



5-1-1976

An Analysis of Perceptions of Job Specifications for Secondary Principals as Viewed by Principals and Teachers in Selected Minnesota Secondary Schools

Ervin F. Garbe Jr.

Follow this and additional works at: <https://commons.und.edu/theses>

[How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!](#)

Recommended Citation

Garbe, Ervin F. Jr., "An Analysis of Perceptions of Job Specifications for Secondary Principals as Viewed by Principals and Teachers in Selected Minnesota Secondary Schools" (1976). *Theses and Dissertations*. 2796.

<https://commons.und.edu/theses/2796>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses, Dissertations, and Senior Projects at UND Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of UND Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact und.common@library.und.edu.

AN ANALYSIS OF PERCEPTIONS OF JOB SPECIFICATIONS FOR
SECONDARY PRINCIPALS AS VIEWED BY PRINCIPALS
AND TEACHERS IN SELECTED MINNESOTA
SECONDARY SCHOOLS

by

Ervin F. Garbe, Jr.

Bachelor of Science, Minot State College, 1959
Master of Science, University of North Dakota, 1967

A Dissertation
Submitted to the Graduate Faculty
of the
University of North Dakota
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
Doctor of Education

Grand Forks, North Dakota

May
1976

This dissertation submitted by Ervin F. Garbe, Jr., in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Education from the University of North Dakota is hereby approved by the Faculty Advisory Committee under whom the work has been done.

Hlyde M. Morris
(Chairman)

Donald L. Piper
Henry D. Wiley

Richard H. Handry

James H. Larson

Dean of the Graduate School

Permission

AN ANALYSIS OF PERCEPTIONS OF JOB SPECIFICATIONS FOR
SECONDARY PRINCIPALS AS VIEWED BY PRINCIPALS AND
Title TEACHERS IN SELECTED MINNESOTA SECONDARY SCHOOLS
Department Center for Teaching and Learning
Degree Doctor of Education

In presenting this dissertation in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a graduate degree from the University of North Dakota, I agree that the Library of this University shall make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for extensive copying for scholarly purposes may be granted by the professor who supervised by dissertation work or, in his absence, by the Chairman of the Department or the Dean of the Graduate School. It is understood that any copying or publication or other use of this dissertation or part thereof for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission. It is also understood that due recognition shall be given to me and to the University of North Dakota in any scholarly use which may be made of any material in my dissertation.

Signature _____

Date _____

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to express his gratitude to the many people who contributed to the success of this study.

Special appreciation is expressed to Dr. Clyde Morris, committee chairman, for his professional counsel and assistance in the preparation of this study.

Acknowledgement is given to Dr. Richard Landry for his advice and constructive criticism in the statistical analysis of the data.

In addition, recognition is also given to Dr. Donald Piper, Dr. Larry Smiley, and Dr. James Larson for their help and encouragement.

A special thank you is expressed to the members of the Minnesota Association of Secondary School Principals who exhibited their professional commitment to research by participating in the study and to the MASSP office staff who made the mailing of the survey possible.

A deep debt of gratitude is owed by the writer to his parents, Ervin and Kathryn Garbe, for rearing their children in an atmosphere in which learning and education were important and for their continued interest in education throughout their lives.

The author also expresses a very special sense of gratitude and loving appreciation to his wife, Mary, whose patience, love, understanding, and assistance through eleven years of summer schools and evening classes, and, finally, a year of separation, helped see the project to its completion; and to his son, David, whose unswerving faith in his father provided a strong impetus.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	viii
ABSTRACT	xiv
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Purposes	
Hypotheses and Research Questions	
Design of the Study	
Scope and Limitations	
Definitions	
Implications of the Study	
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	13
A History of the Principalship	
The Principalship During the Early Twentieth Century	
The Principalship: Present and Future	
III. DESIGN AND PROCEDURE	30
Development of the Instrument	
Description of the Population	
Collection of Data	
Statistical Treatment of the Data	
IV. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA	38
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	89
Summary	
Discussion and Conclusions	
Recommendations	
APPENDIX A. Survey Instrument	102
APPENDIX B. Letter to Principals	107

APPENDIX C.	Letter to Teachers	109
APPENDIX D.	Resume Interest Card	111
APPENDIX E.	Stepwise Forward Regression Tables for Principals' Demographic Variables with Subsets One Through Five as Criteria	113
APPENDIX F.	Simple Correlations Between Demographic Variables and Subsets and Categories	117
APPENDIX G.	List of Subject Areas	119
APPENDIX H.	School Districts and Schools Included in the Study	121
REFERENCES	127

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Summary of Responses	36
2. Summary of Chi-Square Values for Respondents' Perceptions of Job Specifications, Arranged by Subsets, by Teachers and Principals	43
3. Crosstabulation of Respondents' Perceptions of Item 22, Subset One, by Teachers and Principals	47
4. Crosstabulation of Respondents' Perceptions of Item 28, Subset One, by Teachers and Principals	47
5. Crosstabulation of Respondents' Perceptions of Item 35, Subset One, by Teachers and Principals	48
6. Crosstabulation of Respondents' Perceptions of Item 5, Subset Two, by Teachers and Principals	49
7. Crosstabulation of Respondents' Perceptions of Item 12, Subset Two, by Teachers and Principals	50
8. Crosstabulation of Respondents' Perceptions of Item 1, Subset Three, by Teachers and Principals	50
9. Crosstabulation of Respondents' Perceptions of Item 8, Subset Three, by Teachers and Principals	51
10. Crosstabulation of Respondents' Perceptions of Item 15, Subset Three, by Teachers and Principals	52
11. Crosstabulation of Respondents' Perceptions of Item 16, Subset Three, by Teachers and Principals	52

12.	Crosstabulation of Respondents' Perceptions of item 21, Subset Three, by Teachers and Principals	53
13.	Crosstabulation of Respondents' Perceptions of Item 23, Subset Three, by Teachers and Principals	54
14.	Crosstabulation of Respondents' Perceptions of Item 29, Subset Three, by Teachers and Principals	54
15.	Crosstabulation of Respondents' Perceptions of Item 30, Subset Three, by Teachers and Principals	55
16.	Crosstabulation of Respondents' Perceptions of Item 6, Subset Four, by Teachers and Principals	56
17.	Crosstabulation of Respondents' Perceptions of Item 20, Subset Four, by Teachers and Principals	57
18.	Crosstabulation of Respondents' Perceptions of Item 34, Subset Four, by Teachers and Principals	58
19.	Crosstabulation of Respondents' Perceptions of Item 11, Subset Five, by Teachers and Principals	58
20.	Crosstabulation of Respondents' Perceptions of Item 18, Subset Five, by Teachers and Principals	59
21.	Crosstabulation of Respondents' Perceptions of Item 3, Subset Six, by Teachers and Principals	60
22.	Crosstabulation of Respondents' Perceptions of Item 10, Subset Six, by Teachers and Principals	60
23.	Crosstabulation of Respondents' Perceptions of Item 24, Subset Six, by Teachers and Principals	61
24.	Crosstabulation of Respondents' Perceptions of Item 31, Subset Six, by Teachers and Principals	62

25.	Stepwise Forward Inclusion Procedure for Demographic Variables of all Respondents with Subset One, Professional, as the Criterion	63
26.	Stepwise Forward Inclusion Procedure for Demographic Variables of all Respondents with Subset Two, Conflict Mediator, as the Criterion	64
27.	Stepwise Forward Inclusion Procedure for Demographic Variables of all Respondents with Subset Three, Educational Leader, as the Criterion	65
28.	Stepwise Forward Inclusion Procedure for Demographic Variables of all Respondents with Subset Four, Ombudsman, as the Criterion	66
29.	Stepwise Forward Inclusion Procedure for Demographic Variables of all Respondents with Subset Five, Public Relations Practitioner, as the Criterion	67
30.	Stepwise Forward Inclusion Procedure for Demographic Variables of all Respondents with Subset Six, Administrator, as the Criterion	68
31.	Summary Table for the Analysis of Variance for the Teachers' and Principals' Perceptions of the General Job Category, Professional	69
32.	Summary Table for the Analysis of Variance for the Teachers' and Principals' Perceptions of the General Job Category, Conflict Mediator	69
33.	Summary Table for the Analysis of Variance for the Teachers' and Principals' Perceptions of the General Job Category, Educational Leader	70
34.	Summary Table for the Analysis of Variance for the Teachers' and Principals' Perceptions of the General Job Category, Ombudsman	71

35.	Summary Table for the Analysis of Variance for the Teachers' and Principals' Perceptions of the General Job Category, Public Relations Practitioner	72
36.	Summary Table for the Analysis of Variance for the Teachers' and Principals' Perceptions of the General Job Category, Administrator	72
37.	Stepwise Forward Inclusion Procedure for Demographic Variables of all Respondents with General Job Category, Professional, as the Criterion	73
38.	Stepwise Forward Inclusion Procedure for Demographic Variables of all Respondents with General Job Category, Conflict Mediator, as the Criterion	74
39.	Stepwise Forward Inclusion Procedure for Demographic Variables of all Respondents with General Job Category, Educational Leader, as the Criterion	75
40.	Stepwise Forward Inclusion Procedure for Demographic Variables of all Respondents with General Job Category, Ombudsman, as the Criterion	76
41.	Stepwise Forward Inclusion Procedure for Demographic Variables of all Respondents with General Job Category, Public Relations Practitioner, as the Criterion	77
42.	Stepwise Forward Inclusion Procedure for Demographic Variables of all Respondents with General Job Category, Administrator, as the Criterion	78
43.	Stepwise Forward Inclusion Procedure for Principals' Demographic Variables with Subset Six, Administrator, as the Criterion	79
44.	Stepwise Forward Inclusion Procedure for Teachers' Demographic Variables with Subset One, Professional, as the Criterion	80
45.	Stepwise Forward Inclusion Procedure for Teachers' Demographic Variables with Subset Two, Conflict Mediator, as the Criterion	81

46.	Stepwise Forward Inclusion Procedure for Teachers' Demographic Variables with Subset Three, Educational Leader, as the Criterion	81
47.	Stepwise Forward Inclusion Procedure for Teachers' Demographic Variables with Subset Four, Ombudsman, as the Criterion	82
48.	Stepwise Forward Inclusion Procedure for Teachers' Demographic Variables with Subset Five, Public Relations Practitioner, as the Criterion	82
49.	Stepwise Forward Inclusion Procedure for Teachers' Demographic Variables with Subset Six, Administrator, as the Criterion	83
50.	Summary Table for the Analysis of Variance for the Respondents' Perceptions of the General Job Category, Professional, and Subset One, Professional	85
51.	Summary Table for the Analysis of Variance for the Respondents' Perceptions of the General Job Category, Conflict Mediator, and Subset Two, Conflict Mediator	86
52.	Summary Table for the Analysis of Variance for the Respondents' Perceptions of the General Job Category, Educational Leader, and Subset Three, Educational Leader	86
53.	Summary Table for the Analysis of Variance for the Respondents' Perceptions of the General Job Category, Ombudsman, and Subset Four, Ombudsman	87
54.	Summary Table for the Analysis of Variance for the Respondents' Perceptions of the General Job Category, Public Relations Practitioner, and Subset Five, Public Relations Practitioner	87
55.	Summary Table for the Analysis of Variance for the Respondents' Perceptions of the General Job Category, Administrator and Subset Six, Administrator	88

56.	Stepwise Forward Inclusion Procedure for Principals' Demographic Variables with Subset One, Professional, as the Criterion	114
57.	Stepwise Forward Inclusion Procedure for Principals' Demographic Variables with Subset Two, Conflict Mediator, as the Criterion	114
58.	Stepwise Forward Inclusion Procedure for Principals' Demographic Variables with Subset Three, Educational Leader, as the Criterion	115
59.	Stepwise Forward Inclusion Procedure for Principals' Demographic Variables with Subset Four, Ombudsman, as the Criterion	115
60.	Stepwise Forward Inclusion Procedure for Principals' Demographic Variables with Subset Five, Public Relations Practitioner, as the Criterion	116
61.	Correlations of Demographic Variables with Subsets of Principals' Job Specifications and General Job Categories	118

ABSTRACT

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to determine what differences in perception existed between teachers and principals when they viewed the job specifications of a secondary school principal. Further purposes were to determine if any differences existed between teachers and principals in their perceptions of a secondary school principal's general job categories and to attempt to identify those educational and demographic variables whose presence significantly affected the respondents' perceptions.

Procedure

The population of the study was limited to 253 public secondary schools in the state of Minnesota. The study sample included 169 principals and 273 teachers. The teachers and principals were asked to complete a questionnaire designed for this study relating to thirty-five job specifications of a secondary school principal. The survey form also requested the respondents to provide selected educational and demographic data. The survey was conducted through the use of the U. S. Postal Service during the middle of school year 1975-76.

Statistical techniques employed in the study included the chi-square, one-way analysis of variance, and a stepwise forward multiple

regression. The .05 level of significance was selected a priori.

Results and Conclusions

Statistically significant differences at the .05 level were found between teachers' and principals' perceptions of twenty-two of the thirty-five job specifications of a secondary school principal as identified in the study. The study showed that the differences were caused more by the intensity of agreement than by the amount of disagreement in the perceptions of the respondents.

Perceptions by the respondents of four job specifications containing the words "responsible" or "accountable" indicated the possibility of a semantic differential existing among the respondents which could have acted as a masking variable.

Differences between the perceptions of teachers and principals concerning items related to inter-personal relationships were significant. The teachers apparently agreed with the principals concerning such relationships between a principal and his staff, but disagreed when the relationships were between the principals and students and principals and groups from outside the school.

The teachers and the principals differed significantly in their perceptions of the ranking of two of the six general categories included in the study. The size of the schools of the teachers seemingly was an important factor, as the teachers of large schools generally agreed with principals in their perceptions of the general role of the principal as an educational leader. When the teachers and principals viewed the job of the principal as an ombudsman, there was also significant disagreement. This disagreement may be attributable

to the newness of the role to the principalship and the accompanying difficulty in composing a definition.

The role of the principal in assisting in teacher-school board negotiations as a resource person was perceived by just over half the principals as being important. The large minority of the principals possibly have not seen the necessity of assisting in the formulation of teachers' contracts.

Statistically different perceptions were discovered among all respondents as they viewed the general job areas of professionalism and educational leadership and their corresponding job specifications. It was concluded that this phenomenon may have been caused by an inability to differentiate between the specifications for these two job areas.

The test of demographic variables against the job specifications showed that measurable variance among the teachers' perceptions were caused primarily by the sizes of the schools involved. The roles of the principal as an administrator and as a conflict mediator, however, were apparently perceived differently by male teachers than by female teachers.

Recommendations

1. Principals should define their task areas and specific jobs for the teachers in their buildings.
2. Principals and teachers should cooperatively define and overcome their differences in perception of educational leadership.
3. Teachers should be made more aware of the need for a principal to have inter-personal relationships with groups other than the professional staff.

4. The state and national principals' associations should identify the need for either increasing or decreasing the importance placed on principals' participation in teacher-board negotiations.

5. Principals of small schools should make an effort to be identified as educational leaders more and as administrators less.

6. Superintendents and school boards of small schools should determine if assigned tasks of secondary principals keep them from becoming educational leaders.

7. A more precise definition of the role of the principal as an educational leader needs to be made.

8. Before attempting a staff evaluation of the building-level administration, principals should be aware that teachers often do not fully understand the job of a principal.

9. Further study should be conducted in order to determine if other demographic variables have a more significant effect upon the perceptions of teachers and principals.

10. The study should be replicated in another area of the country to determine if the results would be duplicated.

11. The study should be conducted on a "Real-Ideal" basis in an attempt to prevent any bias from affecting the results.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The belief, held by many, that the schools can solve any social ill has caused education to come under severe criticism by groups representing a variety of constituencies. As the administrator of the local school unit, the public school principal has generally faced the thrust of most of the critics (Roe and Drake, 1974). English (1971) claims that the majority of the attacks have come from militant teachers and organized parent groups who are championing changes of all types in their schools.

The group with which a principal appears to be in conflict most often is composed of the teachers in his building. This phenomenon places the principal in a difficult position because he often identifies closely, as a colleague, with his faculty. His own professional beginnings were as a teacher; therefore, he feels a professional bond with his teachers (Johnson, 1965).

A dichotomous loyalty often exists for a principal because of this bond. He believes that he must defend his teachers and, yet, he must support the lay authorities to whom he is responsible. When the two loyalties are in conflict, it may be that the teachers have not been made aware of the rationale for the decision the principal had to make (Johnson, 1965).

This lack of knowledge on the part of the teachers can be damaging to the inter-personal relationships a principal has with his staff. The teachers' expectations of the principal's role should be compatible with the specifications for the role. Havighurst and Neugarten stated, "If the teachers' expectations do not coincide with the administrator's concept of his role, relations between the two can be expected to be strained" (1962, p. 163).

A further complicating factor which contributes to a lack of understanding between teachers and principals is the lack of agreement among a specific staff concerning the role of the principal. Getzels et al (1968) maintained that the level of agreement among teachers on what they expect of their administrator is the main issue.

To prevent an erosion of the collegial relationship which may exist between teachers and principal, meaningful dialogue should occur. Before such dialogue can take place, definitions of terms must be made. If the teachers and the principal are planning to share in decision-making, for instance, they should each exhibit what Bartky (1953) coined as "critical empathy" when he wrote:

In projection, it is not sufficient to think how you yourself would react; you must be able to think how another would react. It is in this process of "critical empathy"; this consciousness of putting oneself in the place of another that success . . . lies (1953, p. 100).

The principal needs to explore the needs and expectations of his teachers and the teachers must explore the principal's relationship to the board of education and the community who hold him responsible (Campbell et al, 1966).

Without this awareness by teachers and principals of the perceptions of the other, it is conceivable that potential differences

of opinion could erupt into more severe problems than merely opposing views regarding how certain building-level decisions should have been made (Beck, 1968).

Purposes

One of the purposes of this study was to identify those differences in perception of the secondary principal's job specifications which occurred between teachers and principals. A second purpose was to identify those differences which occurred between teachers and principals in their perceptions of general job categories. A third purpose was to identify those differences in perception which occurred between principals and teachers in their views of the job specifications and job categories, as analyzed through the use of selected demographic variables which may have caused the differences in perception to exist.

Hypotheses and Research Questions

Questions raised by the purposes of the study were answered by testing the following null hypotheses:

1. there are no significant differences between teachers and principals in their perceptions of job specifications of a secondary school principal;
2. there are no significant differences among the respondents' perceptions of job specifications of a secondary school principal when tested against selected educational and demographic variables;
3. there are no significant differences between teachers and principals in their perceptions of general job categories of a secondary school principal;

4. there are no significant differences among the respondents' perceptions of general job categories of a secondary school principal when tested against selected educational and demographic variables.

Research questions were developed to further determine what effect the demographic variables had upon the responses of principals and teachers' and, also, if a similarity existed between the perceptions of job specifications and the perceptions of general job categories.

The questions were:

A. what educational or demographic variables might appear to contribute to the differences in perception of job specifications of secondary school principals among principals and among teachers?

B. what relationship exists between the respondents' perceptions of rankings of general job categories and their perceptions of corresponding job specifications?

Design of the Study

The study was a survey of perceptions of the job of a secondary school principal as viewed by principals and teachers in selected Minnesota public schools. The data were gathered through the use of the U. S. Postal Service. The principal of each selected school was asked to assist by distributing survey forms to teachers who had been randomly selected by grade level and teaching area. The teaching areas are listed in Appendix G.

Population

Eighty-one public school districts in the state of Minnesota were identified as having separate junior and senior high schools with

a specific principal for each building (Minnesota Educational Directory, 1975). In these districts, there were 107 senior high schools and 146 junior high schools. The population of this study included the principals and teachers from these 253 selected schools.

Sampling Procedures

The initial study sample included the entire body of 107 senior high schools as well as 100 randomly selected junior high schools. The random selection was achieved through the use of a table of random numbers (Minium, 1970). The schools were arranged alphabetically, by school name, and assigned a number from one through 146. One-hundred numbers were drawn on a non-replacement basis.

Two teachers from each building were identified by grade level and subject area, rather than by name. A list of subject areas was developed and listed in alphabetical order (Appendix G). Each subject area was assigned a number from one through eleven for the high schools and from one through eight for the junior high schools, following the alphabetical arrangement. The selection of subject areas was made through the adaptation of an existing random number generating program, RANDU, at the Computer Center, University of North Dakota. The same process was used for determining the grade levels of the teachers selected.

Immediately prior to the mailing of the instrument, information was received that five of the originally selected junior high schools had changed their classification to that of middle schools. These five schools were then dropped from the sample, leaving 202 schools. A listing of the schools is found in Appendix H.

Description of the Instrument

The survey instrument used was devised from data in a publication of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, The Principalship (NASSP, 1970). The instrument was divided into three sections.

Part A consisted of thirty-five statements which the NASSP, in its publication, indicated as specific tasks of a secondary school principal. Part B was a list of six general terms which described the general areas in which a principal should function and encompassed the items from Part A. Independent variables were obtained from demographic data which the respondents were asked to provide in Part C.

The respondents were asked to rate each of the thirty-five statements of Part A in order that identification could be made of their perceptions of the degree of importance for that job specification in the job of the principal. The respondents were advised not to use the actions of any principal they may have known as the basis for their judgements. The six categories in Part B were ranked from one through six by the respondents in the order of the importance that the categories were perceived to possess.

The validity of the instrument was assumed, as the data used for the basis of the instrument were developed by the national principals' association (NASSP, 1970). Reliability of the instrument was obtained through the use of an existing statistical program, TESTAT, at the Computer Center, University of North Dakota, and was determined to be .815 (Computer Center, 1975).

Response

Survey instruments were mailed to 202 schools. Of that number, responses were received from 172 schools. A further breakdown of the responses showed that responses were obtained from 169 principals and 273 teachers. A total of 449 responses was received from the original sample of 606. Seven responses were unusable for a variety of reasons, including the return of blank forms. The final total of responses used in the data for the study was 442.

The instruments were mailed to the sample schools January 12, 1976. The decision was made February 14, 1976, to use the responses which had been received to that date. No second mailing or reminders were employed to add to the number of responses.

Treatment of the Data

The data received were analyzed through the use of existing statistical programs at the Computer Center of the University of North Dakota. The subprogram, CROSSTABS, from Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (Nie et al, 1975) was used to produce chi-square scores and contingency tables for the data in Part A. The data from Part B of the questionnaire were analyzed through the use of subprogram ONEWAY (Nie et al, 1975). The same program was used for identifying the relationship between the responses to Part A and the responses to Part B. A multiple regression technique, utilizing stepwise forward inclusion, was used to analyze the data for effects which the demographic variables may have had.

Scope and Limitations

The scope of this study was delimited to include principals and teachers from the Minnesota public schools which had been identified as being either junior high schools or senior high schools with specific buildings and principals. The determination of which schools qualified for these two categories was made on the basis of information in the 1974-75 Minnesota Educational Directory, published by the State of Minnesota (1975). Further delimiting factors included: (1) the restrictions placed upon the selection of the teachers who received the survey form; (2) the fact that the principal was the only administrator in a building asked to complete the form; (3) the number of teachers chosen from each building for inclusion in the study; and (4) the request made to the principal to assist by distributing the survey form to teachers, in his building, who filled the requirements of the selection procedure, had no administration training or experience, and were not first year teachers.

A limiting effect upon the results of the study was produced by other factors. They included: (1) the number of responses received; (2) the unknown accuracy of the distribution made by the principal to the designated teachers; (3) the structure of the items in Part A into subsets; (4) the complete anonymity of the teacher-respondents; (5) the lack of contamination control in the responses due to the fact that it was a mail survey; and (5) bias that may have existed if the respondents did not comply with the request to ignore the actions of principals they may have known.

Definitions

To assist in achieving a continuity of meaning throughout the study, the following definitions of terms were used:

1. administrator--a person who works with policies, strategies of action, and delegation of tasks;
2. conflict mediator--a person who assists parties in conflict to achieve or approach resolution;
3. educational leader--a person who is concerned with the instruction of students and development of the staff;
4. junior high school--a secondary school which has as its population students in grades 7, 8, and 9;
5. ombudsman--a person who helps members of an organization to overcome difficulties caused by the system;
6. principal--the chief administrative officer of a secondary school;
7. professional--a person who exhibits interest in professional organizations and contributes time and effort to those organizations;
8. public relations practitioner--a person who interprets the school to various groups;
9. secondary school--a public school which has as its population students in grades seven through twelve;
10. senior high school--a secondary school which has as its population students in grades ten, eleven, and twelve;
11. teacher--a certificated person who is a classroom teacher in a secondary school.

Implications of the Study

The aim of this study was to identify any differences between perceptions of principals and teachers regarding the job of the principal. As teachers and principals do not function in a vacuum, additional groups from the educational community should also find relevancy in the results of the study.

Teachers

Teachers might better recognize the reasons for a principal's behavior when viewed against the job specifications for that position. After analyzing the results of the study, teachers might better understand the decisions of the principal with which they have disagreed in the past.

Principals

From the data, a principal might identify the areas of his job that his peers have indicated to be either more or less important than he does. The principal might also identify those areas in which he is in disagreement with teachers' perceptions.

Superintendents

As supervisors of principals, district superintendents might determine if principals' evaluations are based upon criteria similar to what the principals have said their tasks should be. Cooperatively designed evaluation instruments might be devised.

Boards of Education

As employers of principals, school boards might determine if their job descriptions for principals are in general agreement with the specifications that principals perceived to be the most important aspects of their jobs.

Educational Administrator Training Institutions

Colleges and universities that train future administrators might apply the findings to their programs and assist future principals to be alert to the job specifications that practicing principals have indicated to be important to them and those with which the teachers disagreed.

Teacher Training Institutions

After an analysis of the data in the study, future teachers should have some knowledge of the role of the building principal and, therefore, be better prepared for the time when they will need to work with a principal.

Professional Organizations

Organizations such as the Minnesota Association of Secondary School Principals and the National Association of Secondary School Principals might recognize the differences between their stated positions and the position of the practicing principal on the issue of what constitutes the specifications for the job of secondary school principal.

The remaining chapters in this study are organized in the following manner: Chapter II contains a review of the literature

related to the development of the job of the secondary principal and how it has changed over the years. Chapter III describes the population and the methodology used in collecting and analyzing the data. Chapter IV reports the results of the statistical analysis. Chapter V consists of the summary, conclusions resulting from the study, and the recommendations for follow-up activities.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

A History of the Principalship

Education in the United States has developed from its meager beginnings in New England, when it was tightly controlled by church groups, to a broad publicly supported enterprise (English, 1971). Elementary education was the first to become a function of public bodies, but secondary and higher education was primarily a matter of private concern up to the time of the Civil War (Smith, 1932).

One of the earliest instances of town authorities taking charge of elementary schools was in 1635, when the Boston Latin Grammar School was begun (Smith, 1932). The development of public secondary schools came much later. Private academies served the purpose of secondary education from 1751 until about 1870 (Smith, 1932).

Although the public high school had made its appearance as early as 1821 with the establishment of the Boston English High School, it was never a serious competitor for the academy until after the middle of the nineteenth century. By 1869 there were approximately 320 public high schools in existence (Smith, 1932).

The Kalamazoo decision in 1872, which permitted public taxation for the support of secondary schools, was praised by Cubberly as

" . . . one of the important milestones in the establishment of the American public high school" (1919, p. 199). Within twenty years of the decision, over two-thirds of the pupils in secondary education were enrolled in public schools (Smith, 1932).

The fact notwithstanding that public elementary schools preceded the secondary schools, the high school principalship antedates both the elementary principalship and the superintendency (Jacobson and Reavis, 1941). The first instance of an elementary school which had all of its departments under an administrative principal was the Quincy School in Boston in 1847 (Jacobson et al, 1973). The acknowledged forerunner for the creation of the secondary school principalship was Cincinnati, Ohio, where the position was created before 1835 (Pierce, 1935).

With the increase in the size of schools in the more populous areas of the country, the practice of naming a chief teacher or principal became more common. The tasks of these persons were generally administrative and clerical in nature. They consisted of such tasks as seeing to the heat of the building, the maintenance of the building, and the filing of reports (Edmonson et al, 1931; Campbell et al, 1966).

As the position of principal teacher developed, duties were generally enumerated by the school boards. Often the school trustees were reluctant to give the principal the task of inspection of instruction. Spears stated,

The principal teacher of the early school, besides his teaching load, looked after the building, the equipment, and the grounds. He classified pupils, prevented their gathering on the premises before the doors were unlocked, and acted as clerk of the school. He enforced the rules of the trustees, rang the bells, and gave minor directions to his associate teacher. One of the

chief requirements of the position, according to early school reports was firmness in carrying out the duties laid down by the trustees (1941, p. 296).

A complete listing of duties of principals was commonplace among school districts. One example of such a list is from St. Paul, Minnesota, in 1891.

The principal of each school shall exercise a general supervision of all the departments of the same, see that the teachers are punctual in attendance, and discharge reasonable fidelity; that they preserve good order in their departments, keep their registers properly, and attend promptly to the ventilation of their rooms. His suggestions and commands shall be respectfully received and carried out by the teachers, and in case of any disagreement as to the methods, the same shall be referred to the superintendent of schools.

The principal in each school shall devote some portion of the day to visiting the other departments thereof for the purpose of supervising the labors of the other teachers. He shall cause a programme of the daily exercises of the several grades to be placed in a conspicuous place in each school room.

He shall transmit to the superintendent of schools at the close of each month and year, full reports according to the blanks furnished him, with such additional information as the board of school inspectors may from time to time require, or as he may think important to communicate.

He shall, at the close of the school year, return the register of his building to the office of the superintendent of schools. He shall also file with the secretary of the board of school inspectors a schedule of the articles used in and belonging to said building, and turn over to him the keys of the same.

The principal in each school building shall see that teachers are prompt in opening and closing schools. It shall be his duty to see that all clocks belonging to the building are properly regulated each morning, and that all teachers conform to this standard in making their records of attendance, both for themselves and pupils.

It shall be the duty of the principal to record on the register of the room the visit made by him, together with a statement of the number of minutes spent there. He shall also call together his assistant teachers at stated times for the purpose of discussing the methods of instruction to be employed in the various branches of study.

He shall examine all pupils seeking admission to his school and place them in their proper classes.

He shall be at his school thirty minutes before the time of opening the morning session. He shall within two weeks after the

commencement of each term furnish the superintendent with the programme of the daily exercises of the different rooms in school.

The principals shall have fire alarm drill once each fortnight in all the buildings (Spears, 1941, p. 301).

Principals in Cincinnati during the mid-nineteenth century also had managerial duties spelled out. A rationale for the existence of the principalship in that city stated:

To secure uniformity and efficiency in the administration of the discipline of the School, and at the same time to enable the Teachers and Assistants to give their whole time, as far as possible, to the business of instruction, the Board commits the general government of the School into the hands of the Principal (Spears, 1941, p. 297).

According to Spears (1941), the principal in Cincinnati in 1848 also conducted classes in eight areas of social science.

During the formative years of the principalship, superintendents, as well as boards of education, delegated administrative tasks to the principal. Such duties as regulation of pupil discipline and grade progression, clerical duties, and " . . . enforcement of various rules and regulations upon the teaching staff . . ." were not uncommon, according to English (1971, p. 44).

The chores which had been assigned to the principals prompted Spears to write, "The seed of the disciplinary aspects of the later principalship was sown deeply in the forerunner" (1941, p. 296).

The Principalship During the Early Twentieth Century

Although the term, principal teacher, was developed well over a century ago and dropped when the position was given more duties of a managerial aspect, Spears (1941) felt that it was still descriptive of the many principals who were required to teach classes as well as perform managerial functions.

As the principalship developed during the first half of the twentieth century, differing opinions concerning the role of the incumbent were apparent. The literature available, however, shows that the emergence of the principal as an educational leader, rather than a manager, had begun.

Morrison (1926) wrote that the five most important qualities for a principal were: (1) executive ability, (2) leadership, (3) ability to supervise, (4) broad experience and training, and (5) an ability to get along with people. No mention was made specifically of being an educational leader. As Bartky stated, however, "More often than not a debate over educational leadership is a debate over its definition . . . " (1956, p. 247).

In a study by Eikenberry, conducted in 1924, supervisory tasks were well down the list in a ranking of tasks which principals performed. The study was made of 1510 high school principals across the United States. Managerial or administrative tasks were much more dominant in the ranking of thirty-two items. In fact, seventy percent of the responses listed "conducting faculty meetings" as the prime item. As Edmonson said, "This study indicates that the principal is wasting valuable time with duties which should be delegated and is spending too little time with the real duties of the principalship" (1931, p. 51).

The amount of time given to various aspects of the job of the principalship was reflected in the certification requirements and preparation of principals during the first third of the century. Spears (1941) found that by 1934, certification requirements for the

position of principal were required by only twenty-seven states and those requirements were superficial at best.

The training institutions of 1934, in their course offerings and requirements for the secondary school principalship, demanded more courses in administration than in supervision, reflecting the states' requirements. Only sixteen states required any course in supervision for certification (Burke, 1934).

Edmonson and his co-authors (1931) reported that high school principals generally agreed that the subject of high school administration was of the most value. As shown by the tasks assigned to the principalship previously, such an agreement was not surprising.

Theoretical movement away from the managerial tasks of the principals of the nineteenth century was apparent in the literature of the first half of this century. A number of sources listed duties of high school principals. Some were in specific tabular format and the others were of a more general narrative form. The North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools gave the following listing:

1. To formulate a vision and a policy for the school over which he presides and to communicate his vision to his entire staff of assistants.
2. To lead in the formulation of ways and means for realizing this vision and policy.
3. To supervise instruction, inspire teachers and pupils, coordinate and articulate efforts, and secure unity of spirit and practice.
4. To serve as the school's accredited agent before the public and to enlighten and advise the public in respect to what the schools are undertaking, what they are achieving, what are their needs, and what education truly signifies.
5. To share confidences with teachers and pupils, capitalize their intelligence and enthusiasm, delegate to them as large and as many responsibilities as circumstances permit, and integrate and unify the work of the entire school (Davis, 1921, p. 59).

Edmonson stated that a progressive principal, as the person who sets the standards and is responsible for the school's morale, is " . . . the dynamic force in any secondary school" It was further stated, "One of the supreme obligations of a real principal is to improve the quality of instruction through constructive leadership" (Edmonson et al, 1931, p. 37).

Further movement toward educational leadership was exhibited by Jacobson et al when they wrote that too many principals were allowing themselves " . . . to become engrossed with the clerical and somewhat routine aspects of administration to the neglect of their functions as intellectual and professional leaders in their schools" (1942, p. 10).

In defining the general roles of the principal, Spears (1934) stated that administration, in itself, never can be called anything more than short-range operation of the school, or operation by precept; while the improvement of instruction offers a challenge to long-range planning.

By mid-century, the attitude had shifted considerably from administration to educational leadership and Moehlman wrote, "Until teaching is recognized as the most important task of the secondary school and administration is recognized as a coordinative facilitating purpose, there is little hope for ultimate improvement in the education process" (1951, p. 311).

The Principalship: Present and Future

The principalship of today and tomorrow are inextricably linked together. The National Association of Secondary School

Principals felt that ". . . any description of the scope of the secondary school principalship as it exists today . . . must be tentative, always subject to change as conditions themselves alter"(1970, p. 1).

Guba also felt that tomorrow is linked to today for the principal, although he felt that a more specific forecast for the principalship could be given.

He is now and will continue to be responsible for both [the manager and instructional leader] roles. I think what will happen is that the principal will tend to specialize in the decision-making aspects of his role and less in the direct supervision or performance of the functions for which he is responsible. He will become an educational executive in a truer sense than has been the case, and will make his mark less by doing than by thinking (1970, p. 45).

Another author disagreed, believing that the principal must function in the "doing" area of leadership. Weaver felt that the efforts of the secondary principal must move toward being a leader with skills in "organizing and directing groups toward mutually acceptable goals" (1971, p. 56). Similarly, Roe and Drake (1974) were of the opinion that the principal must exert leadership in order to improve the quality of life of each person who is with the scope of the school.

Rubin, in a plea for movement away from a purely managerial position, maintained that ". . . schools are managed and operated today much as they were three decades ago" (1970, p. 8). Agreeing with Rubin that the management of schools today has not changed much from thirty years ago, Moser saw the principal of the future in a more positive light. "New demands on old dimensions challenge the principal in the '70s to be a planner of futures, an allocator of resources, a

stimulator of improvement, a coordinator of concerted effort, and an evaluator of process and product" (Moser, 1974, p. 300).

The literature reviewed contained many concepts of what task areas should be encompassed by the principalship. The National Association of Secondary School Principals saw the general areas of a principal's job to be educational leader, communicator, ombudsman, conflict mediator, educator of educators, professional, and administrator. A caveat was given, however, that no order of precedence was intended in the list (NASPP, 1970).

Some fifteen years before the principals' association published its categories, the Southern States Cooperative Program in Educational Administration (SSCP), in attempting to define areas of competency, identified eight task areas. They included instruction and curriculum development, pupil personnel, community-school leadership, staff personnel, school plant, organization and structure, school finance and business management, and transportation (SSCP, 1955).

In attempting to define the general term of educational leadership, Bartky reduced the areas of concern to three when he stated, " . . . three types of educational leader may be identified: (1) the educational statesman, (2) the teacher, and (3) the administrator" (1956, p. 248).

General conceptions relating to the kind of administration required by secondary schools provide four general dimensions to this field of professional service. As identified by McCleary and Hencley (1965), they are technical-managerial skills of running a school, curriculum and guidance skills, relating educational administration to public administration, and an arming with knowledge and leadership

skills to design, advocate, and bring about imaginative programs.

A slightly different view of the role of the principal was stated by Johnson (1965). In his view, the principal performs internal and external functions. The principal has five tasks in his internal function: (1) allocation of resources; (2) establishment of rules and procedures to ensure efficient operation of the school; (3) demanding of his staff whatever performance is necessary to ensure that institutional goals are met; (4) hiring a competent staff, retaining those who prove competent, and discharging those who do not; and (5) motivating staff members to innovate and go beyond the minimal standards of their assignments. The principal's external function is representative. He represents his school when dealing with those who are in charge of its financial support.

A study of Texas school boards indicated that most members agree that the principal should be an instructional leader, but they also agree with the idea that the principal's chief responsibility is to handle discipline (Splawn, 1972). In an earlier study, the same author condemned the principals for allowing the latter perception to exist.

He declared that if principals think their job is as important as the literature would have them believe, they are engaging in self-delusion. If a principal attempted to become a strong instructional leader, he could very well be dismissed shortly thereafter, because boards of education see the principal as a person who keeps strict control. He further stated that this view is caused by the principals, who are hesitant to become educational leaders and, instead, are content to be paper shufflers, record keepers and disciplinarians.

He indicated that board members have never seen principals in any other activities, therefore, they have no basis for any other perception of the tasks of the principal (Splawn, 1969).

In developing a guide for evaluating secondary principals, Demeke (1970) identified seven areas of competence which included leader and director of the educational program, coordinator of guidance and special education services, member of district and school staff, link between community and the school, administrator of personnel, member of the profession of educational administration, and director of support management.

Leonard Kraft (1971), when editing a book on the secondary principal, saw fit to divide it into four basic sections. These were instructional leadership, personnel, students and the community, and educational technology.

In a recent survey of 316 Texas educators, eight areas of competency were identified.

These competency areas were: (1) organization and administration, (2) curriculum design and improvement, (3) instructional process, (4) business and financial management, (5) student management, (6) personnel management, (7) facilities, equipment, and supplies, and (8) communications (Austin, 1974, p. 5706).

Upon reviewing the preceding literature, it was noted that, although different terminology was used, a high degree of agreement was apparent among the authors. Administrative tasks or functions were common to all, as were tasks related to educational leadership. Communication, both internal and external to the school, was included by most sources. Professionalism was thought to be an important ingredient of the principalship by nearly all, and the

role of the principal as a person who assists in resolving conflicts was seen as necessary.

Further investigation into the literature supported the general categories listed by the NASSP (1970). The category "Educator of Educators" was joined with "Educational Leader" in the discussion of the categories contained in the following paragraphs.

The fact that the principal is the executive charged with the total operation of the school was cited as one reason that a principal must function as an administrator (Guba, 1970). Support for this position was given by Campbell and his co-authors (1966) and Havighurst and Neugarten (1962). Identification of the position of the principal as a line officer (Campbell et al, 1966), and as a building level personnel director (Demeke, 1970) were also noted. Guba (1970) additionally believed that the principal's role as the visible school executive to the community caused his position to be perceived as that of an administrator.

The role of the principal as a communicator was also cited in the literature. The scope of the communications function was seen as quite broad, involving the community, the teachers, the students, and the district office. Gagne, in speaking of the principal as a communicator, said, "He himself will have need of skills in public relations, in management of a more diverse operation, and in evaluation of his staff and his school" (1970, p. 86).

The scope of the principal's communication task was noted by Jerrems (1968) and Roe and Drake (1974). These sources identified both in-school and community groups with which communication must be maintained.

The fact that the principal moves in and out of leader and group-member roles was cited by Demeke (1970) as a reason for the need for communication skills. Demeke (1970) also noted the role of the principal as a link between the community and the school, as did Campbell et al (1966).

The need for the principal to act as an interpreter between the district office and his teachers was stressed by Campbell et al (1966), Johnson (1965), and Roe and Drake (1974). Gagne (1970) also mentioned the need to communicate an attitude of excitement and challenge as well as stability to the groups to whom the principal is responsible for communicating.

The function of the principal as a conflict mediator was seen from a number of viewpoints. Addelston (1971), English (1971), and Roe and Drake (1974) saw the involvement of the principal as a resource person during teacher negotiations as a preventive step toward mediation of prospective conflicts. In a study of Colorado teachers, Prascher (1975) found that one of the most important tasks of the principal, as perceived by the teachers, was support by the principal in conflict situations. This was supported by Gross and Herriott (1965). The school board members in Texas, as reported by Splawn (1969, 1972), identified discipline as a major task area related to the mediation of conflict.

As was expected, support for the principal to function as an educational leader was broad. Demeke (1970), English (1971), and Roe and Drake (1974) agreed that the principal must share decision-making with the teachers so that they become actively involved. English mentioned one of the dangers a principal faces by not sharing

this power.

By continuing to withdraw towards entrenched positions and away from teachers' demands to be involved in the decision-making process, principals fall into the trap of defending the status quo and abandoning any claims for leadership (English, 1971, p. 43).

The uniqueness of the role of the secondary school principal was seen by Downey (1963) as his program development and instructional leadership. Agreeing with Downey's position, Conant (1960) stated that if the principal is unable to provide such leadership, help with administrative chores should be provided for him.

In further support of the role of the principal as an educational leader, Campbell et al (1966) wrote that as an instructional leader, the principal should: (1) demonstrate that his school is achieving its educational purposes to a reasonable degree; (2) be a diagnostician of problems and synthesizer of forces needed to solve them; (3) develop a congenial working relationship among the staff; (4) encourage creativity and innovation; (5) assess needs for resources and personnel; and (6) approve the instructional program and take steps to improve it.

Demeke (1970), Erickson (1968), and the NASSP (1970) saw the educational leadership function as that of a catalyst who channels, enhances, and builds learning opportunities within his school.

Attainment of educational leadership by a principal is not without obstacles. Campbell et al (1966) wrote of teachers' resistance to shared decision-making, but Gross and Herriott (1965) saw the principal's feelings of status distinction being a cause, rather than the teachers resistance. Guba (1970) observed that classroom visitations often are artificial situations; however, Baughman et al (1969)

felt that teachers welcome such participation if they are made a part of the process.

A summation of the role of the principal as an educational leader was given by English.

Teachers must become partners; they must be involved with their principals in the shaping of school policies, curriculum decisions, and mutual evaluation of colleagues (1971, p. 46).

The relationship of the principal and the staff come into play in this role, also. The staff expects the principal to defend the school on the one hand and on the other to obtain from his superiors in the organization the materials that they may need to do the job (Johnson, 1965).

As an ombudsman, the principal must function in a manner which allows human relations to become more important than "the system." It is in this role that Demeke (1970) and Roe and Drake (1974) saw the principal assisting students from all strata of the school's social system to achieve success in their scholastic lives. Beck put the concept succinctly when he said, " . . . the most important single aspect of school administration is human relations" (1968, p. 79).

The principal as a professional was defined in a number of ways. The most prevalent aspect of a principal's professionalism centered around educational research. Turner (1971) felt that the principal's being a knowledgeable student of research was imperative. Gagne (1970) saw the need for a principal to be involved in research and development necessary to assist teachers in their judging of innovations. McCleary and Hencley (1965) saw knowledge of research important to the principal as a means to keep from becoming stagnant.

An additional type of professionalism was that the principal should be professional in behavior as well as growth (Demeke, 1970).

A further identification of professional behavior was given as:

- (1) an orientation indicating an acceptance of, and beliefs in, continuous improvement as a requisite of professional excellence;
- (2) active participation in professional learning activities;
- (3) a carefully planned program of independent study; and
- (4) dedication to a well-rounded concept of the principalship (McCleary and Hencley, 1965, p. 373).

The same authors further stated that " . . . it is abundantly clear that high standards of administrative performance are unlikely to become a reality in the absence of long-term commitment, unselfish dedication, and a desire to improve professional competence" (McCleary and Hencley, 1965, p. 369).

While it is necessary to be aware of the various functions of the secondary school principal, it also is necessary to realize that no one person can be equally effective in all (NASSP, 1970). In fact, because of this difficulty, Thurman (1971) contended that the principalship be divided into two positions--a coordinator of learning and a coordinator of administrative services, so that the instructional leader could function without being hampered by administrative tasks.

From the literature, it was observed that teachers and principals have disagreed as to the proper tasks for a principal. In fact, principals disagreed among themselves as did teachers.

A study of secondary principals in Virginia showed wide differences of role perceptions among the principals, although the variable of training was not significantly related to role perceptions. Neither was the variable of past experience (Bullock, 1969).

In a study in suburban Chicago schools, Muth (1973) found that the length of time in and adaptation to an organization affected teachers' perceptions of leader behavior.

Seeman (1960) reported that one of the most difficult areas for principals and teachers to determine is the area of responsibility. He further stated that among all respondents, secondary principals and secondary teachers had the widest difference in means for an ambiguity score (difficulty in making a decision regarding opinions about an ideal leader).

The introduction of demographic variables seemed to have little effect on some of the studies investigated. In the study by Prascher (1975) in Colorado, the demographic data were found to have little or no effect on the teachers' reactions. The same phenomenon was cited by Bullock (1969). Galfo contended " . . . that the reason for the inconclusive findings of researches in leadership is [that] the complex interactions seem to result in weak and even contradictory conclusions" (1975, p. 314). These facts tend to support the contention of Havighurst and Neugarten (1962) that interaction with administrators is identified by teachers as a prime factor in their job satisfaction.

As the composite of the secondary school principal is formulated, the following statement from the national principals' organization is pertinent.

The principal is not a machine, an automaton programmed for twenty-four hour duty by the board of education and the community. He is a very human being, with social and family commitments, with limits to his energy and creativity, and with the usual need for rest and relaxation (NASSP, 1970, p. 10).

CHAPTER III

DESIGN AND PROCEDURE

Development of the Instrument

Construction of the survey instrument was begun after reviewing other instruments which had been used in studies of perceptions of the role of the principal. As the search for an appropriate instrument was begun, it was thought that an existing instrument or instruments could be adapted for use in this study. After carefully reviewing the available literature, no instruments were found that seemed appropriate to the purpose of this study. An instrument was devised and developed, therefore, to elicit responses from principals and teachers regarding their perceptions of the job of the secondary school principal (Appendix A).

A publication of the National Association of Secondary School Principals published in 1970, The Principalship, included a number of specific tasks which the national organization believed to be indicative of the normal job of the principal. The publication listed these items under general categories which described the total role of the principal as he performs his assigned tasks. It was from this source that the items included in the instrument were obtained. The validity of the instrument was assumed, as the items included in it had been developed by a study committee of the NASSP. Through the utilization

of an available program, TESTAT, at the Computer Center of the University of North Dakota, the reliability coefficient was determined to be .815 (Computer Center, 1975).

The relationship of a principal with his teaching staff is among the closest in the education profession. It was decided, therefore, to use these two groups as the basis for testing the following null hypotheses and research questions:

1. Hypothesis One--there are no significant differences between teachers and principals in their perceptions of the rating of job specifications of a secondary principal;

2. Hypothesis Two--there are no significant differences among the respondents' perceptions of job specifications of a secondary school principal when tested against selected educational and demographic variables;

3. Hypothesis Three--there are no significant differences between teachers and principals in their perceptions of the ranking of general job categories of a secondary school principal;

4. Hypothesis Four--there are no significant differences among respondents' perceptions of general job categories of a secondary school principal when tested against selected educational and demographic variables;

5. Research Question A--what educational or demographic variables might appear to contribute to the differences in perception of job specifications of secondary school principal among principals and among teachers?

6. Research Question B--what relationship exists between the respondents' perceptions of rankings of general job categories and their perceptions of corresponding job specifications?

The respondents were asked to rate the thirty-five statements concerning certain tasks which a secondary principal might be expected to perform. For each of these task items, the respondents were asked to assign a rating from one to five, based upon their perceptions of the job of a secondary school principal. The ratings were: (1) imperative, (2) important, (3) unimportant usually, but could do, (4) unimportant, and (5) should not do.

The directions for this part of the instrument cautioned the respondents not to use the behavior of any principal that they may have known as the basis for their response. The rating was made on an individual basis for each item and not on a comparative rating with any of the other items.

The second portion, Part B, of the instrument listed six general categories of tasks. Respondents were asked to rank these items from one to six, with one being the most important and six the least important, based upon their perceptions of the job of a principal.

Selected demographic data were requested in Part C of the instrument. Principals and teachers, alike, were asked to complete identical items with the exception of one. This singular exception concerned the length of teaching experience for teachers and the number of years in school administration for principals.

Description of the Population

The population for this study consisted of 202 principals and 404 teachers in selected secondary schools in the state of Minnesota. The schools were selected from the Minnesota Educational Directory for 1974-75 (1975). Schools from Minnesota were selected because the principals' organization in Minnesota has a high percentage of the state's principals as members, and, also, the number of schools in the state would offer a sufficient number of schools for a study of this type.

The schools were selected on the basis of their descriptions in the Directory. Because the study was to be concerned with secondary school principals and teachers, a decision was made to include only schools which had been classified as either junior or senior high schools and only schools from districts that had at least one school for each of those two levels.

Eighty one districts were identified as having such schools. In these districts, 107 senior high schools and 146 junior high schools existed, according to the Directory. The decision was made to use the entire body of 107 senior high schools, but to make a random selection of 100 junior high schools from the original number.

To make the random selection of the junior high schools, the schools were first arranged alphabetically by school name. Each school was then assigned a number, on the basis of the alphabetical arrangement, from one through 100. A table of random numbers (Minium, 1970) was used to obtain the 100 selected schools. The names of the schools were placed on 3 x 5 index cards after the selection was completed.

Two teachers from these schools were selected randomly by subject area and grade level taught. This method was chosen because of the difficulty in obtaining the names of staff members. The decision to use two teachers rather than one from the staff of each of the schools was based upon: (1) a concern for the number of potential returns and (2) the wider range of opinions that could be obtained with the larger sample.

To identify the high school teachers, a list of eleven subject areas was developed (Appendix C), while for the junior high schools, eight subject areas were employed. The larger number of subjects was chosen for the high schools because of the normally larger number of courses available in high school curricula.

Each subject area list was put into alphabetical sequence and numbered from one through eleven for the high schools and from one through eight for the junior high schools. The draw for the random selection of the subject areas for each school was accomplished through the adaptation of an existing random number generating program, RANDU, at the Computer Center of the University of North Dakota. The draw was made separately for senior high schools and junior high schools which were arranged alphabetically. Each draw was on a replacement basis.

Application of the same statistical program was used to determine the grade level for the selected teachers. In this case, the numerals 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12 were used to identify the grade levels. Again, the draw was made on a replacement basis and the junior and senior high schools were arranged alphabetically in separate groups. The subject areas and grade levels to be used for

each school were placed upon the appropriate index cards.

Following the random selections, the cards, which contained the names of the schools and the subject areas and grade levels for teacher selection, were taken to the offices of the Minnesota Association of Secondary School Principals. The names of the principals of the schools were added to the cards which were then put into an alphabetical arrangement, using the last name of the principal as the determination of placement. Each card was then numbered so that later identification of non-responders could be made.

Collection of Data

The survey materials were mailed January 12, 1976, to each of the schools selected to be a part of the study. The date was chosen so that the materials would arrive during mid-week and at least a week after the schools resumed operation following the traditional winter break in December. The mailing went directly to the principal of each building.

Included in the mailing was a letter to the principal (Appendix B), asking for his assistance in the survey by completing the survey instrument. He was also asked to distribute the materials, which were enclosed, to the selected teachers. In addition to the letter, the principal's materials included a copy of the instrument for the principal to complete (Appendix A), a card to be completed and returned if a resume' of the study was desired (Appendix D), an addressed, stamped envelope in which to return the materials, and an envelope of materials for each of the selected teachers.

The materials presented to the teachers were placed in separate

envelopes for each. These materials consisted of a letter requesting the assistance of the teacher (Appendix C), a copy of the survey instrument, and an addressed, stamped envelope to be used for returning the completed instrument.

Both groups, teachers and principals, were advised that their anonymity would be preserved through the use of a neutral person to process the returned instruments.

Survey materials were sent to principals and teachers in 202 schools. Five of the original schools had changed their classification from junior high school to middle school and the decision was made to eliminate them from the population. The data in Table 1 summarize the

TABLE 1
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

Source	Popu- lation	N Usable Response	N Blank Response	N No Response	Response Percent (Col. 2÷ Col. 1)
Junior High					
Schools	95	76	1	18	80.0
Principals	95	73	1	21	76.8
Teachers	190	128	3	59	67.4
Senior High					
Schools	107	96	0	11	89.7
Principals	107	96	0	11	89.7
Teachers	214	145	3	66	67.8
Composite					
Schools	202	172	1	29	85.1
Principals	202	169	1	32	83.6
Teachers	404	273	6	125	67.6
Total	606	442	7	157	72.9

responses received. Responses were received from 172 schools. Of a total of 606 possible responses, 442 were received for an over-all response of 72.9 percent.

Statistical Treatment of the Data

The data on the survey instrument were transferred onto data processing key-punch cards which were then verified for accuracy. Through the medium of the cards, the data were incorporated into existing statistical programs at the Computer Center, University of North Dakota, for analysis.

The specific programs which were used for the analysis of the data were found in Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (Nie et al, 1975). Subprogram CROSSTABS was used with the data for Part A of the instrument to obtain the chi-square values and tables which are presented in Chapter IV.

To analyze the data for Part B, the subprogram, ONEWAY, was utilized to conduct a one-way analysis of variance of the data. A stepwise forward inclusion multiple regression technique was used to analyze the relationship of the demographic variables to the perceptions of ratings in Part A and rankings in Part B.

The subprogram, ONEWAY, was also used to determine the relationships between the data in Part B and those in Part A. The results of these analyses were compiled for presentation in Chapter IV for further interpretation.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

This study was conducted to determine if any differences existed between the perceptions of teachers and principals as they viewed the job specifications of a secondary school principal. A second purpose was to ascertain if teachers and principals differed in their perceptions of general job categories of a secondary school principal. The third purpose of the study was to determine if selected demographic variables had any significant effect upon the responses of the teachers and principals.

Questions raised by these purposes suggested the following null hypotheses for testing:

1. Hypothesis One--there are no significant differences between teachers and principals in their perceptions of the rating of job specifications of a secondary school principal;
2. Hypothesis Two--there are no significant differences among the respondents' perceptions of job specifications of a secondary school principal when tested against selected educational and demographic variables;
3. Hypothesis Three--there are no significant differences between teachers and principals in their perceptions of the ranking of general job categories of a secondary school principal;

4. Hypothesis Four--there are no significant differences among the respondents' perceptions of general job categories of a secondary school principal when tested against selected educational and demographic variables.

Additionally, two research questions were raised: (A) what educational or demographic variables might appear to contribute to differences in perception of job specifications of secondary school principals among principals and among teachers, and (B) what relationship exists between the respondents' perceptions of rankings of general job categories and their perceptions of corresponding job specifications?

The data for this study were collected by means of a three-part questionnaire which requested each respondent to rate thirty-five statements in Part A concerning the job specifications of a secondary school principal and to rank six general job categories in Part B according to the perceptions of the respondents. In addition, the respondents were requested, in Part C, to provide demographic data which were used in the analysis of the data from Parts A and B (Appendix A). A level of .05 was selected a priori to test for significance. After the data were compiled, they were subjected to statistical analyses.

A chi-square treatment was used in the analysis of the data to identify differences in perception of the ratings in Part A as viewed by the teachers and principals in the sample. The data from Part B, the ranking of general job categories, were analyzed through the use of a one-way analysis of variance. The effect which the demographic

variables had upon the perceptions of the respondents was determined through a stepwise forward inclusion multiple regression technique. These statistical analyses were accomplished through the use of Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (Nie et al, 1975) in conjunction with the computer Center of the University of North Dakota.

For the purposes of the analysis of the data, the thirty-five items in Part A of the questionnaire were rearranged into subsets, according to the classifications which had been used in the original publication (NASSP, 1970). A further adjustment of the data was a compression of the data into three levels of importance, rather than the five which the survey instrument called for. This was done to reduce the number of empty cells in the chi-square calculations.

The selected demographic variables used in the analysis included the position held (teacher or principal), the level of the school (junior or senior high school), sex, highest degree obtained, number of years in teaching (teachers only), number of years in administration (principals only), number of years in present position, and the size of school (student population).

The data are presented in a series of tables which display the differences between teachers and principals and which, also, exhibit the effect that the educational and demographic variables had upon the responses.

A summary of chi-square values for the respondents' perceptions of job specifications is shown in Table 2, with the thirty-five items arranged by subsets. Twenty-two of the thirty-five items were shown to possess statistically significant differences at the .05 level,

having reached or exceeded the critical value for the .01 level of significance, 9.21, and eleven exceeded 13.82, the critical value for the .001 level of significance.

In Subset One, item 22 (the principal shares with his fellow principals his knowledge, his understanding, and his comfort when the occasion requires) had a chi-square value which was significant at the .01 level. The values for item 28 (the principal contributes to the programs of and seeks leadership positions in professional associations) and item 35 (the principal delegates tasks to his assistants so that they may receive a wide breadth of administrative experience) were significant at the .001 level.

Subset Two had two significant items. The differences between teachers' and principals' perceptions of item 5 (the principal serves as a resource person during teacher-school board negotiations) were significant at the .001 level. Item 12 (the principal realizes that conflict will arise as people differ on means and ends) differences were significant at the .05 level.

Eight of the ten chi-square values in Subset Three reached significance. The chi-square value for item 8 (the principal keeps instruction and learning foremost in planning for the school) was significant at the .01 level. Five items had chi-square values which reached significance at the .001 level. They were item 1 (the principal does not hesitate to suggest his own ideas for program, curriculum, and organization), item 15 (the principal is accountable for the over-all effectiveness of the school), item 16 (the principal fosters sound inter-personal relationships among and between the students, the

teachers, and the administration), item 21 (the principal adapts the school's program to the requirements of the individual student), and item 23 (the principal assists individual teachers in their self-improvement efforts).

The perceptions of three of the five items in Subset Four reached significant levels of difference. The chi-square value for item 34 (the principal objectively criticizes his own actions) was significant at .05. Item 20 (the principal works sympathetically with all parents) had differences which reached significance at the .01 level. The chi-square value of item 6 (the principal provides counsel and assistance for any student) exceeded the critical value for significance at the .001 level.

Subset Five contained two items in which the differences reached significance. Item 11 (the principal is responsible for making the school meaningful to the community) had a chi-square value which was significant at the .001 level. The differences in perception of item 18 (the principal involves students in the program and the problems of the school) reached the .05 level of significance.

Four items in Subset Six were identified as possessing statistically significant differences. Item 3 (the principal participates in decision-making at all levels, when the policies affect his school's operation) had a chi-square value which was significant at the .05 level. Item 10 (the principal is the sole person within the building responsible for budget allocations for the building) and item 24 (the principal delegates to teachers the task of developing building rules and regulations) had differences which were significant at .01. The chi-square value for item 31 (the principal is responsible for the

effect the school has on its students) exceeded the critical value of 13.82 and was significant at the .001 level.

These twenty-two items showed that there were differences between teachers and principals in their perceptions of the job specifications of a secondary school principal. These differences are demonstrated in Tables 3 through 24.

Hypothesis One--there are no significant differences between teachers and principals in their perceptions of the rating of job specifications of a secondary school principal--therefore, was rejected at the .05 level for the twenty-two job specifications listed above and displayed in Table 2.

TABLE 2

SUMMARY OF CHI-SQUARE VALUES FOR RESPONDENTS'
PERCEPTIONS OF JOB SPECIFICATIONS, ARRANGED
BY SUBSETS, BY TEACHERS AND BY PRINCIPALS

Job Specifications	Chi-Square Value
SUBSET ONE--PROFESSIONAL	
7. The principal participates in continuous study and research in secondary education and administration.	0.07
14. The principal regularly attends the conventions and annual meetings of his professional associations.	4.87
22. The principal shares with his fellow principals his knowledge, his understanding, and his comfort when the occasion requires.	12.15**
28. The principal contributes to the programs of and seeks leadership positions in professional associations.	15.71***

TABLE 2--Continued

Job Specifications	Chi-Square Value
35. The principal delegates tasks to his assistants so that they may receive a wide breadth of administrative experience.	27.23***
SUBSET TWO--CONFLICT MEDIATOR	
5. The principal serves as a resource person during teacher-school board negotiations.	25.78***
12. The principal realizes that conflict will arise as people differ on means and ends.	7.14*
19. The principal establishes a climate that will make conflict unnecessary in the school.	0.13
26. The principal recognizes in the ingredients of a conflict those opportunities that may exist for promoting personal and professional growth.	1.27
33. The principal mediates teacher-teacher disputes.	3.89
SUBSET THREE--EDUCATIONAL LEADER	
1. The principal does not hesitate to suggest his own ideas for program, curriculum, and organization.	25.86***
2. The principal evaluates teacher performance on the basis of cooperatively determined objectives and criteria.	1.82
8. The principal keeps instruction and learning foremost in planning for the school.	6.33*
9. The principal nurtures potential staff leadership by providing opportunities for professional growth.	2.67
15. The principal is accountable for the over-all effectiveness of the school.	14.02***
16. The principal fosters sound inter-personal relationships among and between the students, the teachers, and the administration.	16.39***

TABLE 2--Continued

Job Specifications	Chi-Square Value
21. The principal adapts the school's program to the requirements of the individual student.	33.69***
23. The principal assists individual teachers in their self-improvement efforts.	16.08***
29. The principal helps to establish the goals for the school.	12.34**
30. The principal builds a competent staff through sound selection, orientation, and in-service activities.	10.32**
SUBSET FOUR--OMBUDSMAN	
6. The principal provides counsel and assistance for any student.	37.12***
13. The principal is available to all teachers.	2.27
20. The principal works sympathetically with all parents	11.72**
27. The principal challenges his own school's policies and goals.	4.71
34. The principal objectively criticizes his own actions.	6.21*
SUBSET FIVE--PUBLIC RELATIONS PRACTITIONER	
4. The principal acts as a "go-between" with the teachers and the district administration.	2.43
11. The principal is responsible for making the school meaningful to the community.	33.23***
18. The principal involves students in the program and the problems of the school.	8.23*
25. The principal interprets to his colleagues in the principalship his building's program, its purposes and problems.	0.19

TABLE 2--Continued

Job Specifications	Chi-Square Value
32. The principal helps the board of education understand the goals of the school.	4.39
SUBSET SIX--ADMINISTRATOR	
3. The principal participates in decision-making at all levels, when the policies affect his school's operation.	8.55*
10. The principal is the sole person within the building responsible for budget allocations for the building.	13.79**
17. The principal involves others in decision-making.	3.71
24. The principal delegates to teachers the task of developing building rules and regulations.	9.50**
31. The principal is responsible for the effect the school has on its students.	25.75***

* .05 Level of Significance

** .01 Level of Significance

*** .001 Level of Significance

The data in Table 3 indicated that the responses to item 22 of Subset One showed significant difference between teachers and principals. The chi-square value of 12.15 was significant at the .01 level.

In Table 4 are found the data for item 28, Subset One. The differences shown there are significant at the .001 level with a chi-square value of 15.71.

The differences in responses for item 35, Subset One, are displayed in Table 5. The chi-square value of 27.23 was significant at the .001 level.

TABLE 3

CROSSTABULATION OF RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF ITEM 22,
SUBSET ONE, BY TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS

Respondents	Highly Important	Neutral	Unimportant	Row Total
Teachers	Row % = 76.1	21.7	2.2	61.7
	Col % = 57.8	77.6	85.7	
	N = 207	59	6	272
Principals	Row % = 89.3	10.1	0.6	38.3
	Col % = 42.2	22.4	14.3	
	N = 151	17	1	169
Column Total	% = 81.2 N = 358	17.2 76	1.6 7	441

Chi-Square = 12.15. Significant at .01 with 1 df; tabled value = 9.21.

TABLE 4

CROSSTABULATION OF RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF ITEM 28,
SUBSET ONE, BY TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS

Respondents	Highly Important	Neutral	Unimportant	Row Total
Teachers	Row % = 41.5	48.2	10.3	61.7
	Col % = 52.3	70.8	70.0	
	N = 113	131	28	272
Principals	Row % = 60.9	32.0	7.1	38.3
	Col % = 47.7	29.2	30.0	
	N = 103	54	12	169
Column Total	% = 49.0 N = 216	42.0 185	9.0 40	441

Chi-Square = 15.71. Significant at .001 with 2 df; tabled value = 13.82.

TABLE 5

CROSSTABULATION OF RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF ITEM 35,
SUBSET ONE, BY TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS

Respondents	Highly Important	Neutral	Unimportant	Row Total
Teachers	Row % = 77.9 Col % = 56.7 N = 212	16.5 93.8 45	5.5 78.9 15	61.7 272
Principals	Row % = 95.9 Col % = 43.3 N = 162	1.8 6.3 3	2.4 21.1 4	38.3 169
Column Total	% = 84.8 N = 374	10.9 48	4.3 19	441

Chi-Square = 27.23. Significant at .001 with 2 df; tabled
value = 13.82.

Hypothesis One--there are no significant differences between teachers and principals in their perceptions of the rating of job specifications of a secondary school principal--therefore, was rejected at the .05 level for three of the five job specifications in Subset One. These items are: (1) the principal shares with his fellow principals his knowledge, his understanding, and his comfort when the occasion requires; (2) the principal contributes to the programs of and seeks leadership positions in professional associations; and (3) the principal delegates tasks to his assistants so that they may receive a wide breadth of administrative experience.

The differences between the responses of teachers and principals for item 5, Subset Two, are displayed in Table 6. The chi-square value of 25.78 was significant at .001.

TABLE 6

CROSSTABULATION OF RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF ITEM 5,
SUBSET TWO, BY TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS

Respondents		Highly Important	Neutral	Unimportant	Row Total
Teachers	Row % =	28.2	34.1	37.7	61.8
	Col % =	46.7	72.7	69.1	
	N =	77	93	103	273
Principals	Row % =	52.1	20.7	27.2	38.2
	Col % =	53.3	27.3	30.9	
	N =	88	35	46	169
Column Total	% =	37.3	29.0	33.7	
	N =	165	128	149	442

Chi-Square = 25.78. Significant at .001 with 2 df; tabled
value = 13.82.

In Table 7 are found the data which show the differences between teachers and principals concerning item 12, Subset Two. The chi-square value of 7.14 was significant at the .05 level.

Hypothesis One--there are no significant differences between teachers and principals in their perceptions of the rating of job specifications of a secondary school principal--therefore, was rejected at the .05 level for two of the five job specifications in Subset Two (the principal serves as a resource person during teacher-school board negotiations and the principal realizes that conflict will arise as people differ on means and ends).

A display of respondents' perceptions of item 1 in Subset Three is found in Table 8. The differences in perception were significant at the level of .001 with a chi-square value of 25.86.

TABLE 7

CROSSTABULATION OF RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF ITEM 12,
SUBSET TWO, BY TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS

Respondents		Highly Important	Neutral	Unimportant	Row Total
Teachers	Row % = 89.0		7.0	4.0	61.8
	Col % = 61.1		57.6	100.0	
	N = 243		29	11	273
Principals	Row % = 91.7		8.3	0.0	38.2
	Col % = 38.9		42.4	0.0	
	N = 155		14	0	169
Column Total		% = 90.0 N = 398	7.5 33	2.5 11	442

Chi-Square = 7.14. Significant at .05 with 2 df; tabled value = 5.99.

TABLE 8

CROSSTABULATION OF RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF ITEM 1,
SUBSET THREE, BY TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS

Respondents		Highly Important	Neutral	Unimportant	Row Total
Teachers	Row % = 83.5		12.8	3.7	61.8
	Col % = 57.7		97.2	90.9	
	N = 228		35	20	273
Principals	Row % = 98.8		0.6	0.6	38.2
	Col % = 42.3		2.8	9.1	
	N = 167		1	1	169
Column Total		% = 89.4 N = 395	8.1 36	2.5 11	442

Chi-Square = 25.86. Significant at .001 with 2 df; tabled
value = 13.82.

In Table 9 are found the data representing the differences in perception between teachers and principals concerning item 8, Subset Three. The chi-square value of 6.33 was significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 9

CROSSTABULATION OF RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF ITEM 8,
SUBSET THREE, BY TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS

Respondents	Highly Important	Neutral	Unimportant	Row Total
Teachers	Row % = 96.3 Col % = 60.9 N = 263	2.2 100.0 6	1.5 100.0 4	61.8 273
Principals	Row % = 100.0 Col % = 39.1 N = 169	0.0 0.0 0	0.0 0.0 0	38.2 169
Column Total	% = 97.7 N = 432	1.4 6	0.9 4	 442

Chi-Square = 6.33. Significant at .05 with 2 df; tabled value = 5.99.

The data in Table 10 demonstrate the differences in perception between teachers and principals regarding item 15 in Subset Three. A significance level of .001 was exceeded by the chi-square value of 14.02.

Differences in perception of item 16, Subset Three, by teachers and principals is shown in Table 11. The chi-square value of 16.39 was significant at the .001 level.

In Table 12 are found the data which display the differences in perception between teachers and principals when viewing item 21, Subset Three. The chi-square value of 33.69 exceeded the .001 level of significance.

TABLE 10

CROSSTABULATION OF RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF ITEM 15,
SUBSET THREE, BY TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS

Respondents	Highly Important	Neutral	Unimportant	Row Total
Teachers	Row % = 85.3 Col % = 58.8 N = 233	10.3 84.8 28	4.4 92.3 12	61.8 273
Principals	Row % = 96.4 Col % = 41.2 N = 163	3.0 15.2 5	0.6 7.7 1	38.2 169
Column Total	% = 89.6 N = 396	7.5 33	2.9 13	442

Chi-Square = 14.02. Significant at .001 with 2 df; tabled
value = 13.82.

TABLE 11

CROSSTABULATION OF RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF ITEM 16,
SUBSET THREE, BY TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS

Respondents	Highly Important	Neutral	Unimportant	Row Total
Teachers	Row % = 88.3 Col % = 59.1 N = 241	10.3 93.3 28	1.5 100.0 4	61.8 273
Principals	Row % = 98.8 Col % = 40.9 N = 167	1.2 6.7 2	0.0 0.0 0	38.2 169
Column Total	% = 92.3 N = 408	6.8 30	0.9 4	442

Chi-Square = 16.39. Significant at .001 with 2 df; tabled
value = 13.82.

TABLE 12

CROSSTABULATION OF RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF ITEM 21,
SUBSET THREE, BY TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS

Respondents	Highly Important	Neutral	Unimportant	Row Total
Teachers	Row % = 64.5 Col % = 53.8 N = 176	25.6 85.4 70	9.9 81.8 27	61.8 273
Principals	Row % = 89.3 Col % = 46.2 N = 151	7.1 14.6 12	3.6 18.2 6	38.2 169
Column Total	% = 74.0 N = 327	18.6 82	7.5 33	442

Chi-Square = 33.69. Significant at .001 with 2 df; tabled
value = 13.82.

The teachers and principals differed in their perceptions of item 23, Subset Three, as shown in Table 13. The critical value of 13.82 was exceeded by the chi-square value of 16.08 and was, therefore, significant at the .001 level.

The data displayed in Table 14 indicate the differences in perception between teachers and principals in their views concerning item 29, Subset Three. The chi-square value of 12.34 was significant at the .01 level.

In Table 15 are found the data for the perceptions of item 30 of Subset Three as viewed by teachers and principals. The chi-square value of 10.32 was significant at the .01 level.

TABLE 13

CROSSTABULATION OF RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF ITEM 23,
SUBSET THREE, BY TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS

Respondents	Highly Important	Neutral	Unimportant	Row Total
Teachers	Row % = 83.1 Col % = 58.2 N = 226	14.7 87.0 40	2.2 85.7 6	61.7 272
Principals	Row % = 95.9 Col % = 41.8 N = 162	3.6 13.0 6	0.6 14.3 1	38.3 169
Column Total	% = 88.0 N = 388	10.4 46	1.6 7	441

Chi-Square = 16.08. Significant at .001 with 2 df; tabled
value = 13.82.

TABLE 14

CROSSTABULATION OF RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF ITEM 29,
SUBSET THREE, BY TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS

Respondents	Highly Important	Neutral	Unimportant	Row Total
Teachers	Row % = 93.0 Col % = 60.0 N = 253	5.5 100.0 15	1.5 100.0 4	61.7 272
Principals	Row % = 100.0 Col % = 40.0 N = 169	0.0 0.0 0	0.0 0.0 0	38.3 169
Column Total	% = 95.7 N = 422	3.4 15	0.9 4	441

Chi-Square = 12.34. Significant at .01 with 2 df; tabled value = 9.21.

TABLE 15

CROSSTABULATION OF RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF ITEM 30,
SUBSET THREE, BY TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS

Respondents	Highly Important	Neutral	Unimportant	Row Total
Teachers	Row % = 94.1 Col % = 60.2 N = 256	5.1 100.0 14	0.7 100.0 2	61.7 272
Principals	Row % = 100.0 Col % = 39.8 N = 169	0.0 0.0 0	0.0 0.0 0	38.3 169
Column Total	% = 96.4 N = 425	3.2 14	0.5 2	 441

Chi-Square = 10.32. Significant at .01 with 2 df; tabled value = 9.21.

Hypothesis One---there are no significant differences between teachers and principals in their perceptions of the rating of job specifications of a secondary school principal--therefore, was rejected at the .05 level for eight of the ten job specifications in Subset Three. The eight included: (1) the principal does not hesitate to suggest his own ideas for program, curriculum, and organization; (2) the principal keeps instruction and learning foremost in planning for the school; (3) the principal is accountable for the over-all effectiveness of the school; (4) the principal fosters sound inter-personal relationships among and between the students, the teachers, and the administration; (5) the principal adapts the school's program to the requirements of the individual student; (6) the principal assists individual teachers in their self-improvement efforts; (7) the principal helps to establish the goals for the school; and (8) the principal builds a competent

staff through sound selection, orientation, and in-service activities.

The data in Table 16 display the differences in perception between teachers and principals when viewing item 6 in Subset Four. The chi-square value of 37.12 was significant at the .001 level.

TABLE 16

CROSSTABULATION OF RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF ITEM 6,
SUBSET FOUR, BY TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS

Respondents	Highly Important	Neutral	Unimportant	Row Total
Teachers	Row % = 52.4 Col % = 51.1 N = 143	38.8 80.9 106	8.8 77.4 24	61.8 273
Principals	Row % = 81.1 Col % = 48.9 N = 137	14.8 19.1 25	4.1 22.6 7	38.2 169
Column Total	% = 63.3 N = 280	29.6 131	7.0 31	442

Chi-Square = 37.12. Significant at .001 with 2 df; tabled value = 13.82.

In Table 17 are found the data which reflect the teachers' and principals' perceptions of item 20 of Subset Four. The chi-square value, 11.71, was significant at the .01 level of significance.

The differences in responses for item 34, Subset Four, are displayed in Table 18. The differences were significant at the .05 level with a chi-square value of 6.21.

Hypothesis One--there are no significant differences between teachers and principals in their perceptions of the rating of job specifications of a secondary school principal--therefore, was rejected at

the .05 level for three of the five job specifications in Subset Four. These specifications were: (1) the principal provides counsel and assistance for any student; (2) the principal works sympathetically with all parents; and (3) the principal objectively criticizes his own actions.

TABLE 17

CROSSTABULATION OF RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF ITEM 20,
SUBSET FOUR, BY TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS

Respondents	Highly Important	Neutral	Unimportant	Row Total
Teachers	Row % = 72.5 Col % = 58.9 N = 198	22.3 78.2 61	5.1 50.0 14	61.8 273
Principals	Row % = 81.7 Col % = 41.1 N = 138	10.1 21.8 17	8.3 50.0 14	38.2 169
Column Total	% = 76.0 N = 336	17.6 78	6.3 26	442

Chi-Square = 11.71. Significant at .01 with 2 df; tabled value = 9.21.

The perceptions reported by the responding teachers and principals concerning item 11, Subset Five, are reported in Table 19. The chi-square value of 33.23 was significant at the .001 level.

The data in Table 20 report the differences in perception between teachers and principals about item 18, Subset Five. The chi-square value of 8.23 was significant at .05.

TABLE 18

CROSSTABULATION OF RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF ITEM 34,
SUBSET FOUR, BY TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS

Respondents	Highly Important	Neutral	Unimportant	Row Total
Teachers	Row % = 90.1	8.8	1.1	61.7
	Col % = 60.0	82.8	75.0	
	N = 245	24	3	272
Principals	Row % = 96.4	3.0	0.6	38.3
	Col % = 40.0	17.2	25.0	
	N = 163	5	5	169
Column	% = 92.5	6.6	0.9	
	N = 408	29	4	441

Chi-Square = 6.21. Significant at .05 with 2 df; tabled value = 5.99.

TABLE 19

CROSSTABULATION OF RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF ITEM 11,
SUBSET FIVE, BY TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS

Respondents	Highly Important	Neutral	Unimportant	Row Total
Teachers	Row % = 72.9	22.3	4.8	61.8
	Col % = 55.4	87.1	100.0	
	N = 199	61	13	273
Principals	Row % = 94.7	5.3	0.0	38.2
	Col % = 44.6	12.9	0.0	
	N = 160	9	0	169
Column	% = 81.2	15.8	2.9	
Total	N = 359	70	13	442

Chi-Square = 33.23. Significant at .001 with 2 df; tabled
value = 13.82.

TABLE 20

CROSSTABULATION OF RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF ITEM 18,
SUBSET FIVE, BY TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS

Respondents	Highly Important	Neutral	Unimportant	Row Total
Teachers	Row % = 71.1	25.6	3.3	61.8
	Col % = 58.1	72.2	81.8	
	N = 194	70	9	273
Principals	Row % = 82.8	16.0	1.2	38.2
	Col % = 41.9	27.8	18.2	
	N = 140	27	2	169
Column Total	% = 75.6 N = 334	21.9 97	2.5 11	442

Chi-Square = 8.23. Significant at .05 with 2 df; tabled value = 5.99.

Hypothesis One--there are no significant differences between teachers and principals in their perceptions of the rating of job specifications of a secondary school principal--therefore, was rejected at the .05 level for two of the five job specifications in Subset Five (the principal is responsible for making the school meaningful to the community and the principal involves students in the program and the problems of the school).

In Table 21 are found the data which indicate the differences in perception between teachers and principals in their views of item 3, Subset Six. A chi-square value of 8.55 was significant at .05.

The data in Table 22 display the responses of teachers and principals to item 10, Subset Six. The chi-square value of 13.79 exceeded the critical value of 9.21 and, therefore, was significant at the .01 level.

TABLE 21

CROSSTABULATION OF RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF ITEM 3,
SUBSET SIX, BY TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS

Respondents	Highly Important	Neutral	Unimportant	Row Total
Teachers	Row % = 89.7 Col % = 59.9 N = 245	5.9 80.0 16	4.4 92.3 12	61.8 173
Principals	Row % = 97.0 Col % = 40.1 N = 164	2.4 20.0 4	0.6 7.7 1	38.2 169
Column Total	% = 92.5 N = 409	4.5 20	2.9 13	442

Chi-Square = 8.55. Significant at .05 with 2 df; tabled value = 5.99.

TABLE 22

CROSSTABULATION OF RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF ITEM 10,
SUBSET SIX, BY TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS

Respondents	Highly Important	Neutral	Unimportant	Row Total
Teachers	Row % = 30.4 Col % = 51.2 N = 83	21.2 62.4 58	48.4 70.6 132	61.8 273
Principals	Row % = 46.7 Col % = 48.8 N = 79	20.7 37.6 35	32.5 29.4 55	38.2 169
Column Total	% = 36.7 N = 162	21.0 93	42.3 187	442

Chi-Square = 13.79. Significant at .01 with 2 df; tabled value = 9.21.

The data in Table 23, indicating perceptions of the teachers and principals as they viewed item 24 of Subset Six, showed significant differences. The chi-square value of 9.50 was significant at the .01 level.

TABLE 23

CROSSTABULATION OF RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF ITEM 24,
SUBSET SIX, BY TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS

Respondents	Highly Important	Neutral	Unimportant	Row Total
Teachers	Row % = 54.4 Col % = 64.9 N = 148	27.9 66.7 76	17.6 48.5 48	61.7 272
Principals	Row % = 47.3 Col % = 35.1 N = 80	22.5 33.3 38	30.2 51.5 51	38.3 169
Column Total	% = 51.7 N = 228	25.9 114	22.4 99	441

Chi-Square = 9.50. Significant at .01 with 2 df; tabled value = 9.21.

In Table 24 are the data which demonstrate the differences in perceptions between teachers and principals as they viewed item 31 of Subset Six. The chi-square value of 25.75 was significant at the .001 level.

Hypothesis One--there are no significant differences between teachers and principals in their perceptions of the rating of job specifications of a secondary school principal--therefore, was rejected at the .05 level for four of the five job specifications in Subset Six. These job specifications are: (1) the principal participates in decision-making at all levels, when the policies affect his school's

operation; (2) the principal is the sole person within the building responsible for budget allocations for the building; (3) the principal delegates to teachers the task of developing building rules and regulations; and (4) the principal is responsible for the effect the school has on its students.

TABLE 24

CROSSTABULATION OF RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF ITEM 31,
SUBSET SIX, BY TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS

Respondents		Highly Important	Neutral	Unimportant	Row Total
Teachers	Row % = 73.9		18.8	7.4	61.7
	Col % = 56.1		82.3	95.2	
	N = 201		51	20	272
Principals	Row % = 92.9		6.5	0.6	38.3
	Col % = 43.9		17.7	4.8	
	N = 157		11	1	169
Column Total	% = 81.2 N = 358		14.1 62	4.8 21	441

Chi-Square = 25.75. Significant at .001 with 2 df; tabled value = 13.82.

The stepwise forward regression for demographic variables of all respondents, with Subset One, Professional, as the criterion is presented in Table 25. Most of the multiple correlations were significant. The remaining variable, Years of Experience, had an F-level which was insufficient for further computation.

Hypothesis Two--there are no significant differences among the respondents' perceptions of job specifications of a secondary school principal when tested against selected educational and demographic

variables--therefore, was rejected at the .05 level for Subset One (Professional) in all areas with which the demographic variables were related except Years of Experience.

TABLE 25

STEPWISE FORWARD INCLUSION PROCEDURE FOR DEMOGRAPHIC
VARIABLES OF ALL RESPONDENTS WITH SUBSET ONE,
PROFESSIONAL, AS THE CRITERION (N=420)

Step	Variable Included	R	F
1	Highest Degree Obtained	.192	16.02*
2	Position	.209	9.53*
3	Size of School	.231	7.74*
4	Sex	.236	6.13*
5	Level of School	.240	5.06*
6	Years in Present Position	.243	4.31*
(F-level of remaining variable--Years of Experience-- insufficient for further computation)			

* .01 Level of Significance

The stepwise forward regression for the demographic variables of all respondents with Subset Two (Conflict Mediator) as the criterion is exhibited in Table 25. All of the multiple correlations were significant.

Hypothesis Two--there are no significant differences among the respondents' perceptions of job specifications of a secondary school principal when tested against selected educational and demographic variables--therefore, was rejected at the .05 level for Subset Two (Conflict Mediator) in all areas of the demographic variables.

TABLE 26

STEPWISE FORWARD INCLUSION PROCEDURE FOR DEMOGRAPHIC
VARIABLES OF ALL RESPONDENTS WITH SUBSET TWO,
CONFLICT MEDIATOR, AS THE CRITERION (N=420)

Step	Variable Included	R	F
1	Position	.114	5.53*
2	Level of School	.151	4.83**
3	Sex	.166	3.91**
4	Years of Experience	.179	3.44**
5	Highest Degree Obtained	.181	2.80*
6	Years in Present Position	.182	2.37*
7	Size of School	.184	2.05*

* .05 Level of Significance

** .01 Level of Significance

The stepwise forward regression for the educational and demographic variables of all respondents with Subset Three (Educational Leader) is presented in Table 27. All of the variables possessed significant multiple correlations.

Hypothesis Two--there are no significant differences among the respondents' perceptions of job specifications of a secondary school principal when tested against selected educational and demographic variables--therefore, was rejected at the .05 level for Subset Three (Educational Leader) in all areas with which the demographic variables were identified.

TABLE 27

STEPWISE FORWARD INCLUSION PROCEDURE FOR DEMOGRAPHIC
VARIABLES OF ALL RESPONDENTS WITH SUBSET THREE,
EDUCATIONAL LEADER, AS THE CRITERION (N=420)

Step	Variable Included	R	F
1	Position	.366	64.47*
2	Size of School	.383	35.37*
3	Years in Present Position	.386	24.22*
4	Highest Degree Obtained	.387	18.27*
5	Level of School	.388	14.67*
6	Sex	.389	12.24*
7	Years of Experience	.389	10.47*

* .001 Level of Significance

The data in Table 28 display the stepwise forward regression for the educational and demographic variables of all respondents with Subset Four (Ombudsman) as the criterion. The multiple correlations for all of the variables were found to be significant at the .01 level.

Hypothesis Two--there are no significant differences among the respondents' perceptions of job specifications of a secondary school principal when tested against selected educational demographic variables--therefore, was rejected at the .05 level for Subset Four (Ombudsman) in all areas with which the demographic variables were identified.

TABLE 28

STEPWISE FORWARD INCLUSION PROCEDURE FOR DEMOGRAPHIC
VARIABLES OF ALL RESPONDENTS WITH SUBSET FOUR,
OMBUDSMAN, AS THE CRITERION (N=420)

Step	Variable Included	R	F
1	Position	.195	16.59*
2	Years in Present Position	.204	9.05*
3	Size of School	.210	6.38*
4	Level of School	.217	5.13*
5	Years of Experience	.221	4.15*
6	Highest Degree Obtained	.225	3.68*
7	Sex	.225	3.14*

* .01 Level of Significance

The stepwise forward regression for the demographic variables of all respondents with Subset Five (Public Relations Practitioner) as the criterion is displayed in Table 29. Most of the multiple correlations were significant. The remaining variable, Position, had an F-level which was insufficient for further computation in the statistical program.

Hypothesis Two--there are no significant differences among the respondents' perceptions of job specifications of a secondary school principal when tested against selected educational and demographic variables--therefore, was rejected at the .05 level of significance for Subset Five (Public Relations Practitioner) in all demographic areas with the exception of Position.

TABLE 29

STEPWISE FORWARD INCLUSION PROCEDURE FOR DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES
OF ALL RESPONDENTS WITH SUBSET FIVE, PUBLIC RELATIONS
PRACTITIONER, AS THE CRITERION (N=420)

Step	Variable Included	R	F
1	Highest Degree Obtained	.146	9.09**
2	Size of School	.176	6.70**
3	Sex	.185	4.89**
4	Years of Experience	.188	3.78**
5	Years in Present Position	.196	3.32**
6	Level of School	.198	2.80*
(F-level of remaining variable, Position is insufficient for further computation)			

* .05 Level of Significance

** .01 Level of Significance

The stepwise forward regression for the demographic variables of all respondents with Subset Six (Administrator) as the criterion is shown in Table 30. All multiple correlations were significant.

Hypothesis Two--there are no significant differences among the respondents' perceptions of job specifications of a secondary school principal when tested against selected educational and demographic variables--therefore, was rejected at the .05 level for Subset Six (Administrator) in all demographic areas.

Simple correlations between the educational and demographic variables and the six subsets are listed in Table 54, which is found in Appendix F. Because the lower numbers were used for the items of

highest importance, it was necessary to reverse the signs of the correlations for ease in interpreting the data.

TABLE 30

STEPWISE FORWARD INCLUSION PROCEDURE FOR DEMOGRAPHIC
VARIABLES OF ALL RESPONDENTS WITH SUBSET SIX,
ADMINISTRATOR, AS THE CRITERION (N=420)

Step	Variable Included	R	F
1	Sex	.201	17.60*
2	Level of School	.242	12.95*
3	Highest Degree Obtained	.264	10.40*
4	Size of School	.277	8.60*
5	Position	.283	7.20*
6	Years of Experience	.284	6.05*
7	Years in Present Position	.284	5.18*

* .01 Level of Significance

In testing Hypothesis Three, the data from Part B of the questionnaire were subjected to a one-way analysis of variance. The information displayed in Table 31 shows the result of the analysis of variance for the teachers' and principals' perceptions of the general job category, Professional. The variance between groups did not reach significance with an F-value of .974. The critical value for the degrees of freedom in Table 31 (1;439) was 3.86.

Hypothesis Three--there are no significant differences between teachers and principals in their perceptions of the ranking of general job categories of a secondary school principal--therefore, was retained for the general job category, Professional.

TABLE 31

SUMMARY TABLE FOR THE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR THE TEACHERS'
AND PRINCIPALS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE GENERAL JOB
CATEGORY, PROFESSIONAL

Source of Variation	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F
Between Groups	1	1.156	1.156	0.974
Within Groups	438	520.121	1.188	
Total	439	521.277		

In Table 32 are the results of the analysis of variance for the teachers' and principals' perceptions of the general job category, Conflict Mediator. The F-value of .003 did not reach significance at the .05 level.

TABLE 32

SUMMARY TABLE FOR THE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR THE TEACHERS'
AND PRINCIPALS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE GENERAL JOB
CATEGORY, CONFLICT MEDIATOR

Source of Variation	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F
Between Groups	1	0.004	0.004	0.003
Within Groups	437	564.309	1.291	
Total	438	564.313		

Hypothesis Three--there are no significant differences between teachers and principals in their perceptions of the ranking of general job categories of a secondary school principal--therefore, was retained

for the general job category, Conflict Mediator.

The data in Table 33 comprise the summary of the analysis of variance for the teachers' and principals' perceptions of the general job category, Educational Leader. The variance between the groups was significant at the .01 level, having exceeded the critical value of 6.70, for the degrees of freedom (1;439).

TABLE 33

SUMMARY TABLE FOR THE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR THE TEACHERS'
AND PRINCIPALS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE GENERAL JOB
CATEGORY, EDUCATIONAL LEADER

Source of Variation	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F
Between Groups	1	12.653	12.653	26.64*
Within Groups	438	208.038	0.475	
Total	439	220.691		

* .01 Level of Significance

Hyptohesis Three--there are no significant differences between teachers and principals in their perceptions of the ranking of general job categories of a secondary school principal--therefore, was rejected at the .05 level for the job classification, Educational Leader.

In Table 34 are the data for the analysis of variance for the teachers' and principals' perceptions of the general job category, Ombudsman. The F-value of 20.65 was significant, indicating that there was variance in perceptions between the two groups. The critical value for the degrees of freedom (1;438) was 6.70 at the .01 level.

TABLE 34

SUMMARY TABLE FOR THE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR THE TEACHERS'
AND PRINCIPALS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE GENERAL JOB
CATEGORY, OMBUDSMAN

Source of Variation	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F
Between Groups	1	30.426	30.426	20.65*
Within Groups	437	644.035	1.474	
Total	438	674.461		

* .01 Level of Significance

Hypothesis Three--there are no significant differences between teachers and principals in their perceptions of the ranking of general job categories of a secondary school principal--therefore, was rejected at the .05 level for the job category, Ombudsman.

A non-significant F-value is shown in Table 35 for the analysis of variance for the teachers' and principals' perceptions of the general job category, Public Relations Practitioner.

Hypothesis Three--there are no significant differences between teachers and principals in their perceptions of the ranking of general job categories of a secondary school principal--therefore, was retained for the job category, Public Relations Practitioner.

The data displayed in Table 36 are for the analysis of variance for the teachers' and principals' perceptions of the general job category, Administrator. The F-value of .40 was not significant.

TABLE 35

SUMMARY TABLE FOR THE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR THE TEACHERS'
AND PRINCIPALS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE GENERAL JOB
CATEGORY, PUBLIC RELATIONS PRACTITIONER

Source of Variation	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F
Between Groups	1	0.824	0.824	0.62
Within Groups	438	583.031	1.331	
Total	439	583.855		

TABLE 36

SUMMARY TABLE FOR THE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR THE TEACHERS'
AND PRINCIPALS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE GENERAL JOB
CATEGORY, ADMINISTRATOR

Source of Variation	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F
Between Groups	1	0.403	0.403	0.40
Within Groups	438	446.789	1.020	
Total	439	447.192		

Hypothesis Three--there are no significant differences between teachers and principals in their perceptions of the ranking of general job categories of a secondary school principal--therefore, was retained for the job category, Administrator.

A stepwise forward inclusion multiple regression procedure was performed on the demographic data to test Hypothesis Four. The data in Table 37 summarize the stepwise forward regression for the demographic

variables of all respondents with the general job category, Professional, as the criterion. Only two variables possessed multiple correlations which were significant, Level of School and Years in Present Position.

TABLE 37

STEPWISE FORWARD INCLUSION PROCEDURE FOR DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES
OF ALL RESPONDENTS WITH GENERAL JOB CATEGORY,
PROFESSIONAL, AS THE CRITERION (N=417)

Step	Variable Included	R	F
1	Level of School	.103	4.45*
2	Years in Present Position	.122	3.10*
3	Position	.133	2.49
4	Highest Degree Obtained	.144	2.19
5	Sex	.149	1.87
6	Size of School	.154	1.66
7	Years of Experience	.154	1.43

* .05 Level of Significance

Hypothesis Four--there are no significant differences among the respondents' perceptions of general job categories of a secondary school principal when tested against selected educational and demographic variables--therefore, was rejected at the .05 level for the general job category, Professional, in the areas of Level of School and Years in Present Position.

In Table 38 are displayed the data for the stepwise forward regression for the educational and demographic variables of all

respondents with general job category, Conflict Mediator, as the criterion. Most of the multiple correlations were significant with only Years in Present Position not having a multiple correlation which reached the .05 level of significance.

TABLE 38

STEPWISE FORWARD INCLUSION PROCEDURE FOR DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES
OF ALL RESPONDENTS WITH GENERAL JOB CATEGORY,
CONFLICT MEDIATOR, AS THE CRITERION (N=417)

Step	Variable Included	R	F
1	Years of Experience	.122	6.27*
2	Level of School	.143	4.32*
3	Highest Degree Obtained	.162	3.71*
4	Size of School	.169	3.02*
5	Position	.177	2.65*
6	Sex	.178	2.22*
7	Years in Present Position	.178	1.91

* .05 Level of Significance

Hypothesis Four--there are no significant differences among the respondents' perceptions of general job categories of a secondary school principal when tested against selected educational and demographic variables--therefore, was rejected at the .05 level for the job category, Conflict Mediator, in the areas of Years of Experience, Level of School, Highest Degree Obtained, Size of School, Position, and Sex.

The data in Table 39 were noteworthy in that all the demographic variables were found to have significant multiple correlations following the stepwise forward multiple regression with the general job category, Educational Leader, as the criterion.

TABLE 39

STEPWISE FORWARD INCLUSION PROCEDURE FOR DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES
OF ALL RESPONDENTS WITH GENERAL JOB CATEGORY, EDUCATIONAL
LEADER AS THE CRITERION (N=417)

Step	Variable Included	R	F
1	Position	.251	27.85*
2	Size of School	.271	16.36*
3	Years of Experience	.280	11.67*
4	Highest Degree Obtained	.283	8.98*
5	Level of School	.285	7.28*
6	Sex	.286	6.07*
7	Years in Present Position	.286	5.19*

* .01 Level of Significance

Hypothesis Four--there are no significant differences among the respondents' perceptions of general job categories of a secondary school principal when tested against selected educational and demographic variables--therefore, was rejected at the .05 level for the job category, Educational Leader, in all areas of the demographic variables.

In Table 40 are the data from the stepwise forward regression

for the demographic variables of all respondents with the general job category, Ombudsman, as the criterion. As in Table 39, all the predictor variables possessed significant multiple correlations.

TABLE 40

STEPWISE FORWARD INCLUSION PROCEDURE FOR DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES
OF ALL RESPONDENTS WITH GENERAL JOB CATEGORY,
OMBUDSMAN, AS THE CRITERION (N=417)

Step	Variable Included	R	F
1	Position	.210	19.22*
2	Size of School	.242	12.87*
3	Level of School	.250	9.17*
4	Years in Present Position	.252	7.01*
5	Sex	.254	5.69*
6	Highest Degree Obtained	.257	4.82*
7	Years of Experience	.257	4.13*

* .01 Level of Significance

Hypothesis Four--there are no significant differences among the respondents' perceptions of general job categories of a secondary school principal when tested against selected educational and demographic variables--therefore, was rejected at the .05 level for the general job category, Ombudsman, in all areas of the educational and demographic variables.

The data in Table 41 show that two demographic variables had significant multiple correlations with the criterion, Public Relations

Practitioner. School Size and Years of Experience both reached significance at the .05 level.

TABLE 41

STEPWISE FORWARD INCLUSION PROCEDURE FOR DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES
OF ALL RESPONDENTS WITH GENERAL JOB CATEGORY, PUBLIC
RELATIONS PRACTITIONER, AS THE CRITERION (N=417)

Step	Variable Included	R	F
1	Size of School	.106	4.76*
2	Years of Experience	.123	3.17*
3	Sex	.134	2.53
4	Position	.146	2.25
5	Level of School	.149	1.88
6	Years in Present Position	.152	1.61
7	Highest Degree Obtained	.153	1.39

* .05 Level of Significance

Hypothesis Four--there are no significant differences among the respondents' perceptions of general job categories of a secondary school principal when tested against selected educational and demographic variables--therefore, was rejected for the general job classification, Public Relations Practitioner, in the areas of Size of School and Years of Experience.

In Table 42 are the data for the stepwise forward regression for the demographic variables with the general job category, Administrator, as the criterion. It was observed that four of the seven multiple correlations were significant. Those reaching significance

were Size of School, Level of School, Years of Experience, and Position.

TABLE 42

STEPWISE FORWARD INCLUSION PROCEDURE FOR DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES
OF ALL RESPONDENTS WITH GENERAL JOB CATEGORY,
ADMINISTRATOR, AS THE CRITERION (N=417)

Step	Variable Included	R	F
1	Size of School	.103	4.45*
2	Level of School	.147	4.55*
3	Years of Experience	.149	3.14*
4	Position	.151	2.41*
5	Highest Degree Held	.152	1.96
6	Years in Present Position	.153	1.63
7	Sex	.153	1.40

* .05 Level of Significance

Hypothesis Four---there are no significant differences among the respondents' perceptions of general job categories of a secondary school principal when tested against selected educational and demographic variables---therefore, was rejected for the general job category, Administrator, in the areas of Size of School, Level of School, Years of Experience, and Position.

Simple correlations for the educational and demographic variables and the job categories are listed in Table 54 in Appendix F.

To answer Research Question A--what educational or demographic variables are responsible for differences in perception of job specifications of secondary school principals among principals and among

teachers--a multiple regression was performed for each group, utilizing a stepwise forward inclusion technique. Tables 43 through 49 display the data from those subsets in which the demographic variables achieved significance. The tables for the other subsets will be found in Appendix E.

The data in Table 43 demonstrate the effect that the principals' educational and demographic variables had upon Subset Six. All multiple correlations were significant. The multiple correlations for Subsets One through Five all failed to reach the .05 level of significance among the principals.

TABLE 43

STEPWISE FORWARD INCLUSION PROCEDURE FOR PRINCIPALS' DEMOGRAPHIC
VARIABLES WITH SUBSET SIX, ADMINISTRATOR,
AS THE CRITERION (N=168)

Step	Variable Included	R	F
1	Level of School	.249	10.98**
2	Years of Administrative Experience	.261	6.02**
3	Size of School	.264	4.11**
4	Highest Degree Obtained	.267	3.12*
5	Years in Present Position	.267	2.49*

* .05 Level of Significance

** .01 Level of Significance

In Table 44 are the data for the multiple regression with the teachers' perceptions of Subset One, Professional, as the criterion.

All of the teachers' educational and demographic variables except Years of Teaching Experience had significant multiple correlations.

TABLE 44

STEPWISE FORWARD INCLUSION PROCEDURE FOR TEACHERS' DEMOGRAPHIC
VARIABLES WITH SUBSET ONE, PROFESSIONAL
AS THE CRITERION (N=252)

Step	Variable Included	R	F
1	Size of School	.176	7.97**
2	Years in Present Position	.189	4.61*
3	Sex	.197	3.34*
4	Highest Degree Obtained	.209	2.81*
5	Level of School	.214	2.35*
6	Years of Teaching Experience	.215	1.98

* .05 Level of Significance

** .01 Level of Significance

When Subset Two--Conflict Mediator--was used as the criterion, only the variable, Sex, was significant. These data are displayed in Table 45.

The data in Table 46 show the result of the regression on Subset Three, Educational Leader. The only variable to reach the .05 level of significance was Size of School.

In Table 47 are the data for Subset Four, Ombudsman. As with Subset Three, only Size of School was a significant variable.

When Subset Five--Public Relations Practitioner, was used as the criterion, all but one of the variables had significant multiple correlations. The exception was Years in Present Position. The data in

Table 48 illustrate the results of the stepwise forward regression with Subset Five.

TABLE 45

STEPWISE FORWARD INCLUSION PROCEDURE FOR TEACHERS' DEMOGRAPHIC
VARIABLES WITH SUBSET TWO, CONFLICT MEDIATOR,
AS THE CRITERION (N=252)

Step	Variable Included	R	F
1	Level of School	.122	3.77
2	Sex	.156	3.09*
3	Years in Present Position	.164	2.28
4	Size of School	.165	1.74
5	Highest Degree Obtained	.166	1.39
6	Years of Teaching Experience	.166	1.16

* .05 Level of Significance

TABLE 46

STEPWISE FORWARD INCLUSION PROCEDURE FOR TEACHERS' DEMOGRAPHIC
VARIABLES WITH SUBSET THREE, EDUCATIONAL
LEADER, AS THE CRITERION (N=252)

Step	Variable Included	R	F
1	Size of School	.126	4.01*
2	Years in Present Position	.146	2.71
3	Years of Teaching Experience	.158	2.13
4	Level of School	.166	1.76
5	Highest Degree Obtained	.168	1.42
6	Sex	.170	1.21

* .05 Level of Significance

TABLE 47

STEPWISE FORWARD INCLUSION PROCEDURE FOR TEACHERS' DEMOGRAPHIC
VARIABLES WITH SUBSET FOUR, OMBUDSMAN,
AS THE CRITERION (N=252)

Step	Variable Included	R	F
1	Size of School	.130	4.29*
2	Years in Present Position	.145	2.66
3	Level of School	.152	1.95
4	Years of Teaching Experience	.155	1.52
5	Highest Degree Obtained	.158	1.25
6	Sex	.158	1.05

* .05 Level of Significance

TABLE 48

STEPWISE FORWARD INCLUSION PROCEDURE FOR TEACHERS' DEMOGRAPHIC
VARIABLES WITH SUBSET FIVE, PUBLIC RELATIONS
PRACTITIONER, AS THE CRITERION (N=252)

Step	Variable Included	R	F
1	Highest Degree Obtained	.152	5.93*
2	Size of School	.185	4.41*
3	Sex	.203	3.57*
4	Level of School	.206	2.74*
5	Years of Teaching Experience	.206	2.19*
(F-level of remaining variable, Years in Present Position, is insufficient for further computation)			

* .05 Level of Significance

In Table 49 are the data for Subset Six, Administrator. The multiple correlations for all demographic variables were significant.

TABLE 49

STEPWISE FORWARD INCLUSION PROCEDURE FOR TEACHERS' DEMOGRAPHIC
VARIABLES WITH SUBSET SIX, ADMINISTRATOR,
AS THE CRITERION (N=252)

Step	Variable Included	R	F
1	Sex	.189	9.23*
2	Highest Degree Obtained	.228	6.80*
3	Size of School	.245	5.28*
4	Level of School	.266	4.71*
5	Years in Present Position	.267	3.78*
6	Years of Teaching Experience	.267	3.14*

* .01 Level of Significance

The answer to Research Question A--what educational or demographic variables are responsible for differences in perception of job specifications of secondary school principals among principals and among teachers--was two-fold. Among principals, all educational and demographic variables were significantly responsible for the differences in perception of Subset Six, Administrator; however, they exhibited no significant effect on Subsets One through Five. The variable Sex was not used with the principals' data, as no responses were received from female principals.

Among teachers, Level of School was a significant contributor to the differences in perception in Subset One (Professional), Subset

Five (Public Relations Practitioner), and Subset Six (Administrator). The sex of the responding teachers was significant in Subset One (Professional), Subset Two (Conflict Mediator), Subset Five (Public Relations Practitioner), and Subset Six (Administrator). The variable relating to level of training--Highest Degree Held--was a significantly responsible factor for differences among teachers' perceptions in Subset One (Professional), Subset Five (Public Relations Practitioner), and Subset Six (Administrator). Years of Teaching Experience was significant in two Subsets, Five and Six (Public Relations Practitioner and Administrator). The variable of Years in Present Position was significant in Subset One (Professional) and in Subset Six (Administrator). The remaining demographic variable, Size of School, was a significant contributor to the differences in perception in five of the six groupings. The only subset which was not affected by the presence of the variable was Subset Two (Conflict Mediator).

To answer Research Question B--what relationship exists between the respondents' perceptions of the ranking of general job categories and the ratings of corresponding job specifications--a one-way analysis of variance was performed upon the data. The responses to Part A--the rating of job specifications--were arranged into the six subsets which were mentioned earlier. The responses to Part B--the ranking of general job categories--were identified by the rating (one through six) given by the respondents and placed into corresponding groups. The data for each of the categories were grouped similarly and analyzed for variance with the corresponding subset from Part A.

The data for the analysis of variance for the general job category labelled Professional and Subset One (Professional) are

displayed in Table 50. The F-value was significant at the .01 level by exceeding the critical value of 3.06 required for the degrees of freedom (5;439).

TABLE 50

SUMMARY TABLE FOR THE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR THE
RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE GENERAL JOB
CATEGORY, PROFESSIONAL, AND
SUBSET ONE, PROFESSIONAL

Source of Variation	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F
Between Groups	5	85.484	17.296	3.447*
Within Groups	434	2177.875	5.018	
Total	439	2264.359		

* .01 Level of Significance

In Table 51 are found the data for the analysis of variance for the respondents' perceptions of the general job category, Conflict Mediator, and Subset Two (Conflict Mediator). The F-value for the variance was not significant, having not surpassed the critical value of 2.23 required for the .05 level of significance and degrees of freedom (5;438).

A significant F-value of 2.34 was found for the analysis of variance in the perceptions of the general job category of Educational Leader and Subset Three (Educational Leader). These data are displayed in Table 52.

The data for the analysis of variance for the respondents' perceptions of the general job category Ombudsman and Subset Four (Ombudsman) are

found in Table 53. The F-value of 0.58 was not significant.

TABLE 51

SUMMARY TABLE FOR THE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR THE
RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE GENERAL JOB
CATEGORY, CONFLICT MEDIATOR, AND
SUBSET TWO, CONFLICT MEDIATOR

Source of Variation	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F
Between Groups	5	46.895	9.379	1.43
Within Groups	433	2839.996	6.559	
Total	438	2885.891		

TABLE 52

SUMMARY TABLE FOR THE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR THE
RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE GENERAL JOB
CATEGORY, EDUCATIONAL LEADER, AND
SUBSET THREE, EDUCATIONAL LEADER

Source of Variation	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F
Between Groups	5	144.250	28.850	2.34*
Within Groups	434	5353.250	12.335	
Total	439	5497.500		

* .05 Level of Significance

TABLE 53

SUMMARY TABLE FOR THE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR THE
RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE GENERAL JOB
CATEGORY, OMBUDSMAN, AND
SUBSET FOUR, OMBUDSMAN

Source of Variation	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F
Between Groups	5	13.539	2.708	0.58
Within Groups	433	2038.215	4.707	
Total	438	2051.754		

In Table 54 are the data for the analysis of variance in the respondents' perceptions of the general job category of Public Relations Practitioner and Subset Five (Public Relations Practitioner). The F-value of 1.03 was not significant.

TABLE 54

SUMMARY TABLE FOR THE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR THE
RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE GENERAL JOB
CATEGORY, PUBLIC RELATIONS PRACTITIONER,
AND SUBSET FIVE, PUBLIC
RELATIONS PRACTITIONER

Source of Variation	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F
Between Groups	5	21.434	4.287	1.03
Within Groups	434	1815.625	4.184	
Total	439	1837.059		

The data in Table 55 display the analysis of variance for the respondents' perceptions of the general job category of Administrator and Subset Six (Administrator). The F-value, 1.54, was below the critical value of 2.23 needed for significance at the .05 level with degrees of freedom (5;439).

TABLE 55

SUMMARY TABLE FOR THE ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR THE
RESPONDENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE GENERAL JOB
CATEGORY, ADMINISTRATOR, AND
SUBSET SIX, ADMINISTRATOR

Source of Variation	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F
Between Groups	5	46.215	9.243	1.54
Within Groups	434	2604.586	6.001	
Total	439	2650.801		

The answer to Research Question B--what relationship exists between the respondents' perceptions of the ranking of general job categories and the ratings of corresponding job specifications--was that two of the relationships showed significant variance in the respondents' perceptions. The relationships which were involved were in the areas of professionalism and educational leadership.

A discussion of the findings of this study and recommendations for future action are included in Chapter V.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine if there were differences in perception between secondary school principals and teachers as to the importance of certain job specifications of a secondary school principal and the ranking of general job categories which a secondary principal is expected to perform. Another purpose was to identify those differences in perception which occurred between principals and teachers in their views of the job specifications and job categories, as analyzed through the testing of selected demographic variables to which the differences in perception may have been attributable.

While current available literature suggests that there are differences in perception between principals and teachers regarding the over-all job of the secondary school principal, there were no studies available that were concerned with differences in perception of specific tasks.

To test for differences, the following null hypotheses were formulated:

1. there are no significant differences between teachers and principals in their perceptions of job specifications of a secondary school principal;

2. there are no significant differences among the respondents' perceptions of job specifications of a secondary school principal when tested against selected educational and demographic variables;

3. there are no significant differences between teachers and principals in their perceptions of general job categories of a secondary school principal;

4. there are no significant differences among the respondents' perceptions of general job categories of a secondary school principal when tested against selected educational and demographic variables.

In addition, two research questions were proposed to aid in further investigation:

A. what educational or demographic variables might appear to contribute to the differences in perception of job specifications of secondary school principals among principals and among teachers?

B. what relationship exists between the teachers' and principals' rankings of general job categories and their ratings of corresponding job specifications?

The research population consisted of principals and teachers from 253 Minnesota public secondary schools, which had been identified as either junior or senior high schools. The sample for the study included 169 principals and 273 teachers. The data for the study were gathered through a survey instrument, which is found in Appendix A. The instruments were distributed and returned through the use of the U. S. Postal Service.

Statistical techniques utilized for this study were the chi-square technique to test for differences between teachers and principals in their perceptions of job specifications for a secondary

principal, the one-way analysis of variance to test for differences between teachers' perceptions and the perceptions of principals regarding the ranking of job categories, and stepwise forward multiple regression to identify any effect that the demographic variables may have had upon the responses of the teachers and principals. The one-way analysis of variance was also used to determine what relationship existed between the responses to Part A of the instrument and the responses to Part B.

During the statistical analysis, the thirty-five items of Part A were rearranged into subsets which were labeled with titles corresponding to the general job areas of a secondary school principal--Professional, Conflict Mediator, Educational Leader, Ombudsman, Public Relations Practitioner, and Administrator.

Hypothesis One--there are no significant differences between teachers and principals in their perceptions of job specifications of a secondary school principal--was rejected at the .05 level for twenty-two of the thirty-five items in Part A. They are listed below by subset:

Subset One--Professional

22. The principal shares with his fellow principals his knowledge, his understanding, and his comfort when the occasion requires.

28. The principal contributes to the programs of and seeks leadership positions in professional associations.

35. The principal delegates tasks to his assistants so that they may receive a wide breadth of administrative experience.

Subset Two--Conflict Mediator

5. The principal serves as a resource person during teacher-school board negotiations.

12. The principal realizes that conflict will arise as people differ on means and ends.

Subset Three--Educational Leader

1. The principal does not hesitate to suggest his own ideas for program, curriculum, and organization.

8. The principal keeps instruction and learning foremost in planning for the school.

15. The principal is accountable for the over-all effectiveness of the school.

16. The principal fosters sound inter-personal relationships among and between the students, the teachers, and the administration.

21. The principal adapts the school's program to the requirements of the individual student.

23. The principal assists individual teachers in their self-improvement efforts.

29. The principal helps to establish the goals for the school.

30. The principal builds a competent staff through sound selection, orientation, and in-service activities.

Subset Four--Ombudsman

6. The principal provides counsel and assistance for any student.

20. The principal works sympathetically with all parents.

34. The principal objectively criticizes his own actions.

Subset Five--Public Relations Practitioner

- 11. The principal is responsible for making the school meaningful to the community.
- 18. The principal involves students in the program and the problems of the school.

Subset Six--Administrator

- 3. The principal participates in decision-making at all levels when the policies affect his school's operation.
- 10. The principal is the sole person within the building responsible for budget allocations for the building.
- 24. The principal delegates to teachers the task of developing building rules and regulations.
- 31. The principal is responsible for the effect the school has on its students.

Hypothesis Two--there are no significant differences among the respondents' perceptions of job specifications of a secondary school principal when tested against selected educational and demographic variables--was rejected at the .05 level for all subsets. Demographic variables which possessed significant multiple correlations with all six subsets were Sex, Highest Degree Obtained, Years in Present Position, Level of School, and Size of School. The multiple correlation for the variable, Position, was significant for all subsets except Subset Five (Public Relations Practitioner). Years of Experience had a significant multiple correlation in all subsets except Professional, Subset One.

Hypothesis Three--there are no significant differences between teachers and principals in their perceptions of the ranking of general job categories of a secondary school principal--was rejected at the .05 level for two of the six categories, Educational Leader and Ombudsman.

Hypothesis Four--there are no significant differences among the respondents' perceptions of general job categories of a secondary school principal when tested against selected educational and demographic variables--was rejected at the .05 level for the Professional category in the areas of Level of School and Years in Present Position; for the category of Conflict Mediator in the areas of Years of Experience, Level of School, Highest Degree Obtained, Size of School, Position, and Sex; for the categories, Educational Leader and Ombudsman, in all areas--Position, Level of School, Sex, Highest Degree Obtained, Years of Experience, Years in Present Position, and Size of School; for the category of Public Relations Practitioner in the areas of Size of School and Years of Experience; and for the sixth category, Administrator, in the areas of Size of School, Level of School, Years of Experience, and Position.

In the analysis of the data performed to answer Research Question A--what educational or demographic variables might appear to contribute to differences in perception of job specifications of secondary school principals among principals and among teachers--it was found that the multiple correlations for the educational and demographic variables of principals were significant, statistically, for only one subset--Administrator--and all of the variables had significant multiple correlations.

Among the teachers, all of the subsets were significantly affected by the educational and demographic variables. For Subset One (Professional) significant multiple correlations were noted in the areas of Size of School, Years in Present Position, Sex, Highest Degree Obtained, and Level of School. The area of Sex was the only demographic variable which had a significant multiple correlation for Subset Two (Conflict Mediator). Subset Three (Educational Leader) had only one variable with a significant multiple correlation, Size of School. The same was true for Subset Four (Ombudsman). For the fifth subset (Public Relations Practitioner) five of the educational and demographic variables had significant multiple correlations. They were Highest Degree Obtained, Size of School, Sex, Level of School, and Years of Experience. All of the educational and demographic variables had multiple correlations which achieved significance for Subset Six (Administrator).

The results from the data analysis for Research Question B-- what relationship exists between the respondents' perceptions of the ranking of general job categories and the ratings of corresponding job specifications--indicated that two of the comparisons were found to possess differences which were statistically significant. The respondents' perceptions of the general job category of Professional differed significantly from their perceptions of Subset One (Professional). Their perceptions of the general job category, Educational Leader, also differed significantly from their perceptions of Subset Three (Educational Leader).

Discussion and Conclusions

The large number of job specifications (63 percent) which showed a significant disagreement between teachers and principals in their perceptions of the job of a secondary principal indicated that teachers do not perceive the job of the principal the same as do the principals.

The differences between teachers and principals in their perceptions of a secondary principal's job specifications, while found to be statistically significant, were often caused by the fact that principals were perceiving an item to be "Highly Important" by a greater majority than were the teachers, rather than having a polarity exist. An additional factor which could have caused the statistical significances to occur was the existence of empty or nearly empty cells among the principals' responses. With few exceptions, a majority of the teachers agreed with a majority of the principals.

It might be concluded that, although there was significant disagreement between teachers and principals in their perceptions of a secondary principal's job specifications, the differences were more often in the intensity of agreement than in the divergence of opinion.

Perceptions of the four job specifications which contained the words "responsible" or "accountable" were found to be significantly different. Because the responses varied as to the percentage of principals and teachers in each of the three categories of importance, the conclusion might be made that a semantic differential may have existed among the respondents and it acted as a masking variable. This phenomenon supports the position of Seeman (1960) who reported that one

of the most difficult areas for principals and teachers to determine is responsibility.

Some of the greatest percentage differences in perception in the study occurred in inter-personal areas. Eleven job specifications could be identified as being beneficial to persons other than teachers. Nine showed significant differences and; of the nine, eight were significant at the .01 level or beyond. In six of the seven job specifications which could be said to directly affect students in a positive manner, teachers differed significantly from principals in their perceptions. The twelve statements which directly affect teachers, however, contained only four items which showed a significant difference.

The conclusion might be made that the teachers generally agree with the principals concerning inter-personal relations between the principal and his staff, but do not agree with the principals regarding the importance of the principal's interaction with other groups.

Regardless of the fact that educational literature for over three decades has called for the principal to assume the role of an educational (instructional) leader, the results of this study show that disagreement still exists between teachers and principals concerning that task area. As no significant demographic variable was apparent among the principals and the size of the school was significant among the teachers, the conclusion might be made that principals are in general agreement concerning their perceptions of the role as an educational leader, but that the size of the school makes a difference as to whether the teachers agree with the principals. The

significant positive correlation which existed between school size and the perception of the job category seems to indicate that teachers in smaller schools may not perceive the principal as an educational leader to the extent that the teachers in the larger schools do.

A small majority (52 percent) of the principals perceived acting in the role of a resource person during teacher-school board negotiations to be highly important. This fact may well indicate that many principals have not yet felt a need to attempt to forestall potential conflict through the assisting in the development of a teachers' contract which is capable of being administered at the building level.

The differences in perception of job specifications which occurred among principals were widely spread across the demographic variables. Only in those specifications which were related to the principal's functioning as an administrator were any educational or demographic variables statistically significant factors. The variable which had the major effect upon the responses was the level of the school. It might be concluded that principals of senior high schools perceive their administrative tasks differently than principals of junior high schools perceive theirs.

Any measurable variances among the teachers' perceptions of the principal's job specifications were primarily caused by the size of the schools of the respondents, except in the areas of conflict mediation and administration. In those two areas the sex variable had the most significant multiple correlation. The conclusion could be made that male teachers see the roles of the principal as a conflict mediator and as an administrator differently than do their female

counterparts, and that teachers in large secondary schools view the aspects of a principal's job differently than do the teachers in small schools.

Differences among teachers and principals as they perceived the general job categories of professionalism and educational leadership when related to the specific job tasks assigned to those areas in the study were statistically significant. It might be concluded that the disagreement was caused by an inability to differentiate between the specifications for these two job areas.

Perceptions of the role of the principal as an ombudsman differed significantly between teachers and principals. These differences may be due to the fact that such an identified role is a new concept and, therefore, its importance to the overall job of the principal is difficult to determine.

Recommendations

The results of this study lead to the following recommendations:

1. Principals should more clearly define their task areas, as well as specific jobs, so teachers can become more aware of the complexities of the position.

2. Principals and teachers should identify the areas of educational leadership, as defined by this study, in which they are in disagreement and attempt a cooperative effort to overcome these differences.

3. The need for principals to have positive inter-personal relationships with persons other than their professional colleagues within their buildings should be stressed in professional literature,

so that teachers may become more aware of the desirability of such behavior.

4. The Minnesota and National Associations of Secondary School Principals should take note of the large number of principals who failed to see the importance of assisting in teacher-school board negotiations, and either change the policies of the organizations or increase the stress on the desirability of such participation on the part of their members.

5. The principals in the smaller schools should make a self-evaluation of their roles as educational leaders in order that they may better ascertain if they are functioning as an educational leader.

6. The superintendents and school boards of the smaller schools should determine if the tasks assigned to the secondary school principals in their districts preclude any action on the part of the principal as an educational leader.

7. A more precise definition of the role of the principal as an educational leader should be accomplished through the professional literature to enable principals and teachers to better identify those tasks which are perceived as being pertinent to the role.

8. Principals who are developing a teacher evaluation of the building administration should be alert to the fact that teachers often are not in agreement with principals as to what constitutes the job of the principal.

9. Further study should be conducted in order to determine what additional educational or demographic variables, if any, are causing most of the differences in perception between teachers and principals to exist.

10. This study should be replicated in another area of the country to determine if the results would be duplicated.

11. This study should be conducted on a "Real-Ideal" basis in an attempt to prevent any bias from affecting the results.

APPENDIX A
SURVEY INSTRUMENT

JOB SPECIFICATIONS FOR SECONDARY PRINCIPALS

This opinionnaire has been devised to determine the perceptions of the job specifications of secondary school principals as viewed by principals and teachers. All responses will be held in the strictest confidence. Completion of the instrument should not exceed fifteen minutes.

PART A

DIRECTIONS: *The following thirty-five statements relate to various aspects of a secondary principal's job. To the right of each statement is a series of numbers from one through five. Place a circle around the number that represents the perception that you have about that particular statement's importance in the job of a principal.*

- 1 - Imperative
- 2 - Important
- 3 - Not Important Usually, But Could Do
- 4 - Unimportant
- 5 - Should Not Do

TRY NOT TO USE THE BEHAVIOR OF ANY PRINCIPAL YOU MAY HAVE KNOWN AS A BASIS FOR YOUR DECISION.

EXAMPLE:

The principal makes coffee for his staff each day. 1 2 **3** 4 5

-
- | | |
|--|-----------|
| 1. The principal does not hesitate to suggest his own ideas for program, curriculum, and organization. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 2. The principal evaluates teacher performance on the basis of cooperatively determined objectives and criteria. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 3. The principal participates in decision-making at all levels, when the policies affect his school's operation. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 4. The principal acts as a "go-between" with the teachers and the district administration. | 1 2 3 4 5 |
| 5. The principal serves as a resource person during teacher-school board negotiations. | 1 2 3 4 5 |

- | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 6. The principal provides counsel and assistance for any student. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7. The principal participates in continuous study and research in secondary education and administration. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8. The principal keeps instruction and learning foremost in planning for the school. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 9. The principal nurtures potential staff leadership by providing opportunities for professional growth. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 10. The principal is the sole person within the building responsible for budget allocations for the building. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 11. The principal is responsible for making the school meaningful to the community. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 12. The principal realizes that conflict will arise as people differ on means and ends. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 13. The principal is available to all teachers. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 14. The principal regularly attends the conventions and annual meetings of his professional associations. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 15. The principal is accountable for the over-all effectiveness of the school. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 16. The principal fosters sound interpersonal relationships among and between the students, the teachers, and the administration. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 17. The principal involves others in decision-making. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 18. The principal involves students in the program and the problems of the school. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 19. The principal establishes a climate that will make conflict unnecessary in the school. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 20. The principal works sympathetically with all parents. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 21. The principal adapts the school's program to the requirements of the individual student. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

- | | | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|
| 22. The principal shares with his fellow principals his knowledge, his understanding, and his comfort when the occasion requires. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 23. The principal assists individual teachers in their self-improvement efforts. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 24. The principal delegates to teachers the task of developing building rules and regulations. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 25. The principal interprets to his colleagues in the principalship his building's program, its purposes and problems. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 26. The principal recognizes in the ingredients of a conflict those opportunities that may exist for promoting personal and professional growth. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 27. The principal challenges his own school's policies or goals. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 28. The principal contributes to the programs of and seeks leadership positions in professional associations. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 29. The principal helps to establish the goals for the school. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 30. The principal builds a competent staff through sound selection, orientation, and in-service activities. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 31. The principal is responsible for the effect the school has on its students. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 32. The principal helps the board of education understand the goals of the school. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 33. The principal mediates teacher-teacher disputes. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 34. The principal objectively criticizes his own actions. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 35. The principal delegates tasks to his assistants so that they may receive a wide breadth of administrative experience. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

PLEASE GO TO THE NEXT PAGE

PART B

DIRECTIONS: Put the following terms in an order of priority. For the item that you feel is of the most importance in the role or job of a principal, place a "1" in the blank to the left of the term. For the second most important, place a "2" and so on through the six items.

- _____ a. PROFESSIONAL (exhibits interest in professional organizations and contributes time and effort to the organization)
- _____ b. CONFLICT MEDIATOR (assists parties in conflict to achieve or approach resolution)
- _____ c. EDUCATIONAL LEADER (concerned with instruction of students and development of the staff)
- _____ d. OMBUDSMAN (helps members of the organization to overcome difficulties caused by the system)
- _____ e. PUBLIC RELATIONS PRACTITIONER (interprets the school to various groups)
- _____ f. ADMINISTRATOR (works with policies, strategies of action and delegation of tasks)

PART C

DIRECTIONS: Place a check mark in the appropriate blank for each item.

1. POSITION: _____ Teacher; _____ Principal
2. SCHOOL: _____ Junior High; _____ Senior High
3. SEX: _____ Female; _____ Male
4. HIGHEST DEGREE OBTAINED: _____ B.A.; _____ M.A.; _____ Spec.; _____ Doct.
5. IF A TEACHER, HOW MANY YEARS EXPERIENCE?
_____ 2 or fewer; _____ 3-5; _____ 6-10; _____ 11-20; _____ over 20
6. IF A PRINCIPAL, HOW MANY YEARS ADMINISTRATIVE EXPERIENCE?
_____ 2 or fewer; _____ 3-5; _____ 6-10; _____ 11-20; _____ over 20
7. HOW MANY YEARS IN YOUR PRESENT POSITION?
_____ 2 or fewer; _____ 3-5; _____ 6-10; _____ 11-20; _____ over 20
8. SIZE OF SCHOOL (STUDENT POPULATION):
_____ under 200; _____ 201-500; _____ 501-1000; _____ 1001-1500; _____ over 1500

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR TIME AND EFFORT. PLEASE PLACE THE COMPLETED FORM IN THE RETURN ENVELOPE AND MAIL IT AS SOON AS POSSIBLE.

APPENDIX B

LETTER TO PRINCIPALS

January 12, 1976

Dear Principal:

As a fellow member of MASSP, I am asking for a few minutes of your time. I am presently on sabbatical leave and in a doctoral program at the University of North Dakota with my major emphasis in educational administration. As you well know, doctoral students are required to complete a scholarly endeavor called a dissertation. It is in this area that I need your assistance.

My study concerns the perceptions that principals and teachers have relative to the job of the principal in a secondary school. In order that I may complete this study, I am dependent upon my colleagues "in the field." Please take about fifteen minutes to complete the accompanying survey form and return it to me in the enclosed stamped envelope. As turn-around time is critical, I would appreciate it if you would complete the form before it slips your mind.

To further assist me, would you please distribute the additional envelopes, which are enclosed, to the teachers who are designated on the envelopes? Please do not distribute them to first year teachers nor to teachers who have had either administration course work or experience as a school administrator. If these two restrictions make the distribution impossible, please give the envelope to a teacher other than is designated.

You will note that an identifying number is on the return envelope. This will be used to identify those persons from whom a completed survey form has not been received. I will not be opening the envelopes, so your anonymity will remain secure.

Thank you very much for your assistance. If your school would be interested in receiving a resume' of the results of the study, please complete the enclosed card and return it with your survey form.

Sincerely,

Ervin F. Garbe

APPENDIX C

LETTER TO TEACHERS

January 12, 1976

Dear Teacher:

To assist me in completing my work toward a doctoral degree at the University of North Dakota, I am asking for a few minutes of your time.

My study concerns the perceptions that principals and teachers have relative to the job of the principal in a secondary school. In order that I may complete this study, I am dependent upon my colleagues "in the field." Please take about fifteen minutes to complete the accompanying survey form and return it directly to me in the enclosed stamped envelope. As turn-around time is critical, I would appreciate it if you would complete the form before it slips your mind.

You will note that an identifying number is on the return envelope. This will be used to identify those persons from whom a completed survey form has not been received. I will not be opening the envelopes, so your anonymity will remain secure.

Thank you very much for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Ervin F. Garbe

APPENDIX D

RESUME INTEREST CARD

Please send me a resume' of the study.

(Name)

(City)

(Zip)

APPENDIX E

STEPWISE FORWARD REGRESSION TABLES FOR PRINCIPALS'
DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES WITH SUBSETS ONE THROUGH
FIVE AS CRITERIA

TABLE 56

STEPWISE FORWARD INCLUSION PROCEDURE FOR PRINCIPALS' DEMOGRAPHIC
VARIABLES WITH SUBSET ONE, PROFESSIONAL,
AS THE CRITERION (N=168)

Step	Variable Included	R	F
1	Highest Degree Obtained	.085	1.22
2	Years of Administrative Experience	.091	0.68
3	Years in Present Position	.094	0.48
4	Level of School	.095	0.37
5	Size of School	.096	0.30

TABLE 57

STEPWISE FORWARD INCLUSION PROCEDURE FOR PRINCIPALS' DEMOGRAPHIC
VARIABLES WITH SUBSET TWO, CONFLICT MEDIATOR,
AS THE CRITERION (N=168)

Step	Variable Included	R	F
1	Years of Administrative Experience	.135	3.09
2	Years in Present Position	.174	2.56
3	Size of School	.193	2.11
4	Highest Degree Obtained	.222	2.11
5	Level of School	.224	1.71

TABLE 58

STEPWISE FORWARD INCLUSION PROCEDURE FOR PRINCIPALS' DEMOGRAPHIC
VARIABLES WITH SUBSET THREE, EDUCATIONAL
LEADER, AS THE CRITERION (N=168)

Step	Variable Included	R	F
1	Size of School	.137	3.19
2	Highest Degree Obtained	.152	1.96
3	Years of Administrative Experience	.165	1.54
4	Years in Present Position	.170	1.21
(F-level of remaining variable, Level of School, is insufficient for further computation)			

TABLE 59

STEPWISE FORWARD INCLUSION PROCEDURE FOR PRINCIPALS' DEMOGRAPHIC
VARIABLES WITH SUBSET FOUR, OMBUDSMAN,
AS THE CRITERION (N=168)

Step	Variable Included	R	F
1	Size of School	.089	1.30
2	Level of School	.114	1.08
3	Years in Present Position	.128	0.91
4	Years of Administrative Experience	.161	1.08
5	Highest Degree Obtained	.166	0.91

TABLE 60

STEPWISE FORWARD INCLUSION PROCEDURE FOR PRINCIPALS' DEMOGRAPHIC
VARIABLES WITH SUBSET FIVE, PUBLIC RELATIONS
PRACTITIONER, AS THE CRITERION (N=168)

Step	Variable Included	R	F
1	Size of School	.108	1.97
2	Years in Present Position	.130	1.41
3	Years of Administrative Experience	.191	2.06
4	Highest Degree Held	.203	1.75
5	Level of School	.204	1.40

APPENDIX F

SIMPLE CORRELATIONS BETWEEN DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES
AND SUBSETS AND CATEGORIES

TABLE 61

CORRELATIONS OF DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES WITH SUBSETS OF PRINCIPALS'
JOB SPECIFICATIONS AND GENERAL JOB CATEGORIES

Demographic Variables		Profes- sional	Conflict Mediator	Educa- tional Leader	Ombudsman	Public Relations Prac- titioner	Admini- strator
Position	Subset (Category)	0.184** (0.048)	0.114* (-0.001)	0.366** (0.251)**	0.195** (-0.210)**	0.078 (0.036)	0.167** (0.022)
Level of School	Subset (Category)	0.079 (0.103)*	0.102* (0.089)	0.015 (0.024)	0.054 (0.029)	0.068 (0.061)	0.132** (-0.080)
Sex	Subset (Category)	0.042 (0.053)	-0.015 (0.013)	0.144** (0.102)**	0.091 (0.061)	0.000 (-0.041)	0.201** (0.014)
Highest Degree Obtained	Subset (Category)	0.192** (0.001)	0.094 (0.046)	0.279** (0.106)*	0.148** (-0.174)**	0.146** (0.051)	-.163** (0.017)
Years of Experience	Subset (Category)	0.061 (0.067)	0.074 (-0.122)*	0.080 (0.078)	0.035 (-0.062)	0.059 (0.077)	0.075 (0.034)
Years in Pres- ent Position	Subset (Category)	0.013 (0.068)	0.010 (-0.096)	-0.005 (0.010)	0.028 (-0.011)	-0.018 (0.027)	0.018 (0.028)
Size of School	Subset (Category)	0.121* (0.047)	0.020 (-0.065)	0.115* (-0.102)*	-0.044 (-0.120)*	0.128** (0.106)*	0.068 (0.103)*

* .05 Level of Significance

** .01 Level of Significance

APPENDIX G

LIST OF SUBJECT AREAS

LIST OF SUBJECT AREAS USED IN
RANDOM SELECTION OF TEACHERSSenior High Schools

Art
Business Education
English
Foreign Language
Home Economics
Industrial Arts
Mathematics
Music
Physical Education
Science
Social Studies

Junior High Schools

English
Home Economics
Industrial Arts
Mathematics
Music
Physical Education
Science
Social Studies

APPENDIX H

SCHOOL DISTRICTS AND SCHOOLS INCLUDED IN THE STUDY

SCHOOL DISTRICTS AND SCHOOLS
INCLUDED IN THE STUDY

* Schools selected for inclusion

ALBANY

- *Albany Junior High
- *Albany Senior High

ALBERT LEA

- *Brookside Junior High
- *Southwest Junior High
- *Central Senior High

ALEXANDRIA

- *Central Junior High
- *Jefferson Senior High

ANOKA

- *Coon Rapids Junior High
- *Jackson Junior High
- *Moore Junior High
- *Northdale Junior High
- *Roosevelt Junior High
- *Anoka Senior High
- *Blaine Senior High
- *Coon Rapid Senior High

AURORA-HOYT LAKES

- Aurora-Hoyt Lakes Junior High
- *Aurora-Hoyt Lakes Senior High

BEMIDJI

- *Bemidji Junior High
- *Bemidji Senior High

BENSON

- *Benson Junior High
- *Benson Senior High

BLOOMINGTON

- *Oak Grove Junior High
- *Olson Junior High
- *Penn Junior High
- *Portland Junior High
- *Jefferson Senior High
- *Kennedy Senior High
- *Lincoln Senior High

BRAINERD

- *Franklin Junior High
- Washington Junior High
- *Brainerd Senior High

BRECKENRIDGE

- *Breckenridge Junior High
- *Breckenridge Senior High

BUFFALO

- *Buffalo Junior High
- *Buffalo Senior High

BURNSVILLE

- Metcalf Junior High
- *Nicollet Junior High
- *Burnsville Senior High

CAMBRIDGE

- *Cambridge Junior High
- *Cambridge Senior High

CENTENNIAL

- *Centennial Junior High
- *Centennial Senior High

CHASKA

- *Chaska Junior High
- *Chaska Senior High

CHISAGO LAKES

- *Chisago City Junior High
- *Lindstrom Senior High

CHISHOLM

- Chisholm Junior High
- *Chisholm Senior High

CLOQUET

- *Cloquet Junior High
- *Cloquet Senior High

COLERAINE

- *Connor Junior High
- *Greenway Senior High

COLUMBIA HEIGHTS

- *Central Junior High
- *Columbia Junior High
- *Columbia Heights Senior High

DETROIT LAKES

- *Holmes Junior High
- *Community Senior High

DULUTH

- *Lincoln Junior High
- *Ordean Junior High
- Washington Junior High
- West Junior High
- *Woodland Junior High
- *Central Senior High
- *Denfield Senior High
- *East Senior High

EAST GRAND FORKS

- East Grand Forks Junior High
- *East Grand Forks Senior High

ELK RIVER

- *Elk River Junior High
- *Elk River Senior High

ELY

- Washington Junior High
- *Memorial Senior High

EVELETH

- *Eveleth Junior High
- *Eveleth Senior High

FARIBAULT

- *Faribault Junior High
- *Faribault Senior High

FERGUS FALLS

- Fergus Falls Junior High
- *Fergus Falls Senior High

FOREST LAKE

- Central Junior High
- Southwest Junior High
- *Forest Lake Senior High

FRIDLEY

- Fridley Junior High
- *Fridley Senior High

HASTINGS

- *Hastings Junior High
- *Hastings Senior High

HIBBING

- Lincoln Junior High
- *Hibbing Senior High

HOPKINS

- North Junior High
- South Junior High
- *West Junior High
- *Eisenhower Senior High
- *Lindbergh Senior High

HUTCHINSON

- *Hutchinson Junior High
- *Hutchinson Senior High

INTERNATIONAL FALLS

- Backus Junior High
- International Falls Junior High
- *International Falls Senior High

INVERGROVE

- *Inver Grove Heights Junior High
- *Simley Senior High

LITCHFIELD

- Washington Junior High
- *Litchfield Senior High

MANKATO

- *Lincoln Junior High
- *Mankato Junior High
- North Mankato Junior High
- *Mankato East Senior High
- *Mankato West Senior High

MELROSE

- Melrose Junior High
- *Melrose Senior High

MILACA

- *Milaca Junior High
- *Milaca Senior High

MINNEAPOLIS

- *Folwell Junior High
- Franklin Junior High
- Jefferson Junior High
- *Jordan Junior High
- *Nokomis Junior High
- Northeast Junior High
- *Olson Junior High
- *Phillips Junior High
- Sanford Junior High

MINNEAPOLIS (Continued)

- *Sheridan Junior High
- *Southwest Junior High
- *Central Senior High
- *Edison Senior High
- *Roosevelt Senior High
- *South Senior High
- *Southwest Senior High
- *Washburn Senior High
- *West Senior High

MINNETONKA

- Minnetonka East Junior High
- Minnetonka West Junior High
- *Minnetonka Senior High

MOORHEAD

- *Central Junior High
- North Junior High
- *South Junior High
- *Moorhead Senior High

MORRIS

- *Morris Junior High
- *Morris Senior High

MOUND

- Grandview Junior High
- *Mound Westonka Senior High

MOUNDS VIEW

- *Chippewa Junior High
- Edgewood Junior High
- *Highview Junior High
- *Johanna Junior High
- *Irondale Senior High
- *Mounds View Senior High

NEW ULM

- New Ulm Junior High
- *New Ulm Senior High

NORTHFIELD

- *Northfield Junior High
- *Northfield Senior High

NORTH ST. PAUL

- *Glenn Junior High
- Hillside Junior High
- *Maplewood Junior High
- *North Senior High
- *Tartan Senior High

OSSEO

- Brooklyn Junior High
- *Northview Junior High
- Osseo Junior High
- *Osseo Senior High
- *Park Center Senior High

OWATONNA

- *Central Junior High
- North Junior High
- *Owatonna Senior High

PRINCETON

- Princeton Junior High
- *Princeton Senior High

PRIOR LAKE

- Prior Lake Junior High
- *Prior Lake Senior High

PROCTOR

- *Jedlicka Junior High
- *Proctor Senior High

RED WING

- Twin Bluff Junior High
- *Red Wing Senior High

RICHFIELD

- East Junior High
- *West Junior High
- *Richfield Senior High

ROBBINSDALE

- *Hosterman Junior High
- *Plymouth Junior High
- *Robbinsdale Junior High
- *Sandburg Junior High
- *Armstrong Senior High
- *Cooper Senior High
- *Robbinsdale Senior High

ROCHESTER

- *Adams Junior High
- *Central Junior High
- Kellogg Junior High
- *Marshall Senior High
- *Mayo Senior High

ROSEMOUNT

- Rosemount Junior High
- *Rosemount Senior High

ROSEVILLE

Capitol View Junior High
 Fairview Junior High
 *Parkview Junior High
 *Kellogg Senior High
 *Alexander Ramsey Senior High

ST. CLOUD

*North Junior High
 *South Junior High
 *Apollo Senior High
 *Technical Senior High

ST. JAMES

*St. James Junior High
 *St. James Senior High

ST. LOUIS PARK

*Central Junior High
 *Westwood Junior High
 *St. Louis Park Senior High

ST. PAUL

Battle Creek Junior High
 *Cleveland Junior High
 *Como Park Junior High
 *Hazel Park Junior High
 *Highland Junior High
 *Mounds Park Junior High
 *Ramsey Junior High
 *Roosevelt Junior High
 Wilson Junior High
 *Central Senior High
 *Harding Senior High
 *Highland Senior High
 *Johnson Senior High
 *Washington Senior High

SAUK CENTRE

*Sauk Centre Junior High
 *Sauk Centre Senior High

SAUK RAPIDS

Sauk Rapids Junior High
 *Sauk Rapids Senior High

SOUTH ST. PAUL

*South St. Paul Junior High
 *South St. Paul Senior High

SOUTH WASHINGTON COUNTY

*Oltmann Junior High
 *St. Paul Park Junior High
 *Woodbury Junior High
 *Park Senior High

SPRING LAKE PARK

Westwood Junior High
 Spring Lake Park Junior High
 *Spring Lake Park Senior High

STILLWATER

*Oakland Junior High
 Stillwater Junior High
 *Stillwater Senior High

TOWER-SOUDAN

Soudan Junior High
 *Tower Senior High

VIRGINIA

Technical Junior High
 *Roosevelt Senior High

WADENA

*Wadena Junior High
 *Wadena Senior High

WATERTOWN-MAYER

*Watertown-Mayer Junior High
 *Watertown-Mayer Senior High

WAYZATA

*Ridgemount Junior High
 Wayzata Junior High
 *Wayzata Senior High

WEST ST. PAUL

*Grass Junior High
 *Sibley Senior High

WHITE BEAR LAKE

*Central Junior High
 Sunrise Junior High
 *Mariner Senior High
 *White Bear Lake Senior High

WILLMAR

*Willmar Junior High
 *Willmar Senior High

WINONA

*Winona Junior High

*Winona Senior High

WORTHINGTON

*Worthington Junior High

*Worthington Senior High

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

- Addelston, Lorraine. "The Principal's Stake in Professional Negotiations." In The Secondary School Principal in Action, pp. 298-305. Edited by Leonard Kraft. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Co., 1971.
- Austin, Joe. "The Necessary Job Competencies of Secondary School Principals as Perceived by Selected Texas Educators," Dissertation Abstracts, Ed.D. Dissertation (Denton, Texas: North Texas State University, 1974), Vol. 135, No. 9, p. 5706A.
- Bartky, John A. Supervision as Human Relations. Boston: D. C. Heath and Co., 1953.
- _____. Administration as Educational Leadership. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1956.
- Baughman, M. Dale; Anderson, Wendell G.; Smith, Mark; and Wiltse, Earl W. Administration and Supervision of the Modern Secondary School. West Nyack, N.Y.: Parker Publishing Co., Inc., 1969.
- Beck, William R. "The Teachers and the Principal." In Perspectives on the Changing Role of the Principal, pp. 79-88. Edited by Richard W. Saxe. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1968.
- Bullock, Wm. J. "The Relationship of Educational Training and Years of Administrative Experience to Role Perceptions of High School Principals." Journal of Educational Research 63 (September 1969): 3-5.
- Burke, A. J. "Professional Courses for Secondary School Principals." Educational Administration and Supervision 20 (October 1934): 506-512.
- Campbell, Roald F.; Corbally, John E.; and Ramseyer, John A. Introduction to Educational Administration. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1966.
- Computer Center, University of North Dakota. A User's Guide to Statistical Programs. Grand Forks, North Dakota: University of North Dakota, 1975.

- Conant, J. B. Education in the Junior High Years. Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1960.
- Cubberly, E. P. Public Education in the United States. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1919.
- Davis, C. O. "The Duties of High School Principals." Proceedings of the 26th Annual Meeting of the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. 26 (1921, Part I): 59.
- Demeke, Howard Jr. Guidelines for Evaluation: The School Principalship--Seven Areas of Competence. Tempe, Arizona: By the Author, Arizona State University, 1970.
- Downey, Lawrence W. "The Secondary School Principal." In Preparation Programs for School Administrators, pp. 129-138. Edited by Donald J. Leu and Herbert C. Rudman. East Lansing, Mich.: Michigan State University, 1963.
- Edmonson, James B., Roemer, Joseph, and Bacon, Francis L. Secondary School Administration. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1931.
- English, Fenwick. "The Ailing Principalship." In The Secondary School Principal in Action, pp. 43-48. Edited by Leonard Kraft. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Co., 1971.
- Erickson, Donald A. "Forces for Change: A New Role for Principals." In Perspectives on the Changing Role of the Principal, pp. 285-295. Edited by Richard W. Saxe. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1968.
- Gagne, Robert M. "Desirable Changes in the School." In Frontiers in School Leadership, pp. 86-100. Edited by Louis J. Rubin. Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1970.
- Galfo, Armand J. "Measurement of Group versus Educational Leaders' Perceptions of Leadership Style and Administrative Theory Orientation." Journal of Educational Research 66 (April 1975): 310-14.
- Getzels, Jacob W., Lipham, James M., and Campbell, Roald F. Educational Administration as a Social Process. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, Inc., 1968.
- Gross, Neal and Herriott, Robert E. Staff Leadership in Public Schools: A Sociological Inquiry. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1965.
- Guba, Egon G. "Missing Roles in School Leadership." In Frontiers in School Leadership, pp. 25-50. Edited by Louis J. Rubin. Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1970.

- Havighurst, Robert J. and Neugarten, Bernice L. Society and Education. 2nd ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1962.
- Jacobson, Paul B. and Reavis, William C. Duties of School Principals. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1941.
- Jacobson, Paul B.; Reavis, William C.; and Logsdon, James D. Duties of School Principals. 2nd ed. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1950.
- Jacobson, Paul B.; Logsdon, James D.; and Wiegman, Robert R. The Principalship: New Perspectives. 3rd ed. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1973.
- Jerrems, Richard W. "The Principal and the Pupils." In Perspectives on the Changing Role of the Principal, pp. 23-40. Edited by Richard W. Saxe. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas, 1968.
- Johnson, Mauritz, Jr. American Secondary Schools. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1965.
- Kraft, Leonard E., ed. The Secondary Principal in Action. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Co., 1971.
- McCleary, Lloyd E. and Hencley, Stephen P. Secondary School Administration. New York: Dodd, Mead and Co., 1965.
- Minium, Edward W. Statistical Reasoning in Psychology and Education. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1970.
- Minnesota Educational Directory, 1974-75. St. Paul: State of Minnesota, 1974.
- Moehlman, Arthur B. School Administration. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1951.
- Morrison, R. H. "Qualities Leading to Appointment as School Supervisors and Administrators." Educational Administration and Supervision 12 (November 1926): 505-511.
- Moser, Robert P. "Today's Principalship: New Dimensions/New Demands." North Central Association Quarterly 49 (Fall 1974): 294-300.
- Muth, Rodney. "Teacher Perceptions of Power, Conflict and Consensus." Administrators Notebook 21 (April 1973): 2.
- National Association of Secondary School Principals. The Principalship. Washington: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1970.
- Nie, Norman H.; Hull, C. Hadlai; Jenkins, Jean G.; Steinbrenner, Karin; and Bent, Dale H. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. 2nd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1975.

- Pierce, Paul R. The Origin and Development of the Public School Principalship. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1935.
- Prascher, Ronald E. "Effective and Ineffective Administrative Behavior Exhibited by High School Principals as Judged by a Selected Group of Colorado Classroom Teachers." Dissertation Abstracts, Ed.D. Dissertation (Greeley, Colorado: University of Northern Colorado, 1975), Vol. 36, No. 5, p. 2556A.
- Roe, William H. and Drake, Thelbert L. The Principalship. New York: The Macmillan Publishing Co., 1974.
- Rubin, Louis J., ed. Frontiers in School Leadership. Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1970.
- Saxe, Richard W., ed. Perspectives on the Changing Role of the Principal. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, 1968.
- Seeman, Melvin. Social Status and Leadership. Columbus, Ohio: Bureau of Educational Research and Service, Ohio State University, 1960.
- Smith, William A. Secondary Education in the United States. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1932.
- Southern States Cooperative Program in Educational Administration. Better Teaching in School Administration. Nashville: McQuiddy Printing Co., 1955.
- Spears, Harold. Secondary Education in American Life. New York: American Book Co., 1941.
- Splawn, Robert. "Boards of Education Members' Perceptions of the Role of the Board and the Role of the Superintendent and the High School Principal." Studies in Education, Vol. VIII. Canyon, Texas: West Texas State University, 1969.
- _____. "A Study of Boards of Education in Texas--The Makeup of Boards and the Perceptions of Board Members." Studies in Education, Vol. XI. Canyon, Texas: West Texas State University, 1972.
- Thurman, Robert S. "The Principal Must Be Replaced." In The Secondary School Principal in Action, pp. 73-78. Edited by Leonard Kraft. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Co., 1971.
- Turner, Harold E. "The Principal--Moving Toward Research." In The Secondary School Principal in Action, pp. 119-124. Edited by Leonard Kraft. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Co., 1971.
- Weaver, Donald C. "Competent Leadership for an Explosive Era." In The Secondary School Principal in Action, pp. 49-58. Edited by Leonard E. Kraft. Dubuque, Iowa: Wm. C. Brown Co., 1971.