

- The Effect of Collective Bargaining on Teacher Salaries. (Vienna, Virginia: Public Service Research Council, 1982) 14.
- The Principal: A Crucial Element in Quality Education. (Atlanta, Georgia: The Professional Standards Commission, 1983).
- "The 'Spy Principle' Works for Selecting Principals." Education USA, March 24, 1982, 245-246.
- Thomas, A. Ross. "The Complexities of Educational Leadership." NASSP Bulletin, December 1977, 34-40.
- _____. "The Organizational Climate of Schools." International Review of Education, October 1976, pp. 441-456.
- Thomas, M. Donald. "The Complexities of Educational Leadership." NASSP Bulletin, December 1977, 38.
- Trask, Anne E. "Principals, Teachers, and Supervision: Dilemmas and Solutions." Administrator's Notebook, December 1964, 1-4.
- Traub, James. "Principals in Action." Harper's, May 1983, 12-13.
- Twenty-sixth Biennial Salary and Staff Survey of Public School Professional Personnel, 1972-73. (Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1973).
- Tye, Kenneth A. and Barbara Benham Tye. "Teacher Isolation and School Reform." Phi Delta Kappan. January 1984, 319-322.
- U.S. House of Representatives. Merit Task Pay Force Report. (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1974), 6-7.
- Vetter, Eric W. "Role Pressures and the School Principal." NASSP Bulletin, November 1976, 22.
- Vik, Phil. "A Response to A Nation at Risk: More Looking and Less Leaping." NASSP Bulletin, March 1984, 53.
- Walters, Donald L. Perceptions of Administrative Competencies, A Survey of School Principals and Superintendents, 1979, 37. ED 172 361.
- Wayson, William W. "A Proposal to Remake the Principalship." The National Elementary Principal, September-October 1974, 28-44.

- Wellisch, Jean, Anne MacQueen, Ronald Carriere, and Gary Duck. "School Management and Organization in Successful Schools." Sociology of Education, February 1978, 212-214.
- White, Daphne. "Can Merit Pay Work in Education?" American Educator, Winter 1983, 8.
- Williams, Patricia. "Career Aspirations of Selected Women Teachers as Related to Their Perceptions of the Chances of Success in Becoming a School Administrator." Dissertation Abstracts International, 38, 1978, 4507A.
- Wilms, Wellford. Public and Proprietary Vocational Training: A Study of Effectiveness. (Lexington, Massachusetts: D.C. Heath Co., 1975).
- Wilson, Ken. "An Effective School Principal." Educational Leadership, February 1982, 359-360.
- Wisniewski, Richard and Paul Kleine. "Teacher Moonlighting: A Unstudied Phenomenon." Phi Delta Kappan, April 1984, 553-555.
- Wochner, Raymond E., editor. Competency-Based Perception of Educational Administrators. Tasks, Competencies, and Indicators of Competencies. (Tempe: Arizona: Arizona State University, Bureau of Educational Research Services, 1977). ED 145 510.
- Wolcott, Harry. The Man in the Principal's Office: An Ethnography. (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1973).
- Wood, Carolyn J. "Participatory Decision Making: Why Doesn't It Seem to Work?" The Educational Forum, Fall 1984, 62.
- Wood, Fred H., Gil Johnson and Jon Paden. "Will This New Round of Recommendations for High Schools Make a Difference?" Educational Leadership, March 1984, 69.
- Wynn, Richard. "The Relationship of Collective Bargaining and Teacher Salaries, 1960 to 1980." Phi Delta Kappan, December 1981, 242.
- Yukl, Gary. "Managerial Leadership and the Effective Principal." In The Effective Principal. (Reston, Virginia: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1982) 2-4.
- Zander, Alvin. Groups at Work. (San Francisco: California: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1981).

Zechman, Harry T. "Are Principals Competent in the Instructional Leadership Domain?" NASSP Bulletin, December 1977, 22.

Zuelke, D. C. and L. E. Frohreich, "The Impact of Comprehensive Collective Negotiations on Teachers' Salaries: Some Evidence from Wisconsin." Journal of Collective Negotiations in the Public pector, Spring 1977, 87-88.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

LETTERS OF PERMISSION AND APPROVAL

"Home of the HIGHLANDERS"

Gatlinburg-Pittman
615/436-5637 - Route 3, Box 302*
Gatlinburg, Tennessee 37738* *High School*

February 24, 1984

Professional Standards Commission
1645 Tullie Circle, NE
Suite 105
Atlanta, Georgia 30329

Dear Sir:

Please find enclosed my personal check in the amount of six dollars (\$6.00) in payment for one copy of the report entitled "The Principal: A Crucial Element in Quality Education."

I would also like to request permission of the Commission to replicate the study in the state of Tennessee as a part of my dissertation at the University of Tennessee. I would like to use the questionnaire developed for your study with slight modifications for Tennessee. My major professor and I feel that the data generated would be useful to this state as we begin the Master Teacher/Principal program and also as a base for comparison between the two states.

Your approval of this request would be most appreciated.

In advance, thank you for your assistance and cooperation.

Sincerely,


Michael D. Richardson
Principal

MDR/ck

Enclosure



Professional Standards Commission

1645 Tullie Circle NE, Suite 105 • Atlanta, Georgia 30329 • (404) 656-2535

March 1, 1984

Suzann R. Harrison
Executive Secretary

Commission

Barbara R. Hatton
Chairman

Joyce Ann Brown
Sherman R. Day
Anne Flowers
Malvin Fraish
Carl E. Franklin
John Goodlett
Green E. Herr
Earline Loutermik
Gwendolyn Mundy
Peggy Neal
Louise Radloff
Werner Rogers
Karen E. Ruff
Edith Simsek
Jacquelyn Stephens
LeAnna Walton
Richard Young

Mr. Michael D. Richardson
Principal
Gatlinburg-Pittman High School
Route 3, Box 302
Gatlinburg, Tennessee 37738

Dear Mr. Richardson:

Thank you for your letter of February 24, 1984,
regarding The Principal: A Crucial Element in Quality
Education.

The Professional Standards Commission will be most
pleased for you to utilize information from the report
as a part of your dissertation at the University of
Tennessee. Please feel free to make any modifications
you feel necessary to meet your needs.

The Commission is extending its study of the
principal to include the preparation of administrators
in Georgia and the nation. I would like to take this
opportunity to request any information on your graduate
educational administration program (M.Ed./Ph.D.) including
a graduate catalog (school/department/college of education),
graduate student information package, and any additional
information about special programs or seminars for K-12.
Also, I would be interested in receiving materials
regarding the Master Principal program, if separate
from the preparation program.

Best wishes with your dissertation and the Master
Teacher/Principal program. If copies of reports from
your work become available, the Commission would be
pleased to receive them.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if I can supply
additional information about the report.

Sincerely

Suzann R. Harrison
Suzann R. Harrison
Executive Secretary

SRH:kh

APPENDIX B

TENNESSEE ADMINISTRATOR QUESTIONNAIRE

TENNESSEE

ADMINISTRATOR QUESTIONNAIRE

NOTE: PLEASE DO NOT WRITE YOUR NAME ON THE QUESTIONNAIRE. A SUBJECT NUMBER IS ATTACHED. THIS WILL BE USED SOLELY TO CONTACT YOU IF A FOLLOW-UP IS NECESSARY. AFTER RECEIPT OF THE COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE, ALL IDENTIFYING INFORMATION WILL BE DESTROYED. THE DATA WILL BE ANALYZED BY THE RESEARCHER, AND ONLY GROUP DATA WILL BE REPORTED. STRICT CONFIDENTIALITY WILL BE MAINTAINED BY THE RESEARCHER.

DIRECTIONS: PLEASE CHECK THE CORRECT RESPONSE OR WRITE IN YOUR ANSWER FOR EACH QUESTION. IF MORE SPACE IS NEEDED, PLEASE ATTACH ADDITIONAL SHEET(S). THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR COOPERATION.

1. Please write in the school system in which your school is located.

_____ (school system)

2. The city/town in which your school is located is predominantly:

- ☐ Urban
- ☐ Suburban
- ☐ Rural (farming)
- ☐ Rural (non-farming)

3. Please estimate the average family income of the majority of students who attend your school?

\$ _____ /yr

4. What is the total number of students enrolled in your school?

_____ (number of students)

5. What grades are taught in this school?

_____ (grades at school)

6. Please write in the number of staff members assigned to your school as their primary work station for the positions listed below: (If none write "0")

- ___ Assistant principals
- ___ Full-time teachers
- ___ Part-time teachers
- ___ Deans/Counselors
- ___ Full-time office clerical
- ___ Specialists in reading, math, etc.
- ___ Librarians
- ___ Psychologists
- ___ Nurses
- ___ Specialists in art, music, and PE

7. Please indicate the approximate number of students in each of the following ethnic groups who are enrolled at your school:

Ethnic Group	Number Enrolled
White	_____
Black	_____
Hispanic	_____
Others (specify)	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

8. Please indicate the approximate number of teachers at your school whose highest degree is:

	Full-time teachers	Part-time teachers
Masters	_____	_____
Specialists	_____	_____
Doctorate	_____	_____

10. What is the average length of service of teachers at your school?

_____ years

11. What is the average SAT scores of students at your school? (Write "X" if not applicable)

Verbal _____

Math _____

9. What percentage of students in your school: (write "X" if not applicable)

a) participate in free and reduced lunch programs? _____ %

If "X", what % are eligible for AFDC (welfare)? _____ %

b) graduate from school? _____ %

c) do not complete school? _____ %

d) are expelled? _____ %

What % of graduates pursue post-secondary education? _____ %

12. Including weekends, how many hours do you average at school each week?

_____ (hours per week)

13. Including this year, how many years have you been principal of your present school?

_____ (number of years)

15. How many working months are used to determine this salary?

_____ months

17. Of the two following statements, please check the one that applies to you:

- ☐ Completed Certification prior to becoming principal.
☐ Completed Certification after becoming principal.

14. What is your present regular annual salary?

\$ _____ /yr.

16. In order to supplement your income are you employed at a second job?

☐ Yes, If YES, _____
(nature of job)

☐ No

18. Including the principalship at your present school, how many years have you been a principal?

_____ (years)

19. Does your school have any of the following organizational arrangements? If not, do you have plans to implement them? (Please check correct response.)

ARRANGEMENT	YES	NO	HAVE PLANS TO IMPLEMENT
A. Open classrooms	☐	☐	☐
B. Structured traditional classrooms	☐	☐	☐
C. Flexible scheduling	☐	☐	☐
D. Differentiated staffing	☐	☐	☐
E. Team teaching	☐	☐	☐
F. Individualized instruction (e.g. programmed instruction, contract system, etc.)	☐	☐	☐
G. PTA or parent club	☐	☐	☐
H. Community or parent advisory board	☐	☐	☐
I. Multi-age pupil groupings	☐	☐	☐
J. Non-graded classrooms	☐	☐	☐
K. In-class paraprofessional program	☐	☐	☐
L. Ethnic studies program	☐	☐	☐
M. Gifted student program	☐	☐	☐
N. School within a school program	☐	☐	☐
O. Social promotion of students	☐	☐	☐
P. Improvement program for individual teachers	☐	☐	☐

20. For classification purposes, please indicate the following:

Your date of birth: ____ / ____ / ____

Your sex: ☐ Male ☐ Female

Marital Status: ☐ Single
☐ Married
☐ Divorced
☐ Widowed

Your race: ☐ White
☐ Black
☐ Hispanic
☐ Other

(specify)

21. Please indicate the type of community and write in the state in which you lived the greatest number of years as a youth:

☐ Urban STATE: _____
☐ Suburban
☐ Rural (farming)
☐ Rural (non-farming)

22. Please write in the occupations in which your parents have spent the greatest number of years:

_____ (father's occupation)

_____ (mother's occupation)

23. Please check the type of school and write in the state in which you completed the majority of your elementary, intermediate, and senior high school education.

	PUBLIC	RELIGIOUS (Catholic, Baptist, etc.)	PRIVATE NON-RELIGIOUS	STATE
ELEMENTARY				
INTERMEDIATE				
SENIOR HIGH				

24. Please indicate all academic degrees beyond high school that you have earned and identify the college/university, the state, the academic majors, and the years in which the degrees were received.

DEGREES	COLLEGE/UNIVERSITY	STATE	MAJORS	YEAR RECEIVED

25. Excluding all principal positions, please list three previous positions you may have held.

POSITION	WAS POSITION SCHOOL-RELATED? (YES/NO)	WAS POSITION IN SAME SCHOOL AS PRESENT? (YES/NO)	DATES	WAS POSITION USEFUL TO CURRENT ROLE AS PRINCIPAL? (YES/NO)	TYPE OF ENVIRONMENT? 1=URBAN, 2=SUBURBAN, 3=RURAL (farming), 4=RURAL (non-farming)

26. Below is a list of tasks/activities which you may engage in during the work-day. Please fill in:

- 1) Estimated time (in hours) spent per month.
- 2) Estimated hours you wish you were spending on the activity (may be greater, less, or equal to the time spent at present).
- 3) A rating of the preparation you have had to perform the task. (1=Excellent, 2=Good, 3=Fair, 4=Poor, 5=Unsatisfactory, 6=Not applicable.)
- 4) Whether or not additional preparation is desired.

TASK	ESTIMATED Hours Per Month	DESIRED Hours Per Month	RATING OF PREPARATION	DESIRE ADDITIONAL PREPARATION? (YES/NO)
Meeting with teachers individually and in groups				
Teaching or covering classes				
Meeting with students (counseling, handling discipline, etc.)				
Caring for health needs of students				
Meeting with individual parents				
Meeting with parent groups (PTA, clubs, etc.)				
Developing & maintaining school public relations & working with community groups				
Managing the school office, coordinating work with office staff & clerical work (correspondence, records, supplies, etc.)				
Visiting classrooms				
Evaluating teachers				
Mediating staff/personnel problems or concerns				
Preparing required school reports & attending Central Office meetings				
Preparing school class schedule				
Supervising school cafeteria, bus loading, school-yard and custodial staff				
Curriculum development (evaluating school programs, developing or revising school policies/procedures, developing new educational programs & projects, etc.)				
Planning and preparing school budget & proposals for funding				
Professional staff development & planning & conducting staff in-service programs				
Monitoring/Evaluating special state or federal programs				
Supervising extra-class activities				
Personal professional study				

27. Please indicate if you have had any of the following courses. For a course you have had, please check if it was in college or graduate school and indicate whether or not it was useful to your present position as principal.

COURSE	WHERE TAKEN			DID NOT TAKE	USEFULNESS		
	COLLEGE	GRADUATE SCHOOL	WAS NOT OFFERED		VERY USEFUL	SOMEWHAT USEFUL	NOT USEFUL
General school administration	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Curriculum development	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
School finance/economics	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
School personnel management	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
School organization	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Education and the law	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Teacher negotiations	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
History and philosophy of education	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Educational psychology	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Sociology	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Industrial relations	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Political science	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Business administration	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Staff development	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

28. Please provide the information requested below for the administrator in-service programs in which you may have already participated. If you have not participated in such programs, please write in "NONE" and proceed to the next question.

SPONSORING ORGANIZATION	COURSES TAKEN	LENGTH OF PROGRAM (days)	STATE WHERE HELD	YEAR	RATING OF COURSES FOR USEFULNESS IN PRESENT POSITION (1=very useful, 2=somewhat useful, 3=not useful)	DID IT COUNT TOWARD YOUR CERTIFICATE RENEWAL? (YES/NO)

29. If paid to attend an in-service program, which of the following topics would you choose to attend? (Please indicate your response for each topic.)

TOPIC	HAVE ALREADY ATTENDED	WILL SURELY ATTEND	MAY ATTEND	WILL NOT ATTEND	DON'T KNOW
Staff development	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Teacher evaluation	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Building teacher morale	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Student motivation	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Team teaching	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Student discipline	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
School finance	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Due process	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Gifted student program	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Communications	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Curriculum development	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Program planning and implementation	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Developing community involvement	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Public relations	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Financial management	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Student attendance	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Supervision techniques	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Working with assistants	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
School law	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Competencies for graduation	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Long-term planning	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Time management	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Decision making	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Interview techniques	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Energy management	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Leadership skills	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
School staffing	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Interpersonal skills	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Delegating authority and tasks	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Use of computers as teaching aids	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Use of audio-visual equipment for teaching	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Transportation management	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Negotiation skills	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Cafeteria management/supervision	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Tennessee Instructional Model	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Administrators Academy	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Please specify others:	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

30. In relation to the school in which you are principal, please indicate your present level of satisfaction with each of the following activities. (Please check most appropriate response.)

ACTIVITY	ENTIRELY SATISFIED	MOSTLY SATISFIED	EQUALLY SATISFIED & DISSATISFIED	MOSTLY DISSATISFIED	ENTIRELY DISSATISFIED
Parent involvement	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Community relations	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Teacher cooperation	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Student academic performance	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Student athletic performance	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Willingness of staff to attempt innovative programs	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
District office cooperation	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Quality of teaching staff	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Quality of non-teaching staff	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Adequacy of school budget	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Staff morale	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
School human relations program	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

31. How would you rate the in-service training programs available to you in this State? (Please check most appropriate response.)

- ☐ Entirely satisfactory
☐ Mostly satisfactory
☐ Equally satisfactory/unsatisfactory
☐ Mostly unsatisfactory
☐ Entirely unsatisfactory
☐ Don't know

32. Please rank order three of the following items in terms of the role you currently have as principal and the role you would ideally like to have: (1 = Most important role, 2 = Next in importance, 3 = Third in importance)

ROLE	CURRENT RANKING	IDEAL RANKING
Instructional Leader (curriculum planning, teaching, etc.)		
School Manager (budget, correspondence, etc.)		
Community Leader (PTA, advisory groups, etc.)		
Personnel Leader (staff advising, recruitment, etc.)		
Disciplinarian (monitoring student behavior, etc.)		
Professional Developer (conferences, etc.)		
Planner (long range policy, etc.)		
Coordinator of extra-curricular activities		

33. Please rank order three of the following items in terms of your reasons for becoming a principal. (1 = Primary reason, 2 = Secondary reason, 3 = Tertiary reason)

REASON	RANKING
Improved income over previous position	
More prestige than previous position	
Interest in improving students' academic performance	
Desire to make educational improvements for teachers	
Springboard for superintendent role	
Desire to be in a leadership position	
Encouragement of others	
Please specify others:	

34. In terms of your career goals, how interested are you in the items below?

CAREER GOAL	Extremely Interested	Interested	Undecided	Have considered it	Not interested
Remain principal of present school for at least five years:	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Transfer to another school:	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Earn an advanced degree:	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Become a district/central office administrator:	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Become a school superintendent:	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Become a college/university administrator:	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Become a college/university professor:	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Go into educational consulting:	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Enter politics as an educational lobbyist:	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Leave the field of education:	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Become a State Department of Education employee	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Become a State teacher evaluator	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Become a State administrator evaluator	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Please specify others:	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

35. What system does your board of education prescribe for evaluating principals? (If none, please write NONE.)

37. If you renewed your certificate in the past ten years, what method was used to meet your renewal requirements? (If not applicable, please check "not applicable". More than one item may be checked.)

- ☐ College courses
☐ Local staff development programs
☐ Other (specify) _____
☐ Not applicable
☐ Life certificate

36. Do you have a current job description?

- ☐ Yes
☐ No

38. Please indicate your level of satisfaction or dissatisfaction regarding the present certification standards for school administrators in Tennessee:

- ☐ Entirely satisfied
☐ Mostly satisfied
☐ Equally satisfied/dissatisfied
☐ Mostly dissatisfied
☐ Entirely dissatisfied

If you are dissatisfied with the present certification standards for administrators in Tennessee, please indicate the changes you would recommend.

39. Do you favor some form of merit pay for administrators in Tennessee? ☐ Yes ☐ No

40. Have you applied for the Principal's Career Ladder? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes, which? ☐ Provisional ☐ Career Level I ☐ Career Level II

If no, do you intend to apply? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Probably ☐ Not Likely

41. In your school how much authority do you have to affect the following activities? (Please circle the most appropriate number on the scale.)

ACTIVITY	TOTAL	NONE	WISH YOU HAD MORE? (YES/NO)	IF YES WHAT RESTRICTS YOU NOW?
Facilitating change	9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1			
Determining staffing patterns	9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1			
Determining hiring and retention	9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1			
Determining school budget	9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1			
Allocating school resources	9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1			
Determining school policies	9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1			
Evaluating instruction	9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1			
Formulating school-discipline procedures	9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1			
Formulating staff development programs	9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1			
Determining extra-curricular programs	9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1			
Managing special education programs	9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1			
Managing vocational programs	9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1			
Managing federally-mandated programs	9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1			

42. Please describe briefly two or three of the most significant changes you implemented in your present school. (If you did not implement any changes please write in "NONE" and skip question 43.)

IMPLEMENTED CHANGES	YEAR IMPLEMENTED	WHAT PROMPTED YOU TO IMPLEMENT THESE CHANGES?

43. Please indicate below whether your pre-service and in-service training was helpful to you in implementing these changes.

TRAINING	VERY HELPFUL	SOMEWHAT HELPFUL	NOT HELPFUL
Undergraduate	☐	☐	☐
Graduate	☐	☐	☐
In-service	☐	☐	☐

44. Do you feel any additional change is needed at your school?

☐ Yes If YES please indicate what form of change:

☐ No

45. What type of school (excluding post-secondary) did/do your children attend? (If applicable, check more than one.)

- ☐ private (non-religious)
☐ public
☐ religious
☐ not applicable

WHY?

46. What is your opinion about the quality of public schooling in this State?

- ☐ Entirely satisfactory
☐ Mostly satisfactory
☐ Equally satisfactory/unsatisfactory
☐ Mostly unsatisfactory
☐ Entirely unsatisfactory
☐ No opinion

47. How would you rate your overall job satisfaction as principal of your present school? (Please check most appropriate response.)

- ☐ Entirely satisfied
☐ Mostly satisfied
☐ Equally satisfied/dissatisfied
☐ Mostly dissatisfied
☐ Entirely dissatisfied

48. Please list, in order of severity, the major restraints you have in your position as principal of your school.

49. Please list the major strengths and weaknesses (from your point of view) of the better schools program:

STRENGTHS

WEAKNESSES

1.

 2.

 3.

1.

 2.

 3.

50. If you have any other comments about your preparation, environment, job role or any other matter, please indicate so. (Add additional sheet if necessary.)

APPENDIX C

COVER LETTER AND FOLLOW-UP POSTAL CARD



Department of Educational Leadership

College of Education
The University of Tennessee
Knoxville, Tennessee 37996-3400
Telephone: 615-974-2216

Dear Principal:

As a former elementary and secondary principal and currently a doctoral candidate at the University of Tennessee-Knoxville, I am requesting your cooperation. I am conducting a survey of Tennessee principals to determine their perceptions of the principalship. You have been chosen by random sample to participate in this study. Attached is a questionnaire which I am requesting you to complete and return.

I realize how busy you are and how hectic school is due to the days missed because of bad weather. However, it is important that you respond to this questionnaire. Data are needed now more than ever as the Better Schools Program is implemented. This is your opportunity to contribute to the data bank. Please take a few minutes to help your profession as you assist me.

All of the questionnaires have been coded so that a follow-up can be made of those principals not initially responding. As the primary investigator, only I will have access to the codes and the questionnaires. Please be assured that confidentiality will be maintained. No names will be revealed and the data will be compiled and reported in group form.

I hope you will complete the questionnaire and return it to me at your earliest convenience, but not later than March 15, 1985. Once completed please place in the enclosed envelope and mail. No postage is needed.

If you have questions or comments I can be reached at 615-453-4671 during regular office hours.

In advance, thank you for your assistance and cooperation.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Michael D. Richardson".

Michael D. Richardson

MDR/mr

Enclosure

P.S. If you wish a summary of the results of this study please complete the enclosed card. The cards and the questionnaires will be immediately separated to insure confidentiality.

FOLLOW-UP POSTCARD

Dear Colleague:

Realizing how busy your schedule must be, this is just a reminder to request your cooperation in completing the questionnaire concerning the principalship.

Your reply by March 15, 1985, would be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Michael D. Richardson
Graduate Student (UTK)

VITA

Michael D. Richardson was born the oldest son of Robert and Ethyleen Richardson on November 20, 1949, in Cookeville, Tennessee. He was educated in the elementary schools of Overton County, Tennessee and was graduated from Rickman High School, Rickman, Tennessee in 1967. He entered Tennessee Technological University, Cookeville, Tennessee and received a Bachelor of Science degree in Secondary Education in August 1971. He accepted a graduate assistantship at Tennessee Technological University, Cookeville and was graduated with a Master of Science degree in community college education in August 1972.

In August 1972 he accepted a position of elementary principal in Sevier County, Tennessee. In January 1974 he was promoted to the Central Office as Title I Director. He entered the doctoral program at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, in September, 1977, majoring in Educational Administration and Supervision. He was admitted to candidacy in December, 1984 and completed the work for the Doctor of Education degree in March 1986.

In August 1979 he accepted the position of principal of Gatlinburg-Pittman High School where he served until January 1985. At that time he again returned to the Central Office of Sevier County Schools to coordinate special programs. In July 1985 he accepted the principalship of Daniel Boone High School in Washington County, Tennessee.

His professional affiliations include the following organizations: National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP); Tennessee Association of Secondary School Principals (TASSP); Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD); Tennessee Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (TASCD); National Education Association (NEA); Tennessee Education Association (TEA); Washington County Education Association (WCEA); Kappa Delta Pi; and Phi Delta Kappa.