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ABSTRACT

SOME SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES IN SELECTED TENNESSEE ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS' PERCEIVED ALLOCATION AND IDEAL ALLOCATION OF TIME FOR CURRICULUM RELATED ACTIVITIES

by

Norman Ray Davis

The problem of this study was to determine some similarities and differences in selected Tennessee elementary principals perceived allocation and ideal allocation of time for curriculum related activities.

A questionnaire, consisting of the most prevalent curriculum activities, was developed and mailed to a randomly selected sample of 300 elementary principals in Tennessee. The sample was selected from the 1985-86 Directory of Tennessee Public Schools. A total of 124 of the respondents, or better than forty-one per cent, returned the questionnaires.

The t-Test was utilized to determine differences between perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time. Differences were determined for the four stages of curriculum related activities of studying, planning, implementing, and evaluating. The differences were also calculated between female and male principals, county and city principals, principals with a master's degree or less and principals with a higher degree, principals with less than twelve years of administrative experience and principals with twelve or more years of administrative experience, principals who have taken a graduate curriculum course in ten years or less and principals who have taken a graduate curriculum course in more than ten years, and principals in schools with enrollments of 400 or less and principals in schools with enrollments of more than 400 for perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time.

Significant differences were found in perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time by principals for curriculum related activities. The respondents indicated a significant difference in perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time for each of the four curriculum phases of studying, planning, implementing, and evaluating. Significant differences were
also recorded for perceived allocation of time between female and male principals, between female and male principals in the studying phase, between female and male principals in the implementing phase, and for ideal allocation of time between female and male principals in the implementing phase. In each case female principals indicated they spent more time and should spend more time than male principals on perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time in each phase of curriculum related activities.

Certain conclusions were based on the findings in this study. It was concluded that principals feel more time should be spent for curriculum related activities. Principals believe more time should be spent in the studying, planning, implementing, and evaluating phases of curriculum related activities. Female and male principals disagreed on the amount of time spent and the amount of time that should be spent on curriculum related activities. The gender of the principal influences the amount of time spent in the studying and implementing phases of curriculum related activities. Several factors that did not have any influence on the amount of time spent or should be spent on curriculum related activities were the type of school system and the size of the school in which the principal was employed and the number of years since the principal had taken a graduate curriculum course.

Recommendations were made for further study.
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CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

The elementary principal is a key person in any local program of curriculum development. Since change will ultimately be effected only in the individual classroom by the teacher, the attitude of the building principal as he works with his staff is all important.1 Being the central figure, he can block curriculum development or he can promote it. The principal's attitudes and actions can encourage or frustrate the faculty and can either negate all of the efforts of supervisors and central office staff or facilitate the use of their contribution.2

A part of the pattern of expectations is that the school principal should provide leadership for curriculum development and, above all, for instructional improvement. Whether the school is a large one or a small one, its


principal is the one person who must be concerned with the curriculum at all levels served.³

The elementary principal has been called the real gatekeeper of curriculum improvement due to her proximity to teachers and pupils. In a broad sense she serves as interpreter of the culture, professional leader on the educational frontier, supervisor of instruction, stimulator of local community enlightenment, and manager of a crucial educational enterprise.⁴

The principal must accept responsibility for the total instructional program, which provides for meeting the social, physical, mental, and emotional needs of all the educable children in the community. The extent of growth in these areas, as well as the degree of quality, will further depend upon the proper balance of experiences which the school provides through the leadership of the principal.⁵

As the status leader of the professional staff and as the recognized leader of the school community, the elementary school principal holds a key leadership position

---


in curriculum planning and program development. There is little doubt that this is his major responsibility.  

In many ways the elementary principal has one of the most difficult and demanding jobs in the school district. He is called to be a first-rate administrator and supervisor of instruction.  

The Problem

Statement of the Problem

The problem was to determine some similarities and differences in selected Tennessee elementary principals' perceived allocation and ideal allocation of time for curriculum related activities.

Significance of the Study

A review of the related literature revealed that many studies were conducted concerning the elementary principal and curriculum. Some focused on the role of the elementary principal... 

---


principal in the curriculum development process while others centered on the role of the principal in curriculum as compared to other job responsibilities.

Most writers on the subject of the elementary principal and the curriculum concluded that the most important function of the principal was curriculum development. The source of leadership at the local school level was the principal, and the authors agreed almost unanimously that curriculum-building had to begin at the local school with the principal.

A further revelation was made by the review of literature, that there has been a lack of effort by researchers to assess the elementary principal's perception as to how time is allocated to the various activities involved in curriculum development. If development of curriculum is the most important function of the elementary principal, then it is evident that focusing on time allocated to that function should be of benefit to practitioners.

**Assumptions**

The following assumptions were recognized as being basic to the conduct of the study.

1. Principals would report the time allocations in each category as honestly as they could.
2. The survey instrument included activities that reflected curriculum tasks that principals considered important to the learning process.

3. Principals considered curriculum development to be the most important task in their job descriptions.

4. Principals are the curriculum leaders in the schools.

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses, stated in the declarative format, were developed for this study.

$H_1$: Principals will report a significant difference in perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time for curriculum related activities.

$H_2$: Principals will report a significant difference in perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time in the studying phase of curriculum related activities.

$H_3$: Principals will report a significant difference in perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time in the planning phase of curriculum related activities.

$H_4$: Principals will report a significant difference in perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time in the implementing phase of curriculum related activities.

$H_5$: Principals will report a significant difference in perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time in the evaluating phase of curriculum related activities.
H₀ : County school principals will report a significant difference in perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time for curriculum related activities than city school principals.

H₇ : Principals in schools with enrollments of 400 or less will report a significant difference in perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time for curriculum related activities than principals in schools with enrollments of more than 400.

H₈ : Female principals will report a significant difference in perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time for curriculum related activities than male principals.

H₉ : Principals with less than twelve years of administrative experience will report a significant difference in perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time for curriculum related activities than principals with twelve or more years of administrative experience.

H₁₀ : Principals with a master's degree or less will report a significant difference in perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time for curriculum related activities than principals with a higher degree.

H₁₁ : Principals who have taken a graduate curriculum course in ten years or less will report a significant difference in perceived allocation of time and ideal
allocation of time for curriculum related activities than principals who have taken a graduate curriculum course in more than ten years.

$H_{i1}$: County school principals will report a significant difference in perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time in the studying phase than city school principals.

$H_{i2}$: County school principals will report a significant difference in perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time in the planning phase of curriculum related activities than city school principals.

$H_{i3}$: County school principals will report a significant difference in perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time in the implementing phase of curriculum related activities than city school principals.

$H_{i4}$: County school principals will report a significant difference in perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time in the evaluating phase of curriculum related activities than city school principals.

$H_{i5}$: Principals with a master's degree or less will report a significant difference in perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time in the studying phase of curriculum related activities than principals with a higher degree.

$H_{i6}$: Principals with a master's degree or less will report a significant difference in perceived allocation of
time and ideal allocation of time in the planning phase of curriculum related activities than principals with a higher degree.

$H_{1a}$: Principals with a master's degree or less will report a significant difference in perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time in the implementing phase of curriculum related activities than principals with a higher degree.

$H_{1b}$: Principals with a master's degree or less will report a significant difference in perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time in the evaluating phase of curriculum related activities than principals with a higher degree.

$H_{2a}$: Principals in schools with enrollments of 400 or less will report a significant difference in perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time in the studying phase of curriculum related activities than principals in schools with enrollments of more than 400.

$H_{2b}$: Principals in schools with enrollments of 400 or less will report a significant difference in perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time in the planning phase of curriculum related activities than principals in schools with enrollments of more than 400.

$H_{2c}$: Principals in schools with enrollments of 400 or less will report a significant difference in perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time in the
implementing phase of curriculum related activities than principals in schools with enrollments of more than 400.

$H_3$: Principals in schools with enrollments of 400 or less will report a significant difference in perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time in the evaluating phase of curriculum related activities than principals in schools with enrollments of more than 400.

$H_4$: Principals with less than twelve years of administrative experience will report a significant difference in perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time in the studying phase of curriculum related activities than principals with twelve or more years of administrative experience.

$H_5$: Principals with less than twelve years of administrative experience will report a significant difference in perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time in the planning phase of curriculum related activities than principals with twelve or more years of administrative experience.

$H_6$: Principals with less than twelve years of administrative experience will report a significant difference in perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time in the implementing phase of curriculum related activities than principals with twelve or more years of administrative experience.
H₁₀: Principals who have taken a graduate curriculum course in ten years or less will report a significant difference in perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time in the implementing phase of curriculum related activities than principals who have taken a graduate curriculum course in more than ten years.

H₁₁: Principals who have taken a graduate curriculum course in ten years or less will report a significant difference in perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time in the initiating phase of curriculum related activities than principals who have taken a graduate curriculum course in more than ten years.
difference in perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time in the evaluating phase of curriculum related activities than principals who have taken a graduate curriculum course in more than ten years.

$H_2$: Female principals will report a significant difference in perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time in the studying phase of curriculum related activities than male principals.

$H_3$: Female principals will report a significant difference in perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time in the planning phase of curriculum related activities than male principals.

$H_4$: Female principals will report a significant difference in perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time in the implementing phase of curriculum related activities than male principals.

$H_5$: Female principals will report a significant difference in perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time in the evaluating phase of curriculum related activities than male principals.

**Limitations**

The following were considered to be limitations of the study.

1. The study was limited to the respondents' understandings of key terms, such as "curriculum", 
2. The amount of time engaged in curriculum activities and the amount of time in which respondents felt they should be involved were estimated.

3. The data gathered were limited to a one-time response from the participants.

4. The survey instrument was a self-reporting, closed-response questionnaire.

5. The scale to estimate time was arrived at arbitrarily.

6. The study was limited to a random sample of the elementary principals in Tennessee.

7. The study was limited to the time period from January 1984 to December 1986.

8. The percentage of questionnaires returned was estimated to be thirty per cent.

9. The use of a questionnaire was considered to be a limitation.

Definitions of Terms

For the purposes of this study, the following terms have been interpreted according to the given definitions.
**Curriculum.** Curriculum was considered to be all the activities and experiences in which pupils participate under the direction of the school.⁸

**Innovations.** New ideas, methods, or devices in curriculum were innovations.⁹

**Inservice activities.** Inservice activities were those activities designed specifically to improve instruction by changing the performance of teachers.¹⁰

**Supervisory conferences.** Supervisory conferences were planned meetings between a principal and a teacher to secure improvements in methods of teaching and in the devices and materials used.¹¹

---


¹¹ Good, p. 127.
**Studying phase.** The studying phase is that period of time when the elementary principal is in the process of acquiring knowledge about curriculum.

**Planning phase.** The planning phase is that period of time when the elementary principal is in the process of designing or devising ways to improve curriculum.

**Implementing phase.** The implementing phase is that period of time when the elementary principal is in the process of carrying out plans to improve curriculum.

**Evaluating phase.** The evaluating phase is that period of time when the elementary principal is in the process of judging the value of efforts that have been made to improve curriculum.

**Mean scores.** Mean scores are the average for the number of hours reported per week.

**Null hypothesis.** The null hypothesis, or the opposite of the research hypothesis, states there will be no significant difference between variables.

**N.** The N is the number of cases in the sample.
t-score for independent data. The t-score is a score that results from comparing the means of two variables of a sample for which the population is unknown. In this study the t-value is called the t-score.

Organization of the Study

The study was organized into five chapters. Presented in Chapter One are an introduction to the study, the statement of the problem, limitations of the study, the assumptions of the study, definitions of terms, research hypotheses, and organization of the study.

Chapter Two presents a review of the related literature.

The procedure and methods utilized in the research are presented in Chapter Three. It includes the selection of the sample, the development of the questionnaire, the data collection, and the plan for the analysis and reporting of the data.

Chapter Four presents an analysis of the findings of the study.

Chapter Five includes a summary of the study, implications of the study, conclusions of the study, and recommendations for further study.
CHAPTER TWO

Review of Related Literature

Introduction

A review of studies relating to the elementary school principal and curriculum is presented in this chapter. The curriculum is the backbone of the elementary school and it has long been considered the duty of the elementary principal to maintain and improve the quality of that curriculum.

Material in this chapter is presented in two sections. The first section deals with what theorists and practitioners in the fields of administration and curriculum development believe about the role of the elementary school principal in curriculum development. The second section reviews what researchers have discovered about the role of the elementary principal in curriculum development.

Overview of the Review of Literature by Theorists and Practitioners

It has generally been recognized that curriculum improvement must occur where the pupil is.\(^1\) The pupil is

in the local school unit which is the source for initiating curriculum work because there are fewer participants in the decision-making process making it easier to achieve full participation and move toward group consensus. This leads to the most successful curriculum improvement programs. Numerous authorities point to the local school as being the basic unit for curriculum improvement. Within this local unit, the program must have its initial beginnings in the classrooms which is a setting of familiarity for the teachers. It is in this setting that the principal, as the status leader who has most direct and immediate access to the pupil, can bring his leadership skills to bear upon crucial problems which develop in the process of improving the curriculum.

---


5 Goldman, p. 38.


7 Goldman, p. 40.

8 Doll.
The principal has major responsibility for developing a program at the school building level. It was pointed out that "the superintendent, as the responsible head of the school, usually delegates responsibility for curriculum leadership to principals in the school buildings." Superintendents of schools want her to assume a major responsibility for what happens to instruction in her building. This practice places the principal in a strategic position for promoting improved learning experiences. Of all the persons in the school, she is the one in a key position to provide the conditions necessary for these beginnings of curriculum development. She sets the pace and views the program as an entity. The quality of her leadership is considered to be the keystone

9 Goldman, p. 38.
10 Shuster and Ploghoft.
12 Shuster and Ploghoft.
of a successful program of curriculum development. The principal is the key person in actual situations, and is regarded as the last bastion for curriculum leadership.

The principal is in close relationship with his faculty. He is their instructional leader and curriculum consultant. He knows their strengths and their weaknesses and, therefore, can involve faculty members to the best advantages. He can make or break or block desired activity. Since he is in this "make or break" position, his indifference can dampen enthusiasm and his opposition can stifle experimentation, or his energy can keep a faculty alive and active. He sets the tone for the entire school

---


17 Oliver.


19 Shuster and Ploghoft.


21 Shuster and Ploghoft.

22 Shuster and Wetzler.

23 Oliver, p. 442.
and greatly influences the climate for improving instruction.  

Responsibility for the development of a school program in the interest of the children of the school is fixed squarely on the principal as executive officer of the school.  

She is required to provide such leadership within a particular school as will be most certain to promise the accomplishment of major educational purposes through the education of each elementary school child.  

She is to provide leadership in developing a school curriculum that will include opportunities for each student to achieve his maximum learning potential.  

The principal cannot avoid or evade the important responsibility of curriculum development and improvement.  

Neither can this responsibility be delegated. The principal is in a much better position to provide leadership than systemwide or regional personnel. Central office supervisors or consultants can work with and supplement the efforts

---


26 Hagman, p. 110.

27 Goldman, p. 43.

of the principal but they cannot replace him. They are actually advisors to the principal. No one else in the system can assume this responsibility for the school program as well as the principal. He controls the curriculum and to a large degree determines its effectiveness.

Since responsibility for the improvement of the curriculum rests increasingly with the individual principal she must know what a good instructional program is and recognize the steps that must be taken to evaluate and effect continual improvements. The elementary principal must accept responsibility for the total instructional program, which helps the social, physical, mental, and emotional needs of all educable children in the


31 Reavis et al.

32 Shuster and Stewart, p. 175.


34 Misner, p. 197.
community. Many believe there is the real hope for renewal of the educational system.

As the heart of the elementary school, the instructional program is the main focus of the principal's leadership, decision-making, and staff development activities. He is a facilitator of inquiry into the instructional process. The real authority for the instructional program of the school has rested increasingly with the principal. Guiding the development and maintenance of the program is not only his task; it is also a test of his fitness for the position. It is the responsibility of the principal to insure that the educational program in his school is as good as available sources permit. He is to insure the essence of quality

---

35 Shuster and Stewart, p. 171.


38 Doll, 3rd rev. ed.


40 Goldman, p. 38.
education: critical decision making based on sound information.\textsuperscript{41}

There is agreement among writers on school administration that the most important role for the elementary principal is that of "improver" of the educational program.\textsuperscript{42} If we accept the concept of leadership in the improvement of the instructional program for the elementary school supervising principal, then the definition of responsibility becomes more meaningful and less overpowering.\textsuperscript{43} Often curriculum improvement receives its first impetus in the principal's office.\textsuperscript{44} She can foster an attitude or an atmosphere conducive to improvement in the instructional program. She seeks to place the strength of her total faculty behind the program of improving instruction.\textsuperscript{45} Her cardinal function is the improvement of instruction, which will enhance the learning experiences of her students. The principal, then, is first and foremost an instructional leader: All her other


\textsuperscript{42} Griffiths et al., p. 172.

\textsuperscript{43} Stoops and Marks.

\textsuperscript{44} Doll, 3rd rev. ed.

\textsuperscript{45} Hicks and Jensen, p. 54.
activities must directly support this central function, or else she jeopardizes her raison d'etre.44

Improvement of the curriculum of a school implies change. The principal is the key person involved in this changing school situation.47 He has a significant role to exercise in bringing about meaningful change through improvement of the curriculum.48 He utilizes the knowledge and abilities in all personnel to develop and improve the total instructional program.49 His attitude toward curriculum improvement is reflected throughout the school--in the teachers, in the pupils, in the parents, and in the non-certified personnel; and if he starts with "where they are" and proceeds from there, he is well on his way toward bringing about effective change in the school's program and in the members of the staff.50 His fundamental responsibility then is not just to maintain programs but to insure that the process of education in the school goes


47 Misner.


49 Stoops and Marks.

50 Misner.
forward appropriately.\textsuperscript{51} This means not only updating the social science, mathematics and other curriculum areas, but also studying the need for completely new programs.\textsuperscript{52}

Neagley and Evans firmly support the principal as the educational leader of his school and community.\textsuperscript{53} The principal sees education in its broader framework of the total community. Revision takes place in terms of community needs rather than in terms of a narrow concept, such as improved spelling.\textsuperscript{54} The principal's leadership, based on his understanding of how to improve the curriculum program, is essential for promoting unity among the staff and community.\textsuperscript{55} If the principal is an alert leader with respect, faith, and confidence in his staff and is cognizant of the need for community participation in decision making, curriculum revision will be a continuous process.\textsuperscript{56} He needs to provide the type of leadership and coordination which will encourage the staff, the community,

\textsuperscript{51} The National Association of Secondary School Principals.

\textsuperscript{52} Shuster and Stewart, p. 172.


\textsuperscript{54} Griffiths et al., p. 176.

\textsuperscript{55} Shuster and Stewart, p. 171.

\textsuperscript{56} Shuster and Stewart, p. 175.
and the students to work toward the best school program that they (together) can conceive.\textsuperscript{37}

The principal must be aware of the different approaches to the curriculum and its development, and must be acquainted with the different types of curriculum, understand the problems and methods of curriculum development and improvement, and realize the relationship of other administrative policies and procedures to the instructional program. Both knowledge and curriculum must be built up gradually and continually transformed over long periods of time through the active participation of people.\textsuperscript{58} The organization which the principal helps develop can do much to help or hinder the curriculum program she and her staff conceive to be good.\textsuperscript{59}

One basic need of principal and staff, as well as of the community, is an intelligent perspective of the total school program from kindergarten through grade twelve.\textsuperscript{60} When the principal understands the concept of sequence, he will be in a better position to lead his staff in seeing

\begin{flushleft}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{37} Griffiths et al., p. 173.
\item \textsuperscript{58} Sergiovanni and Elliot, p. 240.
\item \textsuperscript{60} Shuster and Stewart, p. 171.
\end{itemize}
\end{flushleft}
individuals in terms of their differences rather than forcing all children into the same pattern.  

It is also an obligation of the principal to assess constantly the expectations held in the culture for the school as an institution, thereby capitalizing on societal pressures to ensure a contemporary curriculum. She studies and interprets the trends in the society that demand curricular change. The principal delineates the general needs of learners that are basic to the instructional program. The principal directs the assessment of the needs of learners that are unique to the school and community. She conducts a formal assessment of the adequacy of the current program for meeting objectives and learner needs. She examines and interprets alternative programs, procedures, and structures for improving the instructional program.

The principal should be aware that basic to the functions of all committee work are the sharing and exchanging of ideas, the new challenges and insights gained, and the realization that "ultimately the plans are carried out by the teachers." This type of activity is more likely to occur in open than in closed organizational

61 Shuster and Stewart, p. 160.
63 Lipham and Hoeh, p. 228.
64 Shuster and Stewart, p. 177.
climates. Where there is a good relationship between
teacher and principal, assistance with instructional matters
will be sought as long as it can be expected to be
forthcoming. Thus in motivating others to implement
planned change, the principal needs not only to be skilled
in interpersonal relationships but also to be flexible in
his decision-making styles. He must be responsible for
clarifying the decision-making structure from the beginning
of the task, so that participants do not become disappointed
with the organization or charge that it was deliberately
contrived to keep out certain interests.

The principal can certainly help build a staff climate
with norms for experimentation and freedom to observe and to
help the development of staff teams within the staff to work
on the development of curricular innovation tryouts. She
must be inventive and visionary and able to articulate her
vision to lead her colleagues and community to try out new

---

65 Raymond H. Harrison, *Supervisory Leadership in

66 Liphama and Hoeh, p. 222.

67 Glenys G. Unruh, *Responsive Curriculum Development:
Theory and Action* (Berkley, California: McCutchan, 1975),
p. 110.

68 Association for Supervision and Curriculum
Development, *Strategies for Curriculum Change* (Washington,
D.C.: Association for Supervision and Curriculum
ideas and innovations. She encourages her staff to suggest new ideas and to try new ways of doing things, and does not hesitate to suggest her own ideas for a program, curriculum, and organization. She should create collegial relations with and among teachers through encouraging faculty members to use their abilities, interests, and aptitudes to the end of cooperative solving of curricular problems. She is to provide for maintenance of a climate in which the fullest possibilities of the curriculum may be realized through the operation of high level, cooperative human relations. The principal should be able to clear avenues for growth and improvement, to identify talents and abilities in others, and to release the potential within all persons concerned. Employing these skills in working with people, she may be able to enlist the

---


70 The National Association for Secondary School Principals.


74 Stoops and Marks, p. 77.
cooperation and enthusiasm of the initially dissident, but though she does not engage the interest and support of all faculty members, she can lead an interested majority into serious and active study of the curriculum while being content with whatever contribution the less interested may offer. But because effective measures to improve the school's program will hinge upon the changed classroom activities of individual teachers, it is well if the proposals to engage in improvement efforts come from the group of teachers, rather than from the administrator or other supervisors.\(^7\) So she needs to develop a process for staff involvement in the development, implementation, and evaluation of learning programs. Effective principals in schools have known for a long time that when faculty groups make a cooperative decision they carry it out more readily.\(^8\) But under no circumstances can the principal dodge the responsibility for making the final decisions regarding the "what, when, how, how much, and by whom for whom" of instructional changes and improvements.\(^7\)

Before the principal involves his staff too deeply in curriculum improvement, he must be cognizant of the

\(^7\) Hagman, p. 150.


limitations placed upon him by the central administrative staff. These people should be utilized as resource personnel, but the principal must also have their support in order that proposed changes in curriculum will not be hampered and thus cause teacher morale to be lowered.\textsuperscript{78}

The principal must realize that he is not expected to be an expert in all areas of the curriculum.\textsuperscript{79} He must draw on expertise as a source of power in order to create and sustain interactive relationships among professionals interested in curriculum and instruction.\textsuperscript{80} He may find that teacher interest is greatest and inservice growth best when responsible study of significant school problems is under way.\textsuperscript{81}

The principal can help establish the conditions for study and program improvement, and work to interpret and clarify the process to all concerned.\textsuperscript{82} She must imbue her faculty with a spirit of self-evaluation and a thirst for constructive improvement that will continue even when the principal himself cannot participate.\textsuperscript{83}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{78} Shuster and Ploghoft.
\textsuperscript{79} Harrison.
\textsuperscript{81} Harrison, p. 279.
\textsuperscript{82} Sergiovanni and Elliot, p. 203.
\textsuperscript{83} Harrison.
\end{flushright}
establishing the conditions, she needs to study trends in society that demand curricular change. \(^3\) Next, she probably will spend sufficient time to diagnose the curriculum actually in use. This should be done with full recognition of the fact that it will vary from one classroom to another, depending upon the interpretation of "curriculum" which each teacher accepts.

From this starting point, and by appropriate interaction with teachers and the community, policies may be evolved to govern the following important matters: (1) what the curriculum ought to be and what it should include, (2) procedures in applying conclusions as to the nature of the curriculum, and (3) procedures for continually re-examining the curriculum and the assumptions which support it in a given school. \(^3\)

The principal should do everything in his power to create conditions for productive curriculum planning. He should regard planning as an organized application of skills which the participants can and should develop inservice. He should help provide a free climate, open communication, and problem-solving situations. \(^4\) The school staff and

\(^3\) Klopf.


the community must be brought into the planning process. It behooves the principal to give direction to his staff's thinking in order to provide a curriculum that will insure each child the opportunity of achieving maximum success from his school experience.  

As the chief planner, the principal helps the staff determine priorities and devote their collective energies toward the accomplishment of planned tasks. She will work with staff in formulating plans for evaluating and reporting student progress. To interest teachers in curriculum improvement the principal will plan with the staff some new learning activities. She must be aware that careful, reflective, long-range planning is a very positive way to help teachers improve instruction.

Another of the principal's essential duties is that of evaluation. He appraises the effectiveness of the instructional program and takes the steps necessary to improve it. The building principal becomes the

---

87 Shuster and Stewart, p. 178.
91 Harrison, p. 278.
administrator who is charged with the responsibility of giving leadership to the improvement of the educational program in his building. The principal must be able to identify curriculum and instructional problems independent of personalities, and to control issues. The analysis of curriculum content and instructional methods must be precisely correlated with both instructional objectives and instructional outcomes. Lipham and Hoeh suggest that he examine and recommend instrumentation for evaluating program processes and outcomes. Jensen says the principal must make use of tests and measurements to provide continuous curriculum evaluation and improvement. Specifically he must see that there is a thorough evaluation of the curriculum, that the results are interpreted adequately, that teachers understand its meaning and purpose, that alternatives are identified and suggested

---


* Lipham and Hoeh, p. 229.

* Jensen et al., p. 482.

* Shuster and Wetzler, p. 269.

for improving weak areas in the curriculum, that research results be used in formulating alternatives for change, that instruments be examined and recommended for evaluating curriculum, and that evaluative techniques are conscientiously administered.

Goldman sees the first step in curriculum development and improvement to be a determination of the goals that define the purpose of schooling. The principal will need to lead the staff and community in setting goals and objectives, and integrating those goals and objectives with the needs of the learners. They provide the basic guidelines for the development of the curriculum and also assure that the school meets the needs of the community. As educational leader, the principal helps to establish and clarify both short and long range goals for her school, develops alternative means to accomplish those goals and

---

98 Roe and Drake.

99 Klopf.

100 Lipham and Hoeh, p. 228.

101 Goldman, p. 43.

102 De Bevoise.

103 Roe and Drake, p. 112.

104 Klopf.

105 Goldman.

106 The National Association for Secondary School Principals, p. 3.
objectives, and exerts leadership in helping them to evaluate the results.\textsuperscript{107}

The principal actually controls the curriculum.\textsuperscript{108} He is often unaware that the daily schedule\textsuperscript{109} has a positive influence on the curriculum.\textsuperscript{110} He may fail to give good leadership if he does not make the necessary provisions for flexibility in the schedule. Such provisions, if they are cooperatively derived, should enhance curriculum experiences for boys and girls.\textsuperscript{111}

Today's principal can provide curriculum leadership by providing meaningful inservice experiences.\textsuperscript{112} Curriculum development comes down to being mostly professional staff development.\textsuperscript{113} Therefore, the principal should provide leadership and organization through which staff members are encouraged to participate in inservice education programs which keep them abreast of curriculum trends.\textsuperscript{114} The principal should involve teachers in the planning and

\textsuperscript{107} Roe and Drake.

\textsuperscript{108} Shuster and Wetzler, p. 241.

\textsuperscript{109} Shuster and Stewart.

\textsuperscript{110} Shuster and Wetzler, p. 239.

\textsuperscript{111} Shuster and Wetzler, p. 241.

\textsuperscript{112} Georgiades, "Renewal: A Bust for the Principal/Instructional Leader," 7.

\textsuperscript{113} Sergiovanni and Elliot, p. 240.

\textsuperscript{114} Jensen.
developing of inservice programs. She should teach inservice education courses dealing with curriculum.

Providing and managing use of the necessary resources, including supplies, equipment, and materials to improve the curriculum, is a function of the principal. He provides supplies and equipment to facilitate the program by securing needed funds for educational media from the school board and working with the staff to develop appropriate materials. He provides for instructional materials varied in grade-level difficulty and content for each classroom. The principal establishes ways of identifying and effectively utilizing resources and materials. Within his building teachers may be organized into small groups or committees for the selection of materials and their coordination with the changing curriculum.

---

115 Georgiades, "Renewal: A Bust for the Principal/Instructional Leader."

116 Cooper, p. 107.


118 Shuster and Stewart, p. 163.

119 Lipham and Hoeh.

120 Charles R. Spain, Harold D. Drummond, and John I. Goodlad, p. 122.

materials should be readily accessible; particularly, all teachers should be thoroughly familiar with what is available. The principal has a major responsibility for promoting the best possible use of all materials of instruction, including the most effective use of the best-quality textbooks.

The principal is responsible for supervision and evaluation in her school. Of all the supervisory techniques used by principals, the most common is the classroom visit. Since this is the center of instruction, it is natural that much of the principal's attention would be focused on the classroom and what is happening there. As she visits the classrooms and other learning centers of her school, she observes the curriculum and learning resources in action. She works with individual teachers, and she works with the entire staff, helping them to become a team. The principal's supervisory visits to the classroom should be followed by conferences. She should have conferences with teachers regarding what the teacher has been doing during the past several days and what some of his problems have

---

1 Harrison, p. 289.
2 Harrison, p. 290.
3 Harrison, p. 282.
4 Neagley and Evans, p. 62.
The principal evaluates teacher performance on the basis of cooperatively-determined objectives and criteria.\textsuperscript{118}

The community must be involved in curriculum activities. The principal must lead his staff and community in gaining knowledge of the total development of children, so that teachers may select appropriate learning experiences related to problems of social living based on developmental need.\textsuperscript{118} He must assist interested parents in studying aspects of elementary curriculum.\textsuperscript{118} The principal must respond to community needs in initiating new curriculum programs when needed. He works closely with the community in developing such programs. As the school becomes more autonomous in its relationship to the central office, the responsibility increases for broadening the base of local curriculum development. All segments of the community must be brought into the steps of the process, including decision making.\textsuperscript{130}

The principal must attempt to keep up-to-date with the major curricular trends and movements at her level and

\textsuperscript{118} Harrison, p. 288.
\textsuperscript{117} The National Association for Secondary School Principals.
\textsuperscript{118} Shuster and Stewart, p. 160.
\textsuperscript{119} Cooper.
\textsuperscript{130} Shuster and Stewart, p. 178.
involve the teaching staff in problem identification and curriculum committee work.\textsuperscript{131} She must sense when new technologies, research findings, or promising practices are ready to be introduced into the school.\textsuperscript{131} The principal encourages her staff members to experiment with new media that show promise in realizing the stated goals of instruction.\textsuperscript{133} She needs to be continually seeking new insights and ideas; consequently, she subscribes personally or through her school to numerous educational periodicals.\textsuperscript{134} She must channel journals, reports, and pamphlets to the appropriate teachers.\textsuperscript{135} She obtains curriculum materials published by other school systems to aid teachers working on curriculum guides, courses of study, and teaching units.\textsuperscript{136} She should be involved in other activities such as reading, attendance at professional meetings, or enrollment in courses and seminars devoted to developing an understanding of cultural demands on the

\textsuperscript{131} Neagley and Evans, p. 136.


\textsuperscript{133} Neagley and Evans, p. 62.

\textsuperscript{134} Charles R. Spain, Harold D. Drummond, and John I. Goodlad, p. 118.

\textsuperscript{135} Oliver, p. 51.

\textsuperscript{136} Cooper, p. 106.
school. She should seek to influence educational policy at state and local levels in response to societal demands.\textsuperscript{137}

Many other activities involve the principal in curriculum development and improvement. He allocates and assigns the staff to accomplish instructional goals. The principal explains the instructional change to parents and the community. He collects, organizes, and interprets data concerning the present, as compared with the previous performance of students. He certifies the viability of the program or initiates subsequent change in the newly established instructional program.\textsuperscript{138} The principal plans with individual teachers, orients and guides new teachers, works with small groups of teachers on instructional problems, helps teachers provide for individual differences, works with grade level or departmental groups, conducts faculty meetings, and initiates and coordinates research programs.\textsuperscript{139}

\textbf{Overview of the Review of Literature on Research}

There has been some disagreement on the question of the role the principal should play in curriculum development and


\textsuperscript{138} Lipham and Hoeh, p. 229.

\textsuperscript{139} Stoops and Marks, p. 82.
improvement. A Nebraska study in 1975 conducted by Baughman revealed teachers and principals did not agree on the importance of the principal's leadership behaviors in curriculum development. Principals viewed themselves as providing financing, philosophy, facilities, and organizing, planning and developing the curriculum.\textsuperscript{140}

Studies at the University of Connecticut\textsuperscript{141} and Wayne State University\textsuperscript{142} found principals and central office staff differed significantly on role expectations held for principals as instructional leader. In 1981 Meager discovered the number of years of principal's experience affected their role expectations in curriculum development and improvement. Principals with eleven or more years of experience in their present district placed a greater

\textsuperscript{140} Myra June Baughman, "A Study of the Degree of Agreement Between Principals' and Teachers' Perceptions of the Principal's Functions and Behaviors," Dissertation Abstracts International 36 (1976): 7974-A.


\textsuperscript{142} Benjamin Ernest Spalding, "The Role of the IGE Principal as Instructional Leader," Dissertation Abstracts International 43 (1982): 1382-A.
priority on instruction than principals with less than ten years of experience.  

A National Education Association study in 1968 indicated three-fourths of the principals surveyed believed they had primary responsibility for supervision and the improvement of instruction. Beck and Seifert found more than three-fourths of the principals saw themselves as instructional leaders and almost two-thirds felt they were strong instructional leaders. Agthe discovered a general feeling among elementary principals that they had some influence on the making of decisions relevant to the instructional programs of their school districts.

The development and improvement of curriculum must involve many groups to be effective. Co-operative curriculum development was reported by more than half of the


male principals and more than two-thirds of the females, as reported in a 1958 study by the National Education Association. Della-Dora found most administrators believe in involving teachers, parents, and perhaps even students.

How the elementary principal spends his time has been the subject of many studies. Most of these included the time spent in the areas of supervision and curriculum. The research figures varied as to the amount of time spent in these areas. The National Education Association reported principals indicated they spent more than one-third of their time in supervisory activities. Almost three-fourths of principals spend up to nineteen percent of their week in curriculum development. In a 1977 Michigan study, Bowman found principals most valued the role of instructional leader and were devoting larger portions of time in improving the instructional process in their buildings than


had been typical. In 1980, in the same state, Burke discovered principals spent less than ten percent of their time on supervision and curriculum. Two years later Kmetz spent a week observing five Pennsylvania elementary school principals and found curriculum and instruction occupied more than one-fourth of the principals' time. In another Michigan study in 1982 Robinson learned almost one-sixth of a principal's time is spent on curricular responsibilities. Those responsibilities were ranked third among seven designated areas.

A comparison of actual or perceived time with ideal time for curriculum improvement and development was the subject of various studies. Ahmed found, in a study of 250 Pennsylvania principals, significant differences existed between the principals' perceptions of the actual and ideal role. Instruction and curriculum development did rank as


the most important task area for the ideal role. In a study of 166 Michigan elementary principals, Burke discovered principals would ideally use more of their time on supervision and curriculum. Altman conducted a study of seventy-two San Diego elementary principals and found there was a difference in the amount of time principals were spending in supervision from what they expressed to be an ideal distribution of time. Overall, Wilson found principals agreed there were significant discrepancies between their actual and ideal role perceptions in the area of instructional leadership. Altman, Burke, and Russell found the size of the school results in


134 Burke.


137 Altman.

138 Burke.

differences in the actual and ideal role perceptions in the area of curriculum and instruction.

The principal's desire to spend more time on curriculum and development was the subject of other studies. Research indicated improvement of instruction was of great concern to principals and the one area to which they would most like to devote themselves. They wanted more opportunities to participate in curriculum development and necessary support staff to give them more time to do so. In the 1950's, time expenditure studies of principals revealed they wished to spend more than half their time in supervisory activities, such as, visiting classrooms and inspecting teachers' work. Austin found elementary principals were spending more time on clerical work and less time on supervision and curriculum in 1973 than in 1963. Her study compared the views of elementary principals with a Jury, consisting of leading educators, superintendents, new principals, and teachers. Principals and Jury agreed more

\[\text{\footnotesize 162 Stoops and Marks, p. 79.}\]
\[\text{\footnotesize 163 Keith Goldhammer et al., Elementary Principals and Their Schools (Eugene, Oregon: Center for Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, 1971), p. 52.}\]
\[\text{\footnotesize 164 Doll, 3rd rev. ed., p. 211.}\]
time should be allocated to curriculum development. Slemkewicz and Wills discovered principals believed more time should be spent on supervision of instruction.

Several studies have looked at the principal as an innovator. In an Indiana study, Gourley found curriculum innovation was one of the most significant issues confronting building principals. Knight found superintendents and principals considered curriculum change as one of the principal's most important job functions. More than half the principals surveyed by the National Education Association believed they had a responsibility to "modify and adapt" the general school curriculum program.

---


working in cooperation with teachers.\textsuperscript{170} Enrollment or college degree did not affect the principal's view as to his function.\textsuperscript{171} In a 1980 study on principal effectiveness, Blumberg and Greenfield reported all principals they observed were innovators, constantly seeking ways to effect improvement with an emphasis on student learning.\textsuperscript{172} The National Education Association, in a study conducted in 1958, concluded the principal contributed most effectively to improving instruction by bringing new ideas and constructive criticism to appropriate persons.\textsuperscript{173} A 1979 study reported effective principals took major responsibility for the innovative thrust in the early stages and then turned it over to selected staff when it was running smoothly.\textsuperscript{174} Calhoun found teachers considered actions that support curriculum innovation at the classroom level as illustrative of leadership behavior.

\textsuperscript{170} National Education Association, \textit{The Elementary School Principalship in 1968...A Research Study}, p. 78.

\textsuperscript{171} National Education Association, \textit{The Elementary School Principalship in 1968...A Research Study}, p. 80.

\textsuperscript{172} Arthur Blumberg and William Greenfield, \textit{The Effective Principal: Perspectives on School Leadership} (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1980), p. 257.


both the classroom and building levels teachers identified actions of principals that encouraged innovation as leadership behavior illustrative of showing concern for improving teaching-learning situations. Principals ranked the local workshop as the main source of ideas on innovations. Professional reading was second and other principals and teachers was third.

Principals who provided effective inservice and staff development activities were considered to be successful in curriculum development and improvement. Principals in improving schools provided regular administrative response to teacher difficulties, useful faculty meetings, opportunities for staff interaction on curriculum matters, and adequate inservice training. As a result of research in 1970, Smith discovered principals and teachers felt the instructional program could be improved through the implementation of methods and techniques for improving

---


inservice training. Wilson and Dinero found effective principals who successfully guided curriculum change encouraged the faculty to participate in inservice activities. Staff development that centers on student needs and results in teachers' use of the information, methods, techniques, and procedures introduced in the inservice meetings were characteristics of effective schools. Houts reported effective principals developed curriculum and conducted inservice sessions for teachers. The principal tried to organize teacher effectiveness training, held meetings with small groups of teachers to discuss their students' achievement and held regular and frequent staff meetings.

______________________________
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The atmosphere, or climate, set by the principal in a school contributed greatly to the development and improvement of curriculum. Successful schools had a clearly identifiable instructional leader, an orderly climate, and high expectations. The 1968 National Education Association study discovered more than half of the principals thought their most effective technique for improving instruction was "helping to create a climate in which teachers, individually or collectively, are encouraged to experiment and to share ideas." Other researchers found effective schools had an atmosphere conducive to learning, more evidence of pupil progress monitoring, and the principal had more impact on educational decision-making. At both the classroom and building levels teachers identified the principal's practice of sound human relations as a leadership behavior.

Another useful device for curriculum and development was evaluation. Edmonds discovered improving schools were likely to have principals who were assertive in their role as instructional leader and assumed responsibility for


187 Sweeney, p. 347.

188 Calhoun.
evaluating the achievement of objectives.\textsuperscript{189} In Texas research, Seifert and Beck found almost two-thirds of the principals they surveyed believed instructional improvement was the real purpose of evaluation and approximately three-fourths believed they could help teachers improve their teaching through evaluation procedures.\textsuperscript{190} As a result of research in 1970, Smith discovered principals and teachers felt the instructional program could be improved through the implementation of methods and techniques for periodic evaluation of the instructional program.\textsuperscript{191} In a 1980 study Rosenberg reported that over half of the principals indicated evaluation of classroom instruction was part of their regular daily schedule.\textsuperscript{192}

Research indicated providing of materials and resources was a method of developing and improving curriculum. The 1968 National Education Association study showed more than half of the principals believed their role in selecting instructional materials was to work with their staffs in


\textsuperscript{190} Seifert and Beck.

\textsuperscript{191} Smith.

listing the materials needed. Dinero discovered principals who successfully guided curriculum change anticipated needs and provided resources as necessary. The principal's actions in securing material resources for teachers were considered by teachers to be areas where principals demonstrated leadership behavior that encouraged classroom innovation with real, practical support. Encouraging the use of community resources was an activity most frequently initiated by principals.

Classroom observation was another tool utilized by the principal to develop and improve curriculum. Effective principals worked closely with teachers in the classroom on issues identified during classroom observation. However, in 1982 Kmetz discovered less than five percent of the elementary principal's time was spent in either observation or teaching. In effective schools the principal visited each classroom approximately 30 times over

---
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the school year. Principals and teachers believed attention should be given to classroom visitation.

Effective principal studies reported curriculum development and improvement was centered around goals and objectives. Austin found principals were oriented to goals. Effective principals were exceptionally clear about their own short- and long-range goals for students. They oriented the school program to sets of goals widely endorsed within the community. Effective principals tended to be actively involved in their school's instructional program by becoming knowledgeable about instruction, setting goals for the school's instructional program and announcing these goals to students, faculty, and community. Dinero found effective schools were characterized by strong leadership from the principal in the instructional program and continuous assessment of pupil performance that was related to instructional objectives.

---
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CHAPTER THREE

Research Methodology and Instruments

Introduction

The research procedures used in the study are described in this chapter. These procedures include the process used in the selection of the sample, the development and refinement of the instrument, the procedures followed in gathering the data, and the plan for analyzing the data.

Selection of the Sample

The sample of 300 elementary school principals was drawn from a population of over 1000 elementary school principals in Tennessee. These principals were randomly selected from all the public school systems in Tennessee. A thirty per cent return of questionnaires was considered adequate for continuing the study.

Each school system and school in Tennessee had a number assigned by the State Department of Education in the 1985-1986 Directory of Tennessee Public Schools. Those numbers were utilized to choose a random sample using a random number table. Any numbers chosen that represented schools other than elementary were thrown out and a new number chosen until the sample of 300 was reached.
Development of the Questionnaire

After a review of the related literature and previous research studies, and consultations with former professors, it was determined that a mailed questionnaire would be developed and administered.

The format and design of the questionnaire was determined in order to improve clarity and facilitate completion of the form. An attempt was made to keep the directions as explicit as possible and yet insure the exact interpretation of each activity by the respondent in order to increase the reliability of the instrument.

The questionnaire was divided into two sections. The first section was designed to provide demographic information about the principal, the school, and the school system. Specifically, these questions sought information about the principal's sex, highest degree earned, years of administrative experience, and the number of years since having the last curriculum course. Information was also sought about the school size and whether the school was in a county or city system.

A scale was developed that would represent the amount of time a principal spends in an average week in curriculum related activities. It was decided that the period of time would vary from none to more than two hours.
The second section included the directions for completion of this section and a list of curriculum activities. Four subsections were representative of the curriculum activities including: studying, planning, implementing, and evaluating.

Activities were organized under each subsection that were essential to developing and improving curriculum. The studying subsection included achievement test results, teacher lesson plans, instructional goals, courses of study, curriculum guides, curriculum innovations, enrollment projections, teacher and student needs, teacher and student interests, and new curriculum requirements. The planning subsection included classroom visits, inservice, teacher conferences, goals, remediation for weak areas, studies on curriculum effectiveness, program evaluation, new curriculum programs, questionnaires for needs assessment, and faculty meetings. The implementing subsection included classroom visits, teacher conferences, curriculum study results, inservice, curriculum guides update, course of study changes, information on innovations to faculty, instructional assistance, new programs, and goals and objectives. The evaluation subsection included teaching effectiveness, goals, use of teaching materials, use of equipment, textbook effectiveness, inservice, course of study, curriculum guides, teacher conferences, and teaching assignments.
The completed questionnaire was then typed, duplicated, and presented to other graduate students in the Department of Supervision and Administration at East Tennessee State University and to elementary principals in the Johnson City School System. The purpose was to solicit comments and suggestions for improvement of clarity and appropriateness of each item. After reviewing their responses, the questionnaire was then revised accordingly to make the instrument as effective and efficient as possible.

A cover letter of introduction was then formulated stating the purpose of the study and requesting the cooperation of the selected principals. The cover letter was attached to the front of the questionnaire. (See Appendix)

**Data Collection**

The questionnaire was printed and mailed to the principals selected by using the random number list. The principals were assured of anonymity of each respondent. They were informed that they could get a report of the results of the study by simply including their address with the returned questionnaire. A self-addressed stamped envelope was included to encourage a quick return.
Statistical Analysis Procedures

The null form for each hypotheses was tested for the purpose of statistical treatment in every case. This form stated that there will be no significant difference between population means, and that any difference found is unimportant and incidental. The hypotheses were stated in research form which states expectations in positive terms.

The t-test for independent samples was used to analyze the differences. The minimum acceptable level of significance was 0.05 level.
CHAPTER FOUR

Analysis and Interpretation

Introduction

This chapter analyzes and interprets the data obtained from the questionnaires. Tables with statistical data and significance levels are presented with each hypothesis. Data were gathered and treated to test the hypotheses set forth in Chapter One. The hypotheses were stated in research form but tested in the null form to determine if there were significant differences. The hypotheses were tested to determine if there were differences between elementary principals’ perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time for curriculum related activities.

Presentation of the Data

Hypothesis 1. Comparison of Perceived Allocation of Time and Ideal Allocation of Time for Curriculum Related Activities

The hypothesis, "principals will report a significant difference in perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time for curriculum related activities," was tested in the null form. The N, the means for perceived
and ideal, the difference, t-score, and level of significance are shown in Table 1.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>PERCEIVED</th>
<th>IDEAL</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>7.54</td>
<td>10.69</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>15.80</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The t-test was utilized to determine the differences between the scores. The mean for perceived allocation of time was 7.54 and the mean for ideal allocation of time was 10.69. The difference between the means amounted to 3.15. The t-score for Hypothesis 1 was 15.80 which was significant beyond the acceptable level of 0.05. Elementary principals believe that they are not allocating an adequate amount of time to curriculum related activities. Based on these findings the null hypothesis for Hypothesis 1 was rejected.
Hypothesis 2. Comparison of Perceived Allocation of Time and Ideal Allocation of Time for Principals in the Studying Phase of Curriculum Related Activities

Hypothesis 2 stated that principals will report a significant difference in perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time in the studying phase of curriculum related activities. The N, the mean scores, differences, t-scores, and level of significance are shown in Table 2.

Table 2

N, Mean Scores, Differences, t-Test results, and Level of Significance Between Principals' Perceived Allocation of Time and Ideal Allocation of Time in the Studying Phase of Curriculum Related Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEAN SCORES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Principals' responses gave mean scores of 1.90 for perceived allocation of time and 2.69 for ideal allocation of time. The difference of 0.69 resulted in a t-score of 12.79 which was significant beyond the 0.001 level. Since
the acceptable level was 0.05, the null hypothesis for Hypothesis 2 was rejected.

Hypothesis 3. Comparison of Perceived Allocation of Time and Ideal Allocation of Time for Principals in the Planning Phase of Curriculum Related Activities

Hypothesis 3 stated that principals will report a significant difference in perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time in the planning phase of curriculum related activities. The N, the means for perceived and ideal allocation of time, the differences, t-scores, and level of significance are presented in Table 3.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEAN SCORES</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>PERCEIVED</td>
<td>IDEAL</td>
<td>DIFFERENCE</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>13.10</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For the planning phase the perceived allocation of time mean was 1.96 and the ideal allocation of time mean was 2.74. The difference between the two mean scores was 0.78 and the t-score was 13.10, which was the lowest for any of the four phases. However, it still indicated there was a significant difference in perceived time and ideal time for the planning phase beyond the 0.001 level. Based on these findings, the null hypothesis was rejected for Hypothesis 3.

Hypothesis 4. Comparison of Perceived Allocation of Time and Ideal Allocation of Time for Principals in the Implementing Phase of Curriculum Related Activities

The hypothesis, "principals will report a significant difference in perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time in the implementing phase of curriculum related activities," was tested in the null form. The N, the means for perceived and ideal, the differences in the means, t-score, and level of significance are presented in Table 4.

The resulting mean scores from principal responses in the implementing phase were 1.85 for perceived allocation of time and 2.68 for ideal allocation of time. A t-score of 13.85 was statistically significant at a level beyond 0.001. This t-score was the highest for any of the four phases of
curriculum related activities. The null hypothesis was rejected for Hypothesis 4.

Table 4

N, Mean Scores, Differences, t-Test results, and Level of Significance Between Principals' Perceived Allocation of Time and Ideal Allocation of Time in the Implementing Phase of Curriculum Related Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>PERCEIVED</th>
<th>IDEAL</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>13.85</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis 5. Comparison of Perceived Allocation of Time and Ideal Allocation of Time for Principals in the Evaluating Phase of Curriculum Related Activities

The hypothesis, "principals will report a significant difference in perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time in the evaluating phase of curriculum related activities," was tested in the null form. The results of the statistical treatment are presented in Table 5.

Scores from the evaluating phase of curriculum related activities resulted in a mean for perceived allocation of
time of 1.81 and a mean for ideal allocation of time of 2.65. The difference in the means was 0.74 and a t-score of 13.26. The t-score resulted in a level of significance beyond the 0.001 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis for Hypothesis 5 was rejected.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N, Mean Scores, Differences, t-Test results, and Level of Significance Between Principals' Perceived Allocation of Time and Ideal Allocation of Time in the Evaluating Phase of Curriculum Related Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEAN SCORES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis 6. Comparison Between County and City Principals for Perceived Allocation of Time and Ideal Allocation of Time for Curriculum Related Activities

The hypothesis stated that county school principals will report a significant difference in perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time for curriculum related activities than city school principals. The results from
the statistical treatment of the data for this hypothesis are shown in Table 6.

Table 6

N, Mean Scores, Differences, t-Test results, and Level of Significance Between County and City Principals' Perceived Allocation of Time and Ideal Allocation of Time for Curriculum Related Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MEAN SCORES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIFFERENCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-SCORE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The differences between the county and city principals for perceived allocation of time resulted in a t-score of 0.73 and a significance level of 0.47. County and city principals reported a mean difference in ideal allocation of time of 0.36 and a level of significance of 0.72.

The treatment of the data for this hypothesis indicated there were no significant differences and the null hypothesis failed to be rejected.
Hypothesis 7. Comparison Between Principals in Schools With Enrollments of 400 or Less and Principals in Schools With Enrollments of More Than 400 for Perceived Allocation of Time and Ideal Allocation of Time for Curriculum Related Activities

Hypothesis 7 stated that principals in schools with enrollments of 400 or less will report a significant difference in perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time for curriculum related activities than principals in schools with enrollments of more than 400. The data for this hypothesis are shown in Table 7.

Analysis of the data for this hypothesis resulted in a mean score for perceived allocation of time of 7.41 for principals in schools with enrollments of 400 or less and a mean score of 7.57 for principals in schools with enrollments of more than 400. The difference in the means for perceived allocation of time was 0.16 which resulted in a t-score of 0.37. A level of significance of 0.71 meant the resulting differences were not significant at the acceptable level.

The mean for ideal allocation of time for principals in schools with enrollments of 400 or less was 10.84 and for principals in schools with enrollments of more than 400 the
mean was 10.59. For ideal allocation of time the difference in the means was 0.35 and the t-score was 0.43. The level of significance of 0.67 was near that for perceived allocation of time, but it was not significant.

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MEAN SCORES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 OR LESS</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORE THAN 400</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIFFERENCE</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-SCORE</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The levels of significance indicated the differences were not significant at the acceptable level. Therefore, the null hypothesis failed to be rejected.
Hypothesis 8. Comparison Between Female and Male Principals for Perceived Allocation of Time and Ideal Allocation of Time for Curriculum Related Activities

Hypothesis 8 stated that female principals will report a significant difference in perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time for curriculum related activities than male principals. The N, means, differences, t-scores, and level of significance are shown in Table 8.

Table 8

N, Mean Scores, Differences, t-Test results, and Level of Significance Between Female and Male Principals for Perceived Allocation of Time and Ideal Allocation of Time for Curriculum Related Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEAN SCORES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIFFERENCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-SCORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Female and male principals reported a significant difference in perceived allocation of time. The mean score for female respondents was 8.24 and for males it was 7.27. The difference between the two scores was 0.97. The t-score of 1.93 was statistically significant at the 0.05 level.

For ideal allocation of time female principals had a mean score of 11.58 and male principals had a 10.43. The difference in the means was 1.15 and the t-score was 1.70. The level of significance was 0.08 which was not within the minimum acceptable level of 0.05.

The null form of Hypothesis 8 was rejected for perceived allocation. For ideal allocation of time the null hypothesis failed to be rejected.

Hypothesis 9. Comparison Between Principals With Less Than Twelve Years of Administrative Experience and Principals With Twelve or More Years of Administrative Experience for Perceived Allocation of Time and Ideal Allocation of Time for Curriculum Related Activities

The hypothesis stated that principals with less than twelve years of administrative experience will report a significant difference in perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time for curriculum related activities
than principals with twelve or more years of administrative experience. The results of statistical treatment are shown in Table 9.

Table 9

N, Mean Scores, Differences, t-Test results, and Level of Significance Between Principals With Less Than Twelve Years of Administrative Experience and Principals With Twelve or More Years of Administrative Experience for Perceived Allocation of Time and Ideal Allocation of Time for Curriculum Related Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>PERCEIVED</th>
<th>IDEAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LESS THAN 12 YEARS</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>7.47</td>
<td>11.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 OR MORE YEARS</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7.53</td>
<td>10.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIFFERENCE</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-SCORE</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The two groups of principals reported a difference of only 0.06 in perceived allocation of time. The mean score for principals with less than twelve years of administrative experience was 7.47 and for principals with twelve or more years of administrative experience the mean score was 7.53. The resulting t-score was 0.14 and the level of significance between the two groups was 0.89.
Principals with less than twelve years of administrative experience had a mean score of 11.08 for ideal allocation of time while principals with twelve or more years of administrative experience had a mean score of 10.14. The difference between the two groups was 0.94 which was greater than that for perceived allocation of time. The difference was greater but the t-score was 1.61 and the level of significance was only 0.11.

The difference between principals with less than twelve years of administrative experience and principals with twelve or more years of administrative experience in perceived allocation of time for curriculum related activities was not significant at the minimum acceptable level. Nor was the difference between the two groups significant at the minimum acceptable level for ideal allocation of time. Therefore, the null hypothesis failed to be rejected.

Hypothesis 10. Comparison Between Principals With a Master's Degree or Less and Principals With a Higher Degree for Perceived Allocation of Time and Ideal Allocation of Time for Curriculum Related Activities

Hypothesis 10 stated that principals with a master's degree or less will report a significant difference in
perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time for curriculum related activities than principals with a higher degree. The N, the means, differences, t-scores, and the level of significance are presented in Table 10.

Table 10

N, Mean Scores, Differences, t-Test results, and Level of Significance Between Principals With a Master's Degree or Less and Principals With a Higher Degree for Perceived Allocation of Time and Ideal Allocation of Time for Curriculum Related Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MEAN SCORES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERCEIVED</td>
<td>IDEAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA OR LESS</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.53</td>
<td>10.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGHER DEGREE</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.40</td>
<td>11.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIFFERENCE</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-SCORE</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean for perceived allocation of time for curriculum related activities for principals with a master's degree or less was 7.53 and for principals with a higher degree the mean was 7.40. This indicated that principals with a higher degree perceived they spent less time in curriculum related activities than their counterparts. However, the difference between the two scores was only
0.13, the t-score was 0.27, and the level of significance was 0.79.

For ideal allocation of time principals with a master's degree or less had a mean score of 10.57 and principals with a higher degree had a mean score of 11.09. The resulting t-score of 0.27 was based on a difference between the two groups of 0.52. The level of significance was 0.42.

There were no significant differences between the two groups of principals in perceived allocation of time or ideal allocation of time. Therefore, the null hypothesis failed to be rejected.

Hypothesis 11. Comparison Between Principals Who Have Taken a Graduate Curriculum Course in Ten Years or Less and Principals Who Have Taken a Graduate Curriculum Course in More Than Ten Years for Perceived Allocation of Time and Ideal Allocation of Time for Curriculum Related Activities

Hypothesis 11, "Principals who have taken a graduate curriculum course in ten years or less will report a significant difference in perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time for curriculum related activities than principals who have taken a graduate curriculum course
in more than ten years," was tested in the null form. Statistical analysis of the data is shown in Table 11.

Table 11

N, Mean Scores, Differences, t-Test results, and Level of Significance Between Principals Who Have Taken a Graduate Curriculum Course in Ten Years or Less and Principals Who Have Taken a Graduate Curriculum Course in More than Ten Years for Perceived Allocation of Time and Ideal Allocation of Time for Curriculum Related Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean Scores</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>PERCEIVED</td>
<td>IDEAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 YEARS OR LESS</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>10.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORE THAN 10 YEARS</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7.45</td>
<td>10.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIFFERENCE</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-SCORE</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Principals who have taken a graduate curriculum course in ten years or less had a mean for perceived allocation of time of 7.50. The mean for principals who have taken a graduate curriculum course in more than ten years was 7.45. The difference was only 0.05, the t-score was 0.09, and the level of significance was 0.93.

The resulting figures for ideal allocation of time was similar to the perceived scores. Those who have taken a graduate curriculum course in ten years or less had a mean
score of 10.75 and those who have taken a graduate curriculum course in more than ten years had a mean of 10.33. The difference was only 0.42 and the t-score was 0.50, but the level of significance was 0.62.

The level of significance approached the 1.00 level and the null hypothesis failed to be rejected for Hypothesis 11.

**Hypothesis 12. Comparison Between County and City Principals for Perceived Allocation of Time and Ideal Allocation of Time in the Studying Phase of Curriculum Related Activities**

Hypothesis 12 stated that county school principals will report a significant difference in perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time in the studying phase of curriculum related activities than city school principals. The results of the treatment of the data for this hypothesis are shown in Table 12.

The mean score for county principals for perceived allocation of time for the studying phase of curriculum related activities was 1.90. For city principals the mean score was 1.87. There was a difference between the two groups of 0.03 and a t-score of 0.23. The level of significance was 0.82.
For county principals, in ideal allocation of time for the studying phase of curriculum related activities, the mean was 2.61. City principals had a mean score of 2.59. There was a difference of 0.02, a t-score of 0.11, and a level of significance of 0.91.

Table 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>MEAN SCORES</th>
<th>DIFFERENCE</th>
<th>t-SCORE</th>
<th>Level of Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was little difference between county and city principals in the studying phase of curriculum related activities. All levels of significance approached 1.00 and the null hypothesis failed to be rejected.
Hypothesis 13. Comparison Between County and City Principals for Perceived Allocation of Time and Ideal Allocation of Time in the Planning Phase of Curriculum Related Activities

The hypothesis stated that county school principals will report a significant difference in perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time in the planning phase of curriculum related activities than city school principals. The N, mean scores, differences, t-test results, and level of significance for this hypothesis are presented in Table 13.

County principals had a mean score of 1.90 for perceived allocation of time in the planning phase of curriculum related activities. City principals recorded a mean score of 2.06. The difference between the two groups was 0.16. This resulted in a t-score of 1.12 and a level of significance of 0.26.

Little difference was reported between the two groups in ideal allocation of time in the planning phase of curriculum related activities. County principals had a mean score of 2.74 and city principals 2.73. A difference of 0.01 and a t-score of 0.07 resulted in a level of significance of 0.94.
The difference in the two groups for perceived allocation of time in the planning phase was much greater than the difference between the two groups for ideal allocation of time. However, the difference was not significant at the minimum acceptable level and the null hypothesis failed to be rejected for Hypothesis 13.

Table 13

N, Mean Scores, Differences, t-Test results, and Level of Significance Between County and City Principals for Perceived Allocation of Time and Ideal Allocation of Time in the Planning Phase of Curriculum Related Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MEAN SCORES</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N PERCEIVED</td>
<td>IDEAL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIFFERENCE</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-SCORE</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis 14. Comparison Between County and City Principals for Perceived Allocation of Time and Ideal Allocation of Time in the Implementing Phase of Curriculum Related Activities

Hypothesis 14 stated that county school principals will report a significant difference in perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time in the implementing phase of curriculum related activities than city school principals. The N, mean scores, differences, t-test results, and level of significance for Hypothesis 14 are shown in Table 14.

Table 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N, Mean Scores, Differences, t-Test results, and Level of Significance Between County and City Principals for Perceived Allocation of Time and Ideal Allocation of Time in the Implementing Phase of Curriculum Related Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEAN SCORES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY 90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DIFFERENCE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>t-SCORE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>p</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The mean score for county principals for perceived allocation of time in the implementing phase of curriculum related activities was 1.80. City principals had a mean score of 1.95 and a difference of 0.15 from county principals. The t-score was 1.11 and level of significance was 0.27.

County principals had a mean score of 2.72 for ideal allocation of time in the implementing phase of curriculum related activities. The mean score for city principals was 2.58. There was a difference between the two groups of 0.14, a t-score of 0.78, and level of significance of 0.44.

All levels of significance for this hypothesis were above the minimum acceptable level. The null hypothesis failed to be rejected for Hypothesis 14.

Hypothesis 15. Comparison Between County and City Principals for Perceived Allocation of Time and Ideal Allocation of Time in the Evaluating Phase of Curriculum Related Activities

Hypothesis 15 stated that county school principals will report a significant difference in perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time in the evaluating phase of curriculum related activities than city school principals. The N, mean scores, differences, t-test results, and level of significance are presented in Table 15.
The mean for perceived allocation of time in the evaluating phase for county principals was 1.79 and for city principals the mean was 1.88. The difference of 0.09 and a t-score of 0.61 resulted in a level of significance of 0.54.

For ideal allocation of time in the evaluating phase of curriculum related activities the mean for county principals was 2.67. The mean for city principals was 2.61 and a difference from county principals of only 0.06. A t-score of 0.27 resulted in a level of significance of 0.79.

Table 15

N, Mean Scores, Differences, t-Test results, and Level of Significance Between County and City Principals for Perceived Allocation of Time and Ideal Allocation of Time in the Evaluating Phase of Curriculum Related Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Scores</th>
<th>Differences</th>
<th>t-Score</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COUNTY</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITY</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The level of significance was not at the minimum acceptable level and the null hypothesis failed to be rejected.
Hypothesis 16. Comparison Between Principals With a Master's Degree or Less and Principals With a Higher Degree for Perceived Allocation of Time and Ideal Allocation of Time in the Studying Phase of Curriculum Related Activities

The hypothesis, "principals with a master's degree or less will report a significant difference in perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time in the studying phase of curriculum related activities than principals with a higher degree," was tested in the null form. The results of those tests are shown in Table 16.

Principals with a master's degree or less had a mean score of 1.91 for perceived allocation of time in the studying phase of curriculum related activities. Principals with a higher degree had a mean score of 1.86. The difference between the two groups was only 0.05. The small amount of difference resulted in a t-score of 0.34 and a level of significance of 0.73.

Principals with a master's degree or less had a mean score of 2.54 for ideal allocation of time in the studying phase of curriculum related activities. The mean for principals with a higher degree was 2.77. The difference of 0.23 resulted in a higher t-score of 1.25 but a level of significance of 0.21.
The level of significance for perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time in the studying phase for principals with master's degrees or less and principals with a higher degree was not at an acceptable level. Therefore, the null hypothesis failed to be rejected.

Table 16

N, Mean Scores, Differences, t-Test results, and Level of Significance Between Principals With a Master's Degree or Less and Principals With a Higher Degree for Perceived Allocation of Time and Ideal Allocation of Time in the Studying Phase of Curriculum Related Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MEAN SCORES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA OR LESS</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGHER DEGREE</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIFFERENCE</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-SCORE</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis 17. Comparison Between Principals With a Master's Degree or Less and Principals With a Higher Degree for Perceived Allocation of Time and Ideal Allocation of Time in the Planning Phase of Curriculum Related Activities

Hypothesis 17 stated that principals with a master's degree or less will report a significant difference in perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time in the planning phase of curriculum related activities than principals with a higher degree. The results of the treatment of the data are shown in Table 17.

Principals with a master's degree or less had a mean score of 1.95 for perceived allocation of time in the planning phase of curriculum related activities. Those with a higher degree had a mean score of 1.91. The difference of only 0.04 in the two groups produced a t-score of 0.28. The level of significance was 0.78.

A mean score of 2.94 was recorded by principals with a higher degree in the planning phase for ideal allocation of time for curriculum related activities. Principals with a master's degree or less had a mean score of 2.67. The difference between the two groups was 0.27, the t-score was 1.61, and the level of significance was 0.11.
The levels of significance for this hypothesis were 0.78 and 0.11, respectively. Therefore, the null hypothesis failed to be rejected.

Table 17

N, Mean Scores, Differences, t-Test results, and Level of Significance Between Principals With a Master's Degree or Less and Principals With a Higher Degree for Perceived Allocation of Time and Ideal Allocation of Time in the Planning Phase of Curriculum Related Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MEAN SCORES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N               PERCEIVED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA OR LESS</td>
<td>92               1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGHER DEGREE</td>
<td>32               1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIFFERENCE</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-SCORE</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis 18. Comparison Between Principals With a Master's Degree or Less and Principals With a Higher Degree for Perceived Allocation of Time and Ideal Allocation of Time in the Implementing Phase of Curriculum Related Activities

The hypothesis, "principals with a master's degree or less will report a significant difference in perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time in the implementing phase of curriculum related activities than principals with a higher degree," was tested in the null form. The N, the means for perceived and ideal, the difference, t-scores, and level of significance are shown in Table 18.

Very little difference was shown by treating the data for this hypothesis. The mean score for perceived allocation of time in the implementing phase for principals with a master's degree or less was 1.85 and for those with a higher degree it was 1.81. The difference was only 0.04, the t-score was 0.28, and the level of significance was 0.78.

For ideal allocation of time in the implementing phase the mean scores were 2.69 for principals with a master's degree or less and 2.66 for principals with a higher degree.
This resulted in a difference of only 0.03. The t-score was 0.16 and level of significance was 0.87.

Table 18

N, Mean Scores, Differences, t-Test results, and Level of Significance Between Principals With a Master's Degree or Less and Principals With a Higher Degree for Perceived Allocation of Time and Ideal Allocation of Time in the Implementing Phase of Curriculum Related Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MEAN SCORES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA OR LESS</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGHER DEGREE</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIFFERENCE</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-SCORE</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The levels of significance approached the level of 1.00 for perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time. This indicated there was very little difference in the score and the null hypothesis failed to be rejected.
Hypothesis 19 stated that principals with a master's degree or less will report a significant difference in perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time in the evaluating phase of curriculum related activities than principals with a higher degree. The treatment of the data for this hypothesis is shown in Table 19.

There was a difference of only 0.01 in the mean scores for perceived allocation of time in the evaluating phase of curriculum related activities. Principals with a master's degree or less had a mean score of 1.82 and principals with a higher degree had a mean score of 1.81. The t-score was 0.02 and the level of significance was 0.98.

The results for ideal allocation of time in the evaluating phase were almost the same as those for perceived allocation of time for curriculum related activities. The mean score for principals with a master's degree or less was 2.64 and for principals with a higher degree it was 2.70.
There was a difference of 0.06, a t-score of 0.32, and a level of significance of 0.75.

Table 19

N, Mean Scores, Differences, t-Test results, and Level of Significance Between Principals With a Master's Degree or Less and Principals With a Higher Degree for Perceived Allocation of Time and Ideal Allocation of Time in the Evaluating Phase of Curriculum Related Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>PERCEIVED</th>
<th>IDEAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MA OR LESS</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGHER DEGREE</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIFFERENCE</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-SCORE</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The type of degree the principal held apparently had little relationship to the amount of time spent or the amount of time that should be spent in the evaluating phase of curriculum related activities. The null hypothesis failed to be rejected for this hypothesis.
Hypothesis 20. Comparison Between Principals in Schools With Enrollments of 400 or Less and Principals in Schools With Enrollments of More Than 400 for Perceived Allocation of Time and Ideal Allocation of Time in the Studying Phase of Curriculum Related Activities

Hypothesis 20 stated that principals in schools with enrollments of 400 or less will report a significant difference in perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time in the studying phase of curriculum related activities than principals in schools with enrollments of more than 400. The analysis of the data is presented in Table 20.

Very little difference was reported in mean scores for Hypothesis 20. The mean score for principals in schools with enrollments of 400 or less for perceived allocation of time in the studying phase was 1.92 and the mean score for principals in schools with enrollments of more than 400 was 1.87. The difference of 0.05 resulted in a t-score of 0.42. The level of significance was only 0.67.

For ideal allocation of time the results were almost identical. The mean for principals in schools with enrollments of 400 or less was 2.65 and for the other group of principals it was 2.56. The difference was greater at
0.09, but the t-score was 0.55 and the level of significance only 0.58.

Table 20

N, Mean Scores, Differences, t-Test results, and Level of Significance Between Principals in Schools with Enrollments of 400 or Less and Principals in Schools with More than 400 for Perceived Allocation of Time and Ideal Allocation of Time in the Studying Phase of Curriculum Related Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MEAN SCORES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 OR LESS</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORE THAN 400</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIFFERENCE</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-SCORE</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The level of significance was well above the minimum acceptable level and the null hypothesis failed to be rejected.
Hypothesis 21. Comparison Between Principals in Schools With Enrollments of 400 or Less and Principals in Schools With Enrollments of More Than 400 for Perceived Allocation of Time and Ideal Allocation of Time in the Planning Phase of Curriculum Related Activities

Hypothesis 21 stated that principals in schools with enrollments of 400 or less will report a significant difference in perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time in the planning phase of curriculum related activities than principals in schools with enrollments of more than 400. The N, mean scores, differences, t-scores, and level of significance are shown in Table 21.

Principals in schools with enrollments of 400 or less had a mean score of 1.86 in the planning phase for perceived allocation of time for curriculum related activities. Principals in schools with enrollments of more than 400 had a mean score of 2.01. The difference was 0.15 and the t-score was 1.23. The level of significance was 0.22.

For ideal allocation of time in the planning phase for curriculum related activities there was little difference between the two groups of principals. The mean score for principals in schools with 400 or less was 2.71 while those
in schools with enrollments of more than 400 the mean was 2.76. There was a difference of only 0.05 and a t-score of 0.32. The resulting level of significance was 0.75.

Table 21

N, Mean Scores, Differences, t-Test results, and Level of Significance Between Principals in Schools with Enrollments of 400 or Less and Principals in Schools with More than 400 for Perceived Allocation of Time and Ideal Allocation of Time in the Planning Phase of Curriculum Related Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MEAN SCORES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>400 OR LESS</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORE THAN 400</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIFFERENCE</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-SCORE</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although there was a wide range of disparity between the levels of significance for this hypothesis neither approached the minimum acceptable level. The null hypothesis failed to be rejected for Hypothesis 21.
Hypothesis 22. Comparison Between Principals in Schools With Enrollments of 400 or Less and Principals in Schools With Enrollments of More Than 400 for Perceived Allocation of Time and Ideal Allocation of Time in the Implementing Phase of Curriculum Related Activities

The hypothesis, "principals in schools with enrollments of 400 or less will report a significant difference in perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time in the implementing phase of curriculum related activities than principals in schools with enrollments of more than 400," was tested in the null form. The results of treatment of the data are presented in Table 22.

The mean was 1.76 for principals in schools with enrollments of 400 or less in the implementing phase of curriculum related activities for perceived allocation of time. The mean was 1.91 for principals in schools with enrollments of more than 400. A difference in the means of 0.15 yielded a t-score of 1.24 and a level of significance of 0.22.

The mean was 2.72 for ideal allocation of time for principals in schools with enrollments of less than 400. The mean for principals in schools with enrollments of more
than 400 was 2.64. A difference of 0.08 and a t-score of 0.49 resulted in a level of significance of 0.62.

Table 22

N, Mean Scores, Differences, t-Test results, and Level of Significance Between Principals in Schools with Enrollments of 400 or Less and Principals in Schools with More than 400 for Perceived Allocation of Time and Ideal Allocation of Time in the Implementing Phase of Curriculum Related Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>PERCEIVED</th>
<th>IDEAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>400 OR LESS</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORE THAN 400</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DIFFERENCE 0.15 0.08

t-SCORE 1.24 0.49

p 0.22 0.62

The level of significance for this hypothesis failed to meet the minimum acceptable level and the null hypothesis failed to be rejected.
Hypothesis 23. Comparison Between Principals in Schools With Enrollments of 400 or Less and Principals in Schools With Enrollments of More Than 400 for Perceived Allocation of Time and Ideal Allocation of Time in the Evaluating Phase of Curriculum Related Activities

Hypothesis 23 stated that principals in schools with enrollments of 400 or less will report a significant difference in perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time in the evaluating phase of curriculum related activities than principals in schools with enrollments or more than 400. The results of the treatment of the data are shown in Table 23.

Very small differences were indicated for this hypothesis. The mean for principals in schools with enrollments of 400 or less for perceived allocation of time in the evaluating phase was 1.87 and for principals in schools with enrollments of more than 400 the mean was 1.77. With a difference of only 0.10, the t-score was 0.83 and the level of significance was 0.41.

The mean for ideal allocation of time for principals in schools with enrollments of 400 or less in the evaluating phase was 2.72. The mean for principals in schools with
enrollments of 400 or more was 2.60. The difference was small at 0.12 and the t-score was 0.72. The level of significance was 0.47.

Table 23

N, Mean Scores, Differences, t-Test results, and Level of Significance Between Principals in Schools with Enrollments of 400 or Less and Principals in Schools with More than 400 for Perceived Allocation of Time and Ideal Allocation of Time in the Evaluating Phase of Curriculum Related Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PERCEIVED</th>
<th>IDEAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>400 OR LESS</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORE THAN 400</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIFFERENCE</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-SCORE</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of the data for this hypothesis had a level of significance well above 0.05. The null hypothesis failed to be rejected.
Hypothesis 24. Comparison Between Principals With Less Than Twelve Years of Administrative Experience and Principals With Twelve or More Years of Administrative Experience for Perceived Allocation of Time and Ideal Allocation of Time in the Studying Phase of Curriculum Related Activities

Hypothesis 24 stated that principals with less than twelve years of administrative experience will report a significant difference in perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time in the studying phase of curriculum related activities than principals with twelve or more years of administrative experience. The results of the statistical analysis are shown in Table 24.

The scores for principals with less than twelve years of administrative experience in the studying phase for perceived allocation of time had a mean of 1.93. Scores for principals with twelve or more years of administrative experience had a mean of 1.84. This small difference in the means of 0.09 resulted in a t-score of 0.80 and level of significance of 0.42.

The scores for ideal allocation of time in the studying phase of curriculum related activities indicated a greater difference in the mean. The mean for principals with less
than twelve years of administrative experience was 2.72 and for principals with twelve or more years of administrative experience the mean was 2.43. A difference of 0.29 resulted in a t-score of 1.82. The level of significance of 0.07 approached the minimum acceptable level of 0.05.

Table 24

N, Mean Scores, Differences, t-Test results, and Level of Significance Between Principals With Less Than Twelve Years of Administrative Experience and Principals With Twelve or More Years of Administrative Experience for Perceived Allocation of Time and Ideal Allocation of Time in the Studying Phase of Curriculum Related Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>PERCEIVED</th>
<th>IDEAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LESS THAN 12 YEARS</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 OR MORE YEARS</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIFFERENCE</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-SCORE</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The level of significance for ideal allocation of time approached the minimum acceptable level of 0.05, but for perceived allocation of time it was much above the acceptable level. As a result, the null hypothesis failed to be rejected for Hypothesis 24.
Hypothesis 25. Comparison Between Principals With Less Than Twelve Years of Administrative Experience and Principals With Twelve or More Years of Administrative Experience for Perceived Allocation of Time and Ideal Allocation of Time in the Planning Phase of Curriculum Related Activities

The hypothesis, "principals with less than twelve years of administrative experience will report a significant difference between perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time in the planning phase of curriculum related activities than principals with twelve or more years of administrative experience," was tested in the null form. The N, mean scores, differences, t-scores, and level of significance are presented in Table 25.

There was little difference between the mean scores for principals with less than twelve years of administrative experience and principals with twelve or more years of administrative experience for perceived allocation of time in the planning phase for curriculum related activities. The mean score for principals with less than twelve years of administrative experience was 1.91 and for principals with twelve or more years of administrative experience the mean
was 1.99. The difference was only 0.08 and the t-score was 0.66. The level of significance was 0.51.

Table 25

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N, Mean Scores, Differences, t-Test results, and Level of Significance Between Principals With Less Than Twelve Years of Administrative Experience and Principals With Twelve or More Years of Administrative Experience for Perceived Allocation of Time and Ideal Allocation of Time in the Planning Phase of Curriculum Related Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEAN SCORES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESS THAN 12 YEARS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 OR MORE YEARS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIFFERENCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-SCORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A greater difference was indicated for ideal allocation of time in the planning phase of curriculum related activities between principals with less than twelve years of administrative experience and those with twelve or more years of administrative experience. The mean score for principals with less than twelve years of administrative experience was 2.81 and the mean score for principals with twelve or more years of administrative experience was 2.64.
A difference of 0.17 resulted in a t-score of 1.14 and a level of significance of 0.25.

The null hypothesis for this hypothesis failed to be rejected.

Hypothesis 26. Comparison Between Principals With Less Than Twelve Years of Administrative Experience and Principals With Twelve or More Years of Administrative Experience for Perceived Allocation of Time and Ideal Allocation of Time in the Implementing Phase of Curriculum Related Activities

Hypothesis 26 stated that principals with less than twelve years of administrative experience will report a significant difference in perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time in the implementing phase of curriculum related activities than principals with twelve or more years of administrative experience. The result of the treatment of the data is shown in Table 26.

There was little difference in perceived allocation of time between principals with less than twelve years of administrative experience and principals with twelve or more years of administrative experience in the implementing phase of curriculum related activities. The mean score for principals with less than twelve years of experience was
1.81 and the mean for principals with twelve or more years was 1.88. The difference was 0.07 and the t-score was 0.52. The level of significance was 0.60.

Table 26

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>PERCEIVED</th>
<th>IDEAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LESS THAN 12 YEARS</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 OR MORE YEARS</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIFFERENCE</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-SCORE</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The mean score for ideal allocation of time in the implementing phase for principals with less than twelve years of administrative experience was 2.79 and the mean for principals with twelve or more years of experience was 2.52. A difference of 0.27 resulted in a t-score of 1.66. The level of significance of 0.10 approached the minimum acceptable level of 0.05.
The level of significance of 0.60 for perceived allocation of time and 0.10 for ideal allocation of time indicated little difference, and therefore, the null hypothesis failed to be rejected.

Hypothesis 27. Comparison Between Principals With Less Than Twelve Years of Administrative Experience and Principals With Twelve or More Years of Administrative Experience for Perceived Allocation of Time and Ideal Allocation of Time in the Evaluating Phase of Curriculum Related Activities

The hypothesis stated that principals with less than twelve years of administrative experience will report a significant difference in perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time in the evaluating phase of curriculum related activities than principals with twelve or more years of administrative experience. The N, mean scores, differences, t-scores, and level of significance for this hypothesis are shown in Table 27.

The mean scores for perceived allocation of time for principals with less than twelve years of administrative experience in the evaluating phase was 1.81 and for principals with twelve or more years the mean was 1.82. A
difference of only 0.01 and a t-score of 0.10 resulted in a level of significance of 0.92.

Table 27

N, Mean Scores, Differences, t-Test results, and Level of Significance Between Principals With Less Than Twelve Years of Administrative Experience and Principals With Twelve or More Years of Administrative Experience for Perceived Allocation of Time and Ideal Allocation of Time in the Evaluating Phase of Curriculum Related Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MEAN SCORES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LESS THAN 12 YEARS</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 OR MORE YEARS</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIFFERENCE</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-SCORE</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For ideal allocation of time in the evaluating phase for curriculum related activities there was more difference. The mean score for principals with less than twelve years of administrative experience was 2.75 and the mean for principals with twelve or more years was 2.50. The difference in means was 0.25 and the t-score was 1.42. The level of significance was 0.16.
The null hypothesis failed to be rejected for this hypothesis.

Hypothesis 28. Comparison Between Principals Who Have Taken a Graduate Curriculum Course in Ten Years or Less and Principals Who Have Taken a Graduate Curriculum Course in More Than Ten Years for Perceived Allocation of Time and Ideal Allocation of Time in the Studying Phase of Curriculum Related Activities

Hypothesis 28 stated that principals who have taken a graduate curriculum course in ten years or less will report a significant difference in perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time in the studying phase of curriculum related activities than principals who have taken a graduate curriculum course in more than ten years. The N, mean scores, differences, t-scores, and level of significance are shown in Table 28.

Differences were very small for this hypothesis. The scores for perceived allocation of time in the studying phase by principals who have taken a graduate curriculum course in ten years or less had a mean of 1.91 and the scores for principals who have taken a graduate curriculum course in more than ten years had a mean of 1.81. The difference was 0.10 and the t-score was 0.58. The resulting
level of significance of 0.56 did not approach the minimum level of acceptance.

Table 28

N, Mean Scores, Differences, t-Test results, and Level of Significance Between Principals Who Have Taken a Graduate Curriculum Course in Ten Years or Less and Principals Who Have Taken a Graduate Curriculum Course in More than Ten Years for Perceived Allocation of Time and Ideal Allocation of Time in the Studying Phase of Curriculum Related Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MEAN SCORES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 YEARS OR LESS</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORE THAN 10 YEARS</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIFFERENCE</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-SCORE</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The difference was a little larger for ideal allocation of time. The mean for principals who have taken a graduate curriculum course in ten years or less was 2.64. A mean of 2.28 was recorded for principals who have taken a graduate curriculum course in more than ten years. A t-score of 1.36 resulted from a difference of 0.36. A level of significance of 0.13 was recorded.
The null hypothesis failed to be rejected for either part of this hypothesis. The level of significance was not within the minimum acceptable level.

**Hypothesis 29. Comparison**

*Between Principals Who Have Taken a Graduate Curriculum Course in Ten Years or Less and Principals Who Have Taken a Graduate Curriculum Course in More Than Ten Years for Perceived Allocation of Time and Ideal Allocation of Time in the Planning Phase of Curriculum Related Activities*

Hypothesis 29 stated that principals who have taken a graduate curriculum course in ten years or less will report a significant difference between perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time in the planning phase of curriculum related activities than principals who have taken a graduate curriculum course in more than ten years. The statistical analysis of the data is presented in Table 29.

There was little difference in either part of this hypothesis. The difference in perceived allocation of time, with means for both groups of principals of 1.94, was near 0.00. The t-score was 0.02 and the level of significance was 0.98.
The difference between the two groups for ideal allocation of time was 0.03. The mean for principals who have taken a graduate curriculum course in ten years or less was 2.74. The mean for those who have taken a graduate curriculum course in more than ten years was 2.71. This small amount of difference resulted in a t-score of 0.12 and a level of significance of 0.90.

Table 29

N, Mean Scores, Differences, t-Test results, and Level of Significance Between Principals Who Have Taken a Graduate Curriculum Course in Ten Years or Less and Principals Who Have Taken a Graduate Curriculum Course in More than Ten Years for Perceived Allocation of Time and Ideal Allocation of Time in the Planning Phase of Curriculum Related Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEAN SCORES</th>
<th>PERCEIVED</th>
<th>IDEAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 YEARS OR LESS</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORE THAN 10 YEARS</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIFFERENCE</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-SCORE</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The null hypothesis failed to be rejected for Hypothesis 29.
Hypothesis 30. Comparison Between Principals Who Have Taken a Graduate Curriculum Course in Ten Years or Less and Principals Who Have Taken a Graduate Curriculum Course in More Than Ten Years for Perceived Allocation of Time and Ideal Allocation of Time in the Implementing Phase of Curriculum Related Activities

The hypothesis, "principals who have taken a graduate curriculum course in ten years or less will report a significant difference in perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time in the implementing phase of curriculum related activities than principals who have taken a graduate curriculum course in more than ten years," was tested in the null form. The N, mean scores, differences, t-scores, and level of significance are shown in Table 30.

Little significant difference was noted between the means for Hypothesis 30. The mean for principals who have taken a graduate curriculum course in ten years or less was 1.83. For principals who have taken a graduate curriculum course in more than ten years the mean was 1.93. The difference between the means was 0.10 and the t-score was 0.54. The resulting level of significance was 0.59.

There was a difference of only 0.04 for ideal allocation of time. Principals who have taken a graduate
curriculum course in ten years or less had scores with a mean of 2.68. A mean of 2.64 was recorded for principals who have taken a graduate curriculum course in more than ten years. The small difference resulted in a t-score of 0.18 and a level of significance of 0.86.

Table 30

N, Mean Scores, Differences, t-Test results, and Level of Significance Between Principals Who Have Taken a Graduate Curriculum Course in Ten Years or Less and Principals Who Have Taken a Graduate Curriculum Course in More than Ten Years for Perceived Allocation of Time and Ideal Allocation of Time in the Implementing Phase of Curriculum Related Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MEAN SCORES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 YEARS OR LESS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORE THAN 10 YEARS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIFFERENCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-SCORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The null hypothesis failed to be rejected for Hypothesis 30.
Hypothesis 31. Comparison Between Principals Who Have Taken a Graduate Curriculum Course in Ten Years or Less and Principals Who Have Taken a Graduate Curriculum Course in More Than Ten Years for Perceived Allocation of Time and Ideal Allocation of Time in the Evaluating Phase of Curriculum Related Activities

Hypothesis 31 stated that principals who have taken a graduate curriculum course in ten years or less will report a significant difference in perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time in the evaluating phase of curriculum related activities than principals who have taken a graduate course in curriculum in more than ten years. The statistical treatment of the data is shown in Table 31.

The difference between the mean scores for perceived allocation of time for this hypothesis was extremely small. The mean for principals who have taken a graduate curriculum course in ten years or less was 1.82 and the mean for principals who have taken a graduate curriculum course in more than ten years was 1.77. The difference of 0.05 resulted in a t-score of 0.25 and a level of significance of 0.80.

The difference was also extremely small for ideal allocation of time. Principals who have taken a graduate
curriculum course in ten years or less had scores with a
mean of 2.66. Principals who have taken a graduate
curriculum course in more than ten years recorded a mean of
2.63. The difference of 0.03 resulted in a t-score of 0.08
and a level of significance of 0.94.

Table 31

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>PERCEIVED</th>
<th>IDEAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 YEARS OR LESS</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MORE THAN 10 YEARS</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DIFERENCE 0.05  0.03

t-SCORE 0.25  0.88

Evidently, taking a graduate curriculum course had
little effect on the principals' perceptions about the
amount of time spent or the amount of time that should be
spent in the evaluating phase of curriculum related
activities. Therefore, the null hypothesis failed to be
rejected.
Hypothesis 32. Comparison Between Female and Male Principals for Perceived Allocation of Time and Ideal Allocation of Time in the Studying Phase of Curriculum Related Activities

Hypothesis 32 stated that female principals will report a significant difference between perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time in the studying phase of curriculum related activities than male principals. The N, mean scores, differences, t-scores, and level of significance for this hypothesis are presented in Table 32.

Table 32

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MEAN SCORES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIFFERENCE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-SCORE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The treatment of the data resulted in a significant difference between female and male principals. The mean score for female principals in the studying phase for perceived allocation of time was 2.11 and the mean for male principals was 1.83. A difference of 0.28 and a t-score of 2.17 resulted in a level of significance of 0.03.

Female respondents had a mean score of 2.73 and male respondents a mean score of 2.56 in the studying phase for ideal allocation of time. The 0.17 difference and a t-score of 0.90 produced a level of significance of 0.37.

The difference between male and female principals for perceived allocation of time was significant at the 0.03 level. Therefore, the null hypothesis for this part of the hypothesis was rejected. For ideal allocation of time in the studying phase the level of significance was 0.37. The null hypothesis failed to be rejected for ideal allocation of time.

Hypothesis 33. Comparison Between Female and Male Principals for Perceived Allocation of Time and Ideal Allocation of Time in the Planning Phase of Curriculum Related Activities

The hypothesis stated that female principals will report a significant difference in perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time in the planning phase of
curriculum related activities than male principals. The results of the statistical analysis are shown in Table 33.

Table 33

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N, Mean Scores, Differences, t-Test results, and Level of Significance Between Female and Male Principals for Perceived Allocation of Time and Ideal Allocation of Time in the Planning Phase of Curriculum Related Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEAN SCORES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DIFFERENCE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>t-SCORE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>p</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Little difference was indicated between male and female principals in the planning phase of curriculum related activities. For perceived allocation of time female principals had scores with a mean of 2.06 and males had scores with a mean of 1.91. A difference of 0.15 resulted in a t-score of 0.97 and a level of significance of 0.33.

For ideal allocation of time in the planning phase the mean for female principals was 2.83 and the mean for male principals was 2.71. The difference of 0.12 was near that
for perceived allocation of time. A t-score of 0.70 gave a level of significance of 0.48.

The null hypothesis failed to be rejected for this hypothesis.

Hypothesis 34. Comparison Between Female and Male Principals for Perceived Allocation of Time and Ideal Allocation of Time in the Implementing Phase of Curriculum Related Activities

Hypothesis 34 stated that female principals will report a significant difference between perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time in the implementing phase of curriculum related activities than male principals. The N, mean scores, differences, t-scores, and level of significance are presented in Table 34.

Female respondents had scores for perceived allocation of time in the implementing phase with a mean of 2.07 and male principals had scores with a mean of 1.77. There was a difference of 0.30 and a t-score of 2.21. The level of significance, 0.03, was beyond the minimum acceptable level of 0.05.

The difference was even greater for ideal allocation of time in the implementing phase of curriculum related activities. The mean score for female principals was 3.02 and the mean score for male principals was 2.57. This gave
a difference of 0.55 between the two groups of principals and a t-score of 2.42. The level of significance was beyond 0.02.

Table 34

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N, Mean Scores, Differences, t-Test results, and Level of Significance Between Female and Male Principals for Perceived Allocation of Time and Ideal Allocation of Time in the Implementing Phase of Curriculum Related Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIFFERENCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t-SCORE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The levels of significance of 0.03 and 0.02 resulted in the rejection of the null hypothesis for Hypothesis 34.
Hypothesis 35. Comparison Between Female and Male Principals for Perceived Allocation of Time and Ideal Allocation of Time in the Evaluating Phase of Curriculum Related Activities

Hypothesis 35 stated that female principals will report a significant difference between perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time in the evaluating phase of curriculum related activities than male principals. The results of the statistical analysis are shown in Table 35.

Table 35

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N, Mean Scores, Differences, t-Test results, and Level of Significance Between Female and Male Principals for Perceived Allocation of Time and Ideal Allocation of Time in the Evaluating Phase of Curriculum Related Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEAN SCORES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MALE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIFFERENCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>t-SCORE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>p</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The mean score approached the minimum acceptable level of significance for this hypothesis. In perceived allocation of time female principals had scores with a mean of 1.98 and male principals had scores with a mean of 1.76. The difference was 0.22 and the t-score was 1.51. The level of significance was 0.13.

The mean score for ideal allocation of time for female principals was 2.92 and the mean for male principals was 2.57. The resulting difference was 0.35 and a t-score of 1.74. The difference between male and female principals had a level of significance of 0.08.

For perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time the level of significance approached the minimum acceptable level. However, the null hypothesis failed to be rejected for Hypothesis 35.
CHAPTER 5

Summary, Findings, Conclusions, Implications, And Recommendations

Summary

This chapter summarizes the findings of this research study and discusses the conclusions and implications. In addition, this concluding chapter identifies possible topics for further study.

Summary of Procedures

The primary purpose of this study was to determine some similarities and differences in selected Tennessee elementary principals' perceived allocation and ideal allocation of time for curriculum related activities. This study was conducted during the spring semester of 1986.

A questionnaire with five separate sections was administered to elementary school principals randomly selected from across the state of Tennessee. The first section of the questionnaire consisted of questions on personal characteristics. The remaining part of the questionnaire was divided into phases of curriculum work, studying, planning, implementing, and evaluating. Each of the four sections had questions about curriculum related activities.
A total of 300 questionnaires were mailed to the selected principals. A total of 124, or approximately forty-one per cent, of the questionnaires were returned and scores from all of the 124 were used for each hypothesis.

The t-test was utilized to determine significant differences in perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time for curriculum related activities. It was also used to determine the differences between principals for perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time.

Findings

The following findings are reported from the results of the treatment and interpretation of the data. The findings in each case are reported as they pertain to the hypothesis.

Elementary principals reported a significant difference between perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time for curriculum related activities. There was also a significant difference between perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time for each of the four phases of studying, planning, implementing, and evaluating. The greatest difference was recorded in the implementing phase and the smallest difference in the studying phase. Elementary principals also indicated they spent the least amount of time in the evaluating phase and the greatest amount of time in the planning phase. They felt they should
spend the greatest amount of time in the planning phase and the least amount of time in the studying phase. It was evident that elementary principals felt they were not allocating enough time to curriculum related activities.

There was no significant difference between county and city principals in perceived allocation of time for curriculum related activities. Also, no significance was reported between principals in schools with enrollments of 400 or less and principals in schools with enrollments of more than 400 in perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time. Apparently, the type of school system and the size of the school in which the principals work had little influence on the the amount of time they spend or the amount of time they felt should be spent on curriculum related activities.

Female and male principals indicated a significant difference in perceived allocation of time for curriculum related activities. The relationship for ideal allocation of time approached the level of significance. Female principals appear to spend more time than male principals on curriculum related activities. Both groups felt they should spend more time but there was not a great deal of difference.

There was no significant difference in perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time between principals with less than twelve years of administrative
experience and principals with twelve or more years of administrative experience. Apparently, the number of years of administrative experience had little to do with how a principal viewed the amount of time she spent and the amount of time she should spend on curriculum related activities. But it was evident that principals with less than twelve years of administrative experience were not spending nearly the amount of time they felt they should and principals with twelve or more years felt they were spending approximately the right amount of time for curriculum related activities.

Principals with a master's degree or less did not report a significant difference from principals with a higher degree in perceived allocation of time or ideal allocation of time. Also, there was not a significant difference between principals who have taken a graduate curriculum course in ten years or less and principals who have taken a graduate curriculum course in more than ten years in perceived allocation of time or ideal allocation of time. From this data it appears that the degree the principal has and the number of years since he has taken a curriculum course have little to do with how the principal viewed the amount of time he spent and how much time he should spend on curriculum related activities.

County and city principals indicated no significant difference between perceived allocation of time or ideal allocation of time for the studying phase, planning phase,
implementing phase, and evaluating phase. It was apparent that the type of system the principal worked in has little influence on how she viewed the amount of time she spent and the amount of time she should spend on curriculum related activities.

No significant difference was reported for perceived allocation of time or ideal allocation of time for the studying phase and the planning phase of curriculum related activities between principals with a master's degree or less and principals with a higher degree. The type of degree a principal held had little effect on his perception of the amount of time he spent and the amount of time he should spend for the studying phase and the planning phase of curriculum related activities. Principals with a higher degree indicated they should spend a greater amount of time in the studying phase and the planning phase than principals with a master's degree or less.

Principals with a master's degree or less reported no significant difference from principals with a higher degree in the implementing phase and the evaluating phase for perceived allocation of time or ideal allocation of time. Evidently, the type of degree had no relationship to the perceptions the principals had about the amount of time spent or the amount of time that should be spent for curriculum related activities.
There was no significant difference in the studying phase, the planning phase, the implementing phase, or the evaluating phase between principals in schools with enrollments of 400 or less and principals in schools with enrollments of more than 400. Perceptions about the amount of time spent and the amount of time that should be spent were not influenced by the size of the school the principals served in.

Principals with less than twelve years of administrative experience reported no significant difference from principals with twelve or more years of administrative experience in perceived allocation of time or ideal allocation of time in the studying phase. It was apparent that the amount of experience had little effect on the principal's perception on the amount of time she spent and the amount of time she should spend in the studying phase of curriculum related activities.

There was no significant difference in the planning phase, the implementing phase, and the evaluating phase for perceived allocation of time or ideal allocation of time between principals with less than twelve years of administrative experience and principals with twelve or more years of administrative experience. The amount of time the principal reported for perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time in the planning, implementing, and evaluating phases was not affected by the years of
experience the principal had in administration. Principals who have taken a graduate curriculum course in ten years or less reported no significant difference from principals who have taken a graduate curriculum course in more than ten years in any of the four phases of curriculum related activities. It appears that taking a curriculum course had little influence on the amount of time the principal spent or should spend on curriculum related activities.

Female principals reported a significant difference from male principals in perceived allocation of time in the studying phase of curriculum related activities. However, there was not a significant difference between male and female principals in ideal allocation of time for the studying phase of curriculum related activities. It appears that female principals spend more time in the studying phase of curriculum related activities than male principals.

There was no significant difference between female and male principals in perceived allocation of time or ideal allocation of time for the planning phase of curriculum related activities. It appears that the gender of the principal did not affect the amount of time spent or the amount of time that should be spent in the planning phase.

A significant difference existed between female and male principals in the implementing phase for perceived allocation of time and ideal allocation of time for curriculum related activities. It appears that female
principals spend more time and felt they should spend more time in the implementing phase of curriculum related activities than male principals.

Female and male principals reported no significant difference for perceived allocation of time or ideal allocation of time in the evaluating phase of curriculum related activities. The data appears to indicate that the gender of the principal had no effect on the amount of time spent and the amount of time the principal should spend in the evaluating phase of curriculum related activities.

Conclusions

The conclusions of this study based on the findings are as follows:

A. Principals are not spending time for curriculum related activities the way they feel they should.

B. Principals believe more time should be spent in the studying, planning, implementing, and evaluating phases of curriculum related activities.

C. Female principals are spending more time on curriculum related activities than male principals.

D. Female principals feel a greater amount of time should be spent for curriculum related activities than male principals.

E. Female principals place a higher priority on curriculum related activities than male principals.
F. The type of school system in which the principal was employed does not effect the amount of time allocated or should be allocated for curriculum related activities.

G. The number of years since the principal has taken a curriculum course does not influence the amount of time spent or the amount of time that should be spent for curriculum related activities.

H. The size of the school in which the principal works does not effect the amount of time spent or the amount of time that should be spent for curriculum related activities.

I. The gender of the principal effects the amount of time spent in the studying and implementing phases of curriculum related activities.

J. City principals feel they are spending nearer the amount of time that should be spent for curriculum related activities than county principals.

K. Principals in schools with enrollments of more than 400 believe they are spending nearer the amount of time that should be spent for curriculum related activities than principals in schools with enrollments of 400 or less.

L. Principals with twelve or more years of administrative experience feel they are spending nearer the amount of time that should be spent for curriculum related activities than principals with less than twelve years of administrative experience.
M. Principals with a master's degree or less believe they are spending nearer the amount of time that should be spent for curriculum related activities than principals with a higher degree.

N. Principals who have taken a graduate curriculum course in ten years or less feel they are spending nearer the amount of time that should be spent for curriculum related activities than principals who have taken a graduate curriculum course in more than ten years.

Implications

The findings of this study provide a basis for several implications for elementary school principals, superintendents, and professors at institutions of higher learning. Elementary principals and superintendents should be aware that the size of the school and type of system has little influence on the time for curriculum related activities. Superintendents should be apprised that principals want to spend more time in all phases of curriculum work. Superintendents should be cognizant that female principals spend more time and desire to allocate more time for curriculum activities. Professors at institutions of higher learning should be aware that curriculum courses do not make a significant difference in the amount of time the principal spends on curriculum related activities. Also, they should be informed that
curriculum courses do not make a difference in the amount of
time the principal feels should be spent for curriculum
related activities.

Recommendations

It is recommended that further study be made of the
differences between male and female principals. An attempt
should be made to determine which of the curriculum related
activities the two groups place priority on. Also, an
attempt should be made to determine which phase of
curriculum related activities is placed in a priority
position by each group.

It is further recommended that an attempt be made to
determine which of the phases principals consider to be most
important. It should also be determined in which of the
phases the principal spends most of his time. An effort
should be made to determine the difficulty of working in
each phase.

A study should be conducted involving teachers and
professors at institutions of higher learning in the
process. A comparison of the views of principals and
teachers as to the amount of time spent and the amount of
time that should be spent would be beneficial. A study
should be conducted to determine the priorities the teacher
places on the four phases. College professors should be
studied to determine their priorities for the four phases of
curriculum related activities and their views on the amount of time spent and should be spent for curriculum related activities.

A further recommendation is a study to determine the effectiveness of college courses in curriculum development and improvement. An attempt should be made to determine if the curriculum courses influence the priorities principals place on the amount of time for curriculum related activities.

An attempt should be made by superintendents to determine if conditions described in this study exist in their system. An effort should be made by superintendents to permit more time for principals to work on curriculum related activities.

Finally, this study should be replicated in another state to determine similarities and differences. This would lend further credibility to the conclusions.
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APPENDIX A

LETTER TO PRINCIPALS
Dear Colleague,

I am currently a doctoral student in school administration at East Tennessee State University. I would like to request your help in securing information for my doctoral dissertation. Would you please complete and return the enclosed questionnaire?

I have nine years experience as an elementary principal and have been concerned about the amount of time elementary principals have for curriculum development and improvement. My topic is a study of similarities and differences elementary principals have about perceived and ideal allocation of time for curriculum related activities.

I will appreciate your help in completing the questionnaire. Your anonymity is assured.

Sincerely,

Norman R. Davis
APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE
QUESTIONNAIRE
Please place a check (✓) in the appropriate blanks.

SECTION I.

1. Sex
   Female
   Male

2. Highest degree earned
   BS
   MA
   EdS
   EdD

3. Years of administrative experience
   Less than 5
   5-12
   12-20
   Over 20

4. Years since last graduate curriculum course
   Less than 5
   5-10
   More than 10

5. Type of school system
   County
   City

6. Number of students in school
   Less than 200
   201-400
   401-600
   Over 600

SECTION II.
The remainder of this questionnaire attempts to assess how much time you spend in an average week on curriculum development activities and how much time you think you should ideally spend on them.
Some of the activities are more relevant for certain periods of the year but please attempt to total your time and give an answer in terms of an average.
The questionnaire is broken into four subsections each dealing with specific activities related to curriculum development.
In column one (1) indicate the amount of time you believe you actually spend on each activity in an average week.
In column two (2) indicate the amount of time you believe you should spend on each activity in an average week.

Use the following scale to estimate your time.
1 = 0 to 30 minutes
2 = 30 minutes to one hour
3 = one hour to one and one half hours
4 = one and one half to two hours
5 = two to two and one half hours
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>COLUMN I</th>
<th></th>
<th>COLUMN II</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Achievement test results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Teacher lesson plans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Long-range instructional goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Written courses of study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Curriculum guides</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Current curriculum innovations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Enrollment projections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Student needs and interests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Teacher needs and interests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. New curriculum requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLANNING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>COLUMN I</th>
<th></th>
<th>COLUMN II</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Classroom visits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Inservice activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Supervisory conferences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Long-range instructional goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Determination of areas of weakness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Studies on curriculum effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Total program evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. New curriculum programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Questionnaires for needs assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Faculty meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**IMPLEMENTING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>COLUMN I</th>
<th></th>
<th>COLUMN II</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Regular, planned classroom visits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Supervisory conferences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Curriculum study results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Inservice activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Curriculum guides update</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Course of study changes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Information on innovations to faculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Instructional assistance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. New programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Goals and objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**EVALUATING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>COLUMN I</th>
<th></th>
<th>COLUMN II</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Teaching effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Instructional program goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Use of teaching materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Use of equipment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Textbook effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Inservice activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Courses of study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Curriculum guides</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Supervisory conferences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Teaching assignments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Personal Data:
Date of Birth: March 9, 1939
Place of Birth: Holden, West Virginia
Marital Status: Married

Education:
Bowman High School, Bakersville, North Carolina; 1957.

Professional Experience:
Assistant Director, University School; East Tennessee State University, 1986.

Professional Memberships:
National Association of Secondary School Principals
Phi Delta Kappa
Phi Kappa Phi

Honors and Awards:
Phi Kappa Phi
Doctoral Fellowship, East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tennessee, 1980.