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ABSTRACT

A VALIDATION STUDY OF TENNESSEE’S FRAMEWORK FOR THE EVALUATION OF ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS

By

Reba A. Bailey

This study examined assistant principals’ perceptions regarding their beliefs concerning actual involvement and ideal involvement with competencies identified by the Tennessee State Department of Education as evaluative measures for principals and assistant principals employed in public schools in the State of Tennessee during the 1996-1997 school year. Nine hundred fifty-four assistant principals made up the population for this study. Two hundred eighty-one assistant principals made up the sample. One hundred seventy-nine questionnaires were returned.

Competencies from the State of Tennessee Model for Local Evaluation of Administrators/Supervisors were used to develop a survey instrument to determine assistant principals’ actual involvement and ideal involvement with each of the competency areas. The Likert-type responses for actual involvement and ideal involvement each ranged from 1 (Low) through 7 (High). The competency areas included instructional leadership, organizational management, communication, interpersonal relations, professional development, and leadership. Demographic information included gender, race, age, location of school, type of school, and educational attainment.

A significant difference was found in each of the competency areas between assistant principals’ actual involvement and ideal involvement in each of the areas. There was no significant difference found between actual competency scores of assistant principals employed in rural, urban, and suburban schools. No significant difference was found between ideal competency scores of assistant principals according to their educational level, and no significant difference was found between actual competency scores of assistant principals employed in elementary, middle/junior high, and high schools.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

There are many roles that are vital to the operation of individual schools. Those roles may include the principal, the assistant principal, teachers, and support staff. There has been an emphasis on the principal’s role as a major factor in developing the instructional process of the school (Marshall & Greenfield, 1985). The assistant principal’s role however, is one that has commonly been neglected in professional literature and graduate programs (Glanz, 1994b). Also within this realm of neglect is the fact that the assistant principal’s position is generally not recognized as a certifying position by state agencies (Austin, 1972).

Calabrese (1991) contended that the research community often neglects the role of assistant principals, and principals may not recognize the talents of the assistants. He further stated that there is much discontent among those who assume the role. Considering the lack of recognition received by assistant principals, one may question whether or not this valuable human resource is effectively used within school systems. Panyako and Rorie (1987) asserted that the lack of recognition of the role of assistant

1 Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
principals is due to the historical aspects of administration within the framework of the school. Generally, principals are the ones who are recognized as the head executives of the school. Therefore, other administrative positions or executives within the school are not recognized. Thus, the influence, apperception, and prominence afforded to administrators have often been neglected for assistant principals.

This lack of recognition may be linked to many of the custodial responsibilities assigned to assistant principals. Koru (1993) referred to tasks performed by assistant principals as "caretaker" responsibilities. Perhaps this view primarily stemmed from the role assistant principals assumed in the past. Typically, the responsibilities included tasks that did not demand as much development and skill as that of principals. Assistant principals were assigned such duties as supervision of students, student discipline, bus supervision, cafeteria management, fund raising, and supervision of maintenance of the school plant and grounds (Panyako & Rorie, 1987). Although the position was first created to help with clerical duties within the school, the role has evolved into one that is not well defined within the realm of school administration (Black, 1980).
The assistant principalship is considered an entry-level administrative post for those aspiring to become principals or upper level administrators (Marshall, 1992b; Norton & Kriekard, 1987). Smith (1987) noted that most assistant principals aspire to become principals. While in this position, these beginning administrators have the opportunity to observe behaviors of upper level administrators. This period of socialization allows beginning administrators time to observe behaviors of other administrators and determine which behaviors are appropriate or inappropriate for career advancement.

Marshall also described the assistant principal as a mediator. This role may include mediation between students, parents, and teachers. These encounters usually address issues in which the assistant principal may have little or no prior knowledge. The encounters may involve decisions made by upper level administrators or boards, and the assistant principal may have had little or no input into these decisions.

Kelly (1987) noted that the assistant principalship is often thought of as a training ground for the principalship. However, he further stated that tasks preformed by assistant principals do not adequately prepare them to assume the principalship. Kelly documented evidence from a study known
as the Medicine Hat Study. The study, conducted in the Western Canadian province of Alberta, noted that eight participants were asked 16 questions. The questions were asked by phone, but recorded for accuracy. Kelly reported that:

While all eight looked upon the assistant principalship as a preparation ground for the principalship, they observed that assistant principals spend most of their time at tasks they will not look after as principals, and very little time at tasks they must perform when they become principals. As a result, the efficacy of the assistant principalship as a training ground for the principalship is highly questionable (p. 18).

Brown and Rentschler (1973) cited a number of reasons why tasks typically performed by assistant principals do not prepare them for the principalship. Generally, the primary responsibility associated with the position is discipline (Brown & Rentschler, 1973; Calabrese, 1991; Hartzell, 1993; Marshall, 1992b; Pellicer & Stevenson 1991). The majority of the day may be consumed with this task, thus allowing little time for interaction with other areas of the school program. When assistant principals are primarily concerned with discipline, the contacts made with others involved in the total school program are confined, consequently limiting
the assistant principals' scope of others concerns. If assistant principals do not have the opportunity to deal with others outside the realm of discipline issues, an understanding of the total school program will not evolve, and limited professional growth will result.

Assistant principals are usually the administrators who are assigned the job of maintaining proper building maintenance (Brown & Rentschler, 1973). While this is an important task, it does not afford opportunity to gain experience in dealing with other educational concerns. Because of its time consuming nature it may actually inhibit the professional growth potential of assistant principals.

Brown and Rentschler also noted that assistant principals may not have the advantage of attending conferences and workshops which promote professional growth. Assistant principals are usually the last ones to receive the opportunity to attend such an event because of the need for their presence at school.

These experiences when taken cumulatively over the career span of assistant principals do not appear to offer a background that leads to an understanding and knowledge base of the curriculum framework. Therefore, assistant principals who become principals may have a limited view of the total school program.
Although various facets of the educational community may have neglected the role of assistant principals, Calabrese and Tucker-Ladd (1991) contend that assistant principals are essential. Pellicer and Stevenson (1991) maintained that "assistant principals are a vital part of the school administrative team. Given the broad range of responsibilities, and the skill and judgement required to carry them out, it is difficult to imagine how most high schools could operate effectively without the day-to-day contributions of their assistant principals" (p.59).

Greenfield (1985b) noted that assistant principals were the ones who kept things operating at the school. It appears that assistant principals also recognize their own contributions to the functioning of the school. In a study of assistant principals conducted in Houston, Texas, one of the participants was quoted as saying, "The system rotates around me" (Koru, 1993, p.67).

There is some evidence within the educational community that the role of the assistant principal is gaining some prominence. Accreditation agencies such as the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools have addressed the position in terms of school population and credentials of the professional staff. The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools in the Policies, Principles, and
Standards for Elementary Schools Accredited by the Commission on Elementary and Middle Schools manual for the 1997-98 school year stipulated that "a professional administrative or supervisory assistant" be assigned to a school according to school enrollment. The association recommends guidelines for a school to be certified as accredited under the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools. These guidelines are included in Table 1.

**TABLE 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Population</th>
<th>Assistant Administrator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-659</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>660-879</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>880-1099</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1100-1319</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 1320</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Commission on Elementary and Middle School Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, 1997-98

The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools for the 1997-98 school year also specified certain academic requirements be met by the person who is assigned as an
administrative or supervisory assistant. According to information in the 1997-98 Policies, Principles, and Standards for Elementary Schools Accredited by the Commission on Elementary and Middle Schools,

The administrative or supervisory assistant of an elementary school shall have earned a graduate degree from an institution accredited by the Southern Association or other regional accrediting agency. Furthermore, the assistant shall have earned a minimum of 15 semester hours in school administration, and/or supervision, and/or curriculum or shall hold a valid state certificate required for the position (p.14).

The importance of the assistant principalship can no longer be ignored. Factors related to this role attest to its significance in the total perspective of today’s schools and schools of the future. For example, the pool from which most principals are chosen is from that of the assistant principalship (Marshall, Mitchell, Gross & Scott, 1992). This is an important factor to consider when thinking in terms of developing competent principals to lead the schools of tomorrow.

As schools have changed and evolved into very complex organizations, it has become necessary for assistant principals to be prepared to meet the challenges facing
them. Today's assistant principals must have knowledge in the traditional management tasks that are normally assigned to them. They also must have knowledge in areas "of school management, ranging from financial accounting, school law, and educational and psychological measurement, to staff supervision and evaluation, and effective communication with students, parents, and the general public" (Panyako & Rorie, 1987, p.7).

As society changes, schools are beginning to reflect the diversity brought about by that change. Schools are becoming more complex and there is some evidence that the role of the assistant principal may slowly be changing. Pellicer and Stevenson (1991) documented results of a survey conducted by NASSP (National Association of Secondary School Principals) in 1988. They compared the results of the 1988 survey to a similar type survey done in 1965. According to the comparison of the two surveys, there has been some change in the duties associated with the position of assistant principal. Discipline was identified as the main responsibility of the assistant principal in the 1988 survey as well as the 1965 survey. However, teacher evaluations ranked third in the 1988 survey, while it ranked 23rd on the 1966 survey. Also, the 1988 survey indicated that the assistant principal had "assumed more responsibility for
building use and teacher selection. Graduation activities, instructional methods, staff in-service, and teacher incentives/motivation did not appear on the 1965 survey but were ranked in the top 25 responsibilities of assistant principals in 1988" (Pellicer & Stevenson, 1991, p. 61). These changes in the ranking of responsibilities of the assistant may indicate that the role of the assistant may very well be changing, although that change may be occurring gradually given the 23 year span of the studies.

The role of assistant principal is receiving more recognition pertaining to its importance within the school organization. In order to recognize a valuable human resource within the school, it is necessary to look more closely at the role the assistant principal plays within the school administrative team.

In the past 10 years there has been a focus on school improvement. One aspect of school improvement is evaluation and accountability. During this time, emphasis has been placed on educational effectiveness and accountability issues that are important in achieving an overall successful school program. According to Heck (1995) and Marshall (1992a), evaluative measures for assistant principals are lacking. The evaluation process of assistant principals has not improved during this time period, and few studies have
evolved that concentrate on the assessment of new administrators.

In Tennessee, assistant principals are evaluated by the same criteria used to evaluate principals. Given the documentation from the literature concerning assistant principals, one may question the feasibility of this practice since much of the literature states that tasks associated with the assistant principalship are unrelated to the principalship.

Statement of the Problem

The assistant principalship is often perceived as a major training ground for principals. However, tasks associated with the assistant principalship are often unrelated to tasks associated with the principalship. In the State of Tennessee, the assistant principalship is not a position that has specific certification, and no evaluative measures have been developed by the state exclusively for assistant principals. The same criteria are used for assistant principals and principals during the evaluative process of these positions.

The public wants the best qualified people to lead public schools. The evaluation process of assistant principals should bring to the surface the best qualified people for the leadership of the schools.
Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to compare the degree to which assistant principals believe they are actually involved and the degree they believe they should be involved in tasks identified as evaluative competencies of public school principals and assistant principals in the State of Tennessee.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

The research questions and hypotheses associated with this study centered on the beliefs of assistant principals regarding their actual involvement and their ideal involvement with competencies identified by the State of Tennessee as evaluative measures of principals and assistant principals employed by public schools in the State of Tennessee.

Q1: Is there a difference between actual competency scores and ideal competency scores of assistant principals in instructional leadership, organizational management, communication, interpersonal relations, professional growth, and leadership?

Ho1A: There is no difference between actual competency scores and ideal competency scores of assistant principals in instructional leadership.
Ho1B: There is no difference between actual competency scores and ideal competency scores of assistant principals in organizational management.

Ho1C: There is no difference between actual competency scores and ideal competency scores of assistant principals in communication.

Ho1D: There is no difference between actual competency scores and ideal competency scores of assistant principals in interpersonal relations.

Ho1E: There is no difference between actual competency scores and ideal competency scores of assistant principals in professional growth.

Ho1F: There is no difference between actual competency scores and ideal competency scores of assistant principals in leadership.

Q2: Is there a difference between actual competency scores of assistant principals employed in rural, urban, and suburban schools?

Ho2A: There is no difference between actual competency scores of assistant principals employed in rural, urban, and suburban schools in instructional leadership.
**Ho2B:** There is no difference between actual competency scores of assistant principals employed in rural, urban, and suburban schools in organizational management.

**Ho2C:** There is no difference between actual competency scores of assistant principals employed in rural, urban, and suburban schools in communication.

**Ho2D:** There is no difference between actual competency scores of assistant principals employed in rural, urban, and suburban schools in interpersonal relations.

**Ho2E:** There is no difference between actual competency scores of assistant principals employed in rural, urban, and suburban schools in professional growth.

**Ho2F:** There is no difference between actual competency scores of assistant principals employed in rural, urban, and suburban schools in leadership.

**Q3:** Is there a difference between ideal competency scores of assistant principals according to their educational level?
**Ho3A:** There is no difference between ideal competency scores of assistant principals by educational level in instructional leadership.

**Ho3B:** There is no difference between ideal competency scores of assistant principals by educational level in organizational management.

**Ho3C:** There is no difference between ideal competency scores of assistant principals by educational level in communication.

**Ho3D:** There is no difference between ideal competency scores of assistant principals by educational level in interpersonal relations.

**Ho3E:** There is no difference between ideal competency scores of assistant principals by educational level in professional growth.

**Ho3F:** There is no difference between ideal competency scores of assistant principals by educational level in leadership.

**Q4:** Is there a difference between actual competency scores of assistant principals employed in elementary schools, middle/junior high schools, and high schools?
Ho4A: There is no difference between actual competency scores of assistant principals employed in elementary schools, middle/junior high schools, and high schools in instructional leadership.

Ho4B: There is no difference between actual competency scores of assistant principals employed in elementary schools, middle/junior high schools, and high schools in organizational management.

Ho4C: There is no difference between actual competency scores of assistant principals employed in elementary schools, middle/junior high schools, and high schools in communication.

Ho4D: There is no difference between actual competency scores of assistant principals employed in elementary schools, middle/junior high schools, and high schools in interpersonal relations.

Ho4E: There is no difference between actual competency scores of assistant principals employed in elementary schools, middle/junior high schools, and high schools in professional growth.

Ho4F: There is no difference between actual competency scores of assistant principals employed in elementary
Significance of the Problem

Significant research has focused on the principal as a primary contributor to the overall success of schools (Glanz, 1994a). There has been little attention given to the position of the assistant principalship although Marshall (1992b) identified the role as very important and described it as an entry-level position for most administrators. Because of the increasing emphasis on effective schools and instructional leadership, more attention must be given to the assistant principalship. This position must be refined to develop the skills of individuals who are seeking an administrative role in the schools of the future (National Association of Secondary School Principals Council on the Assistant Principalship, 1991).

The basic premise of this study was to identify to what degree assistant principals believe they are actually involved and the degree they believe they should be involved with activities or domains which are expected of principals as identified through the Tennessee State Model of Evaluation of Administrators.
Limitations

This study is limited to a sample of assistant principals from public schools in the State of Tennessee. The study results collected in the State of Tennessee may not be applicable to other states in the nation. This study is limited to assistant principals employed during the 1996-1997 school year.

Assumptions of the Study

The competencies identified for this study are from Tennessee's State Model for Local Evaluation of Administrators/Supervisors. It is assumed that public school principals in the State of Tennessee perform the types of tasks described in the competencies of this evaluation model.

Definition of Terms

Assistant principal: The assistant principal is a member of the administrative team who assists the principal. Hartzell, Williams, and Nelson (1995) identified the assistant principal as one who handles many problems and assumes many roles. This individual is the one most readily available and the one most people consult when problems occur. The assistant principal group is the largest group of applicants from which principals are chosen.
Principal: The principal is identified as the "chief executive officer in charge of a school" (Panyako & Rorie, 1987, p.6).

Evaluation: Evaluation is "the process used for determining the value, amount, or worth of something - a program, a procedure, or other factor" (DeRoche, 1987, p.4). He further describes evaluation as serving three purposes:
1. For improvement of the quality of something
2. For the purpose of accountability
3. For providing an enhanced understanding of something

The two types of evaluation are formative and summative. Formative evaluations are for the purposes of understanding and improving and summative evaluations are for the purposes of "summarizing, describing, or judging planned or unplanned outcomes" (Wilde & Sockey, 1995,p.2). Formative and summative evaluations provide feedback, but formative evaluations provide on-going feedback for improvement (Oliva, 1993), while summative evaluations are generally used for accountability and decisions involving reemployment, termination, or transfers (Seyfarth, 1991).

Organization of the Study

This study is organized and presented in five chapters. Chapter 1 includes the introduction, statement of the problem, the purpose of the study, research questions,
limitations, assumptions, significance of the problem, definition of terms, and the organization of the study.

Chapter 2 presents a review of related literature. This chapter includes a summary of research pertaining to the role of assistant principals and background information for the current study.

Chapter 3 includes the methodology of the study and describes the procedures used to conduct the study.

Chapter 4 presents the analysis of data and results of the analysis.

Chapter 5 includes the research summary, findings, conclusions, and recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

Considerable emphasis has been placed on the roles of school principals and teachers in educational literature. However, the assistant principalship has not received much attention. In this era of educational accountability and effectiveness, it is important to study all roles associated with school improvement.

Historical

Historically, there is little known about when the position of the assistant principal actually began (Glanz, 1994b). During the 19th century, superintendents and principals had little input concerning the operation of schools. Glanz reported that decentralized and loosely structured school programs were governed by "ward boards" (p.36), and little control was given to superintendents or principals. During the latter part of the 19th century however, a movement to centralize school programs occurred. It was believed that by centralizing school programs, a more organized and efficient system for educating America’s
youth would emerge. When the centralization of administration took place, superintendents gained more control over the daily running of school programs, but very little authority was given to principals (Glanz, 1994b).

It was during the latter part of the 19th Century and the beginning of the 20th Century, that school populations began to grow. In 1875 there were fewer than 25,000 students attending public high schools in America. Fifteen years later however, there were 2,500 high schools with a combined enrollment of more than 200,000 students. By the turn of the century, the number of high schools had grown to 6,000, with a combined enrollment of over 500,000 students (Pulliam, 1987). From 1895 until 1920, the total school population grew from 14 million to 21.5 million (Glanz, 1994b).

As a direct result of the growth in student populations, the number of teachers increased. Glanz (1994b) reported that by 1920, the number of teachers had grown to more than 280,000. Until the turn of the century, superintendents had been able to maintain primary control of the majority of the school programs. However, as school enrollment and teacher employment grew, the daily demands of supervising the schools grew. It was during the early
1900s that principals gained more authority for administration of the school.

Because of the astronomical growth of student populations and an increased number of teachers, duties of the principal began changing. Along with acting as head teacher and frequently teaching classes to provide assistance to less experienced teachers in instructional strategies, curriculum, and guidance in handling the classroom, the principal was also responsible for monitoring student attendance.

As school populations continued to grow and school organizations became more complex, principals' responsibilities expanded beyond monitoring attendance. Because of the increasing enrollment in schools, superintendents had to relinquish part of their responsibilities to principals. With the increase in administrative duties, principals were less likely to be assigned teaching responsibilities. The tasks of directly supervising a classroom and being involved in curriculum development were replaced with managerial duties. Other supervisory positions emerged to help restore assistance to classroom teachers and involvement in curriculum development (Glanz, 1994b).
Supervisors known as general supervisors and special supervisors began to appear during the early part of the twentieth century. Special supervisors were usually female and had no formal training in the area of supervision. Their role was to help less experienced teachers master subject matter for the classroom. By the 1920s and 1930s, many schools had special supervisors to assist in most of the curriculum areas.

General supervisors were usually male. Their role was to work with subject areas such as math and science, and help principals with the general operation of the school. Some of the duties of general supervisors included working with attendance reports, collecting information for evaluations, and overseeing special programs. (Glanz, 1994b).

Teachers were more accepting of special supervisors than general supervisors. The role of special supervisors however, was phased out of the schools (Glantz, 1994b). Duties performed by special supervisors were eventually merged with the duties of general supervisors. Glanz stated that because most superintendents and principals were male, gender bias probably was a factor in the disappearance of special supervisors.
The term general supervisor was used to describe the assistant to the principal until the 1940s and 1950s. It was during this time period that the term assistant principal began to appear in the professional literature (Glanz, 1994b).

Assistant principals were usually chosen by principals and given little authority. They were constantly reminded that their responsibilities were to assist principals. Assistant principals were not given charge of activities involving instructional improvement. Instead, their responsibilities included managerial and custodial tasks. The role that was once assumed by special supervisors of assisting teachers with classroom instruction was not merged into the duties of assistant principals (Glanz, 1994b).

The historical role of general supervisors and assistant principals has been one of managerial tasks and discipline. Generally assistant principals were not given responsibilities in the areas of curriculum and teacher development. Their initial tasks were usually dealing with clerical responsibilities (Black, 1980).

Glanz noted, however, that the role of the assistant principal appears to be changing. There seems to be a move
toward recognizing the assistant principal as an instructional leader rather than relying on the position for managerial tasks. Glanz contended that historically this change in the role of assistant principal emerging as an instructional leader may actually be linked to the role the special supervisor played in the early part of the twentieth century. After all, the role of the special supervisor was developed to improve instruction in the classroom.

Selection Process of the Assistant Principal

There are differing opinions concerning the methods used in the selection process of assistant principals. According to Marshall (1992b), there are a number of factors that are prevalent in the selection of assistant principals. She noted that educators who have experienced distinguished classroom careers are generally chosen to become administrators. However, Hess (1985) reported that assistant principals were often chosen in a haphazard manner. He suggested this haphazardness may exist because of a lack of policies and procedures identified by school districts for the selection of assistant principals.
Although the persons chosen to assume the roles of assistant principals may have obtained high visibility and success in the educational field, Marshall (1992b) contended that usually it is the most conservative candidates who are selected to assume the roles of assistant principals. She asserted that "the administrative candidates who conform to work requirements and promote tradition are most likely to be selected for promotion" (p. 89). Marshall (1992a) indicated that those who are chosen as administrators are likely to exhibit the same thinking patterns and traditional values as previous administrators. Therefore, Marshall concluded that it might be somewhat more difficult for women and minorities, people of differing backgrounds, or people with innovative ideas to move into administrative positions.

The indicators outlined above are not the only factors that have been noted in the research pertaining to the selection of an assistant principal. Marshall et al. (1992) argued that in order to secure an administrative position one prevailing factor is the perception of loyalty. Loyalty may include showing support for a boss, upholding district mandates, and not questioning upper level administrators, especially publicly. Marshall
(1992a) further stated administrative candidates are trained to make decisions in a way that the organization desires. If a candidate deviates from this practice and makes innovative decisions, he may be seen as unfit for an administrative position. This practice may make the candidate seem untrustworthy and disloyal to the organization.

Administrators make many decisions each day, and in most instances, these decisions need to be made quickly. Beginning level administrators need to be careful when making decisions that will involve a potential risk or create conflict (Marshall & Mitchell, 1991).

Marshall (1992a) and Heck (1995) noted that an effective evaluation process for assistant principals has not been developed. Therefore, assistant principals must depend on the judgment of superiors to determine their job effectiveness. Consequently, there is a tendency for assistant principals to make decisions that are virtually risk free. Marshall pointed out that innovative behaviors are risky and may actually harm the careers of assistant principals.

However successful one may be in the classroom, Marshall et al. (1992) noted that obtaining a sponsor and
mentor will enhance a candidate’s chance of acquiring an assistant principalship or further promotion in the administrative field. They indicated that "sponsorship offers informal support, training, and an affective bond that assures the protégé the visibility, advice, and career direction needed to build a successful administrative career" (p. 84). In a field study conducted by Marshall et al. there was evidence that sponsorship was important in gaining promotion. One of the assistant principals in the study indicated that an upper level administrator had encouraged her to take formal classes and prepare herself for a career in administration. As a result of following the superior’s suggestion, the candidate was able to secure an administrative position. Other assistant principals in the study also pointed to upper level administrators who had supported them by providing opportunities not only for entry level administrative positions, but other promotions as well. The researchers reported that participants involved in the study who had not gained a sponsor did not obtain promotions beyond the assistant principalship although they had applied for other upper level administrative positions. When considering an administrative career, Marshall et al. cautioned that “the
absence of sponsorship can have a negative effect on one's orientation to the career" (p. 85).

Brown and Rentschler (1973) posed another criteria for the selection of assistant principals. They argued that due to growing school populations, it has become necessary to hire assistant principals who are specialists in specific areas. These specializations may include such areas as counseling, testing information, or technology. Not only have assistant principals been hired to offer specialization in specific areas, but assistants have also been hired to deal strictly with the areas of discipline, curriculum development, athletic events, or other related fields. Brown and Rentschler further noted however, that assistant principals who are hired as specialists rarely achieve the position of principal. They stated other factors that demonstrate leadership qualities in a candidate are more important when it comes to retaining someone for a principalship rather than specialization in a particular area.

Holman (1997) reported that appropriately selecting personnel for various positions may have more impact on school improvement than any other variable. She acknowledged that the assistant principalship is one area
that is recognized as a development position for new administrators and placing competent individuals within the position is crucial. Therefore, she identified important qualities that should be evident when one is considered for the assistant principalship. Among those qualities she suggested an assistant principal should possess were:

1) organizational skills, 2) accounting ability, 3) interpersonal skills, 4) dependability, 5) a good work ethic, 6) problem solving skills, 7) leadership ability, 8) good written communication, 9) the ability to analyze and solve problems quickly, and 10) a respect and regard for others. By being cognizant of these qualities and structuring a job profile related to the specific position for which a candidate is sought, Holman noted that competent and qualified individuals could be chosen to fill these important positions.

**Responsibilities of the Assistant Principal**

Austin (1972) reported that the job description of the assistant principal is usually ill defined, although many larger middle schools and high schools have assistant principals. The responsibilities of the assistant principal have been described in different ways. Hartzell
(1993), characterized the position of assistant principal as being a "mosaic of partial responsibilities" (p. 715). Marshall (1992b) noted that the job description of the assistant principal is a position that contains many "gray areas." Hartzell (1993) conveyed the tasks performed by assistant principals as being short term and affecting the internal organizational stability of the school. Principals usually assign duties to assistant principals, with the assistants having no input concerning those responsibilities. The duties of assistant principals tend to be managerial tasks. Hartzell further stated that management type activities assigned to assistant principals are tasks that accomplish much at a fast pace. For example, there are many different activities that demand the time of assistant principals, and these activities may be somewhat unrelated and unpredictable. Usually assistant principals are involved with situations that afford them no initial knowledge of the problem. Instances pertaining to discipline of students, problems within the staff, or even maintenance problems within the building are usually situations in which assistant principals have not initially been involved. The work world of assistant principals
consist of the present set of circumstances before them (Hartzell, 1993).

Austin (1972) characterized assistant principals as crisis managers because of the unrelated and unpredictable tasks associated with the position. A respondent in Austin’s study portrayed assistant principals as generalists. Along with this description, the respondent commented about the responsibilities he completed during a day. Within a short period of time, the assistant principal spent time repairing a phone, repairing a chair, preparing and sending notices to faculty members, as well as working with students, teachers, office personnel, and custodians concerning problem areas. The respondent noted in the survey that “most assistant principals are good handymen as well as service-oriented educators” (Austin, 1972, p.70).

The day to day duties of the assistant principal include events that are not scheduled. Conferences with faculty members or evaluations of staff are activities that can be scheduled. Conflicts such as fights, classroom disturbances, and disagreements among students and staff are issues that cannot be scheduled (Hartzell, 1993). Koru (1993) noted that the assistant principal must be prepared
to handle emergencies; the urgent things that "always seem to overcome the important" (p. 69). Hartzell, Williams, and Nelson (1995) and Marshall and Greenfield (1985) explained further that the assistant principal is usually the administrator who is most readily available when emergencies occur, and therefore the person most people seek when an urgent event arises. Perhaps this is why Hartzell et al. described the job of an assistant principal as "reactive" because there is no time for planning.

Since the responsibilities of an assistant principal are so varied, Calabrese (1991), noted that it is important for the assistant principal to be able to function in many different aspects of the job. The assistant principal must have the capacity to work with teachers, students, parents, and other administrators.

Hartzell (1993) indicated that one of the primary reasons assistant principals gave for choosing to assume the role of principal is having more opportunities to work with adults. However, he noted that generally assistant principals spend the majority of their time with students. The reason for this may be attributed to assistant principals usually functioning as disciplinarians.
In a study conducted by Black (1980), high school assistant principals responding to a survey indicated that 30% to 49% of their time was spent on student discipline, while assistant principals of junior high schools indicated that 85% of their time was spent with student discipline. These findings reflect a broader assumption asserted by Koru, (1993) which indicated that most of assistant principals' time was spent in conflict situations. However, the time spent with students may not always be spent dealing with discipline issues. Assistant principals deal with other serious problems involving students. Some of these issues include "child abuse, weapons, drugs, poverty, suicide, and children on parole" (Koru, 1993, p.70).

Marshall (1992b) noted that maintaining organizational stability is considered a central activity of the assistant principalship. Discipline however, is not the only area that falls under the category of organizational stability. Reed and Himmler (1985) stated that "organizational stabilizing activities are oriented to establishing regularity within the school and getting all students to comply with a uniform set of regulations and perpetuating traditional organizational values by getting all students
to assume this collection of values" (p.65). Further Reed and Himmler indicated that the establishment of organizational stability is achieved through two areas of the school program. These areas included the curriculum and extra-curricular activities. Organizational stability is maintained through the area of the curriculum by the use of the master schedule. The master schedule serves as a regulator of student activities during the course of the school day. The second area identified for maintaining organizational stability is through extra-curricular activities. These activities are based on the school activity calendar. The activity calendar involves events that take place during the school year. The activity calendar promotes activities and values believed to benefit the student and the organization. Taken collectively, the regulations which accompany the master schedule, and the norms that are established through the activity calendar, constitute the rules of the school (Reed & Himmler, 1985). It is this aspect of maintaining organizational stability that falls within the primary domain of the assistant principalship.

Although discipline and organizational stability have been the areas that have received high visibility for job
responsibilities of assistant principals, they have other duties as well. According to the findings of Gorton and Kattman (1985) elementary assistant principals were also responsible for "supervising substitute teachers, providing instructional materials, and establishing teacher duty rosters" (p. 39). However, the study conducted by Reed and Hemmler (1985) showed that although these responsibilities were considered important, "patrolling, disciplining, and responding to a variety of other problems and emergencies take precedence over all other assignments" (p. 64).

Black (1980) asserted the position of assistant principal was initially designed to do clerical tasks associated with the school, and from that point, the job developed rather haphazardly with an unclear description of the position. However, there is some indication that organizations and institutions are attempting to define and understand the role of the assistant principal much more clearly.

For example, the Assistant Principals Commission of the Association of Wisconsin School Administrators prepared a position paper in September 1980, which noted that job descriptions of assistant principals may vary from school to school. The commission stated that it was impossible to
furnish an inclusive job description related to the assistant principalship because factors such as enrollment of the school, the community, the distinct needs of the school itself, and other administrators within the school affect each individual situation. Therefore, it is difficult to determine one set of factors that fit all situations for assistant principals, and the term "assistant principal" may take on different meanings in different situations.

However, the Assistant Principal Commission identified five major areas that are of prominence for the assistant principal. Those responsibilities included:

1. Students: A mutual respect should exist between the assistant principal and students. The assistant principal should be able to effectively communicate with students, and use flexibility in dealing with students' problems. The assistant principal should involve students in decisions concerning the school. The role should be one that fosters effective listening and counseling skills. The assistant must also act as a mediator between the school and students when necessary.

2. Administrative team: The commission noted that the
assistant principal should be included as part of the administrative team. Members of the administrative team should include the principal and central office staff. The assistant principal should be loyal to the team.

3. Staffing: The commission indicated that the assistant principal should have the opportunity to be included in staffing decisions. It was recommended that this responsibility be extended to assistance and evaluation of staff. The assistant principal should also serve as an agent promoting high staff morale.

4. Curriculum issues: The commission recommended that the assistant principal should be involved in the planning and development of curriculum. The every day contact that the assistant has with students allows for effective decisions to be made concerning the curriculum. According to the commission, the assistant should be afforded a leadership role in curriculum decisions.

5. Community: The commission noted that the assistant principal should have constant contact with the community. The individual assuming the position must possess human-relations skills that enhance the relationship between the school and community. The ability to effectively communicate projects and services offered by the school is vital.
The Assistant Principalship and Upper Administrative Positions

The assistant principalship is one of the most common entry-level positions for school administrators (Norton & Kriekard, 1987). Marshall and Greenfield (1985) stated that most principals began their careers as assistant principals, and Heck (1995) noted that most assistant principals consider their positions as paths to the principalship. According to Heck, most assistant principals assume that the assistant principalship will provide training for the principalship.

Although assuming an assistant principalship may be the most common path to an upper level administrative position, Kelly (1987) noted that one of the most common myths among educators is that serving as an assistant principal prepares one for the principalship. Because it has been noted that the primary responsibility of the assistant principal is discipline (Brown & Rentschler, 1973; Calabrese, 1991; Hartzell, 1993; Marshall, 1992b; Pellicer & Stevenson 1991), this does not leave much time for the assistant to be involved with other responsibilities, thus narrowing the opportunities for professional growth. Hartzell (1993) further stated that
most of the assistant principal's time is spent with students, and the roles of the assistant principal and principal are very different. Because these two leadership roles are different, Hartzell noted that "these contextual differences have implications for educational leadership researchers, for beginning administrator training programs, and for the development of principals as first-level leaders" (p.707).

Hartzell (1993) contrasted the primary difference between the roles of principalship, which he noted as an upper level role or first level administrator, and the assistant principalship, which he noted as a lower level role or a second level administrator. He stated that the upper level administrator must be able to communicate vision or a long-term commitment of what the organization should be to the followers of the organization. Also, the upper level administrator must be able to instill a shared role with the followers in order to accomplish the vision.

The lower level administrator on the other hand, works with short-term organizational concerns (Hartzell, 1993). The tasks included in the lower level administrative position tend to be involved within the organization and lean toward carrying out the vision of the upper level
administrator. Thus, the tasks of the second level administrator are usually predetermined and established by the principal.

Calabrese and Tucker-Ladd (1991) pointed out, however, that a very important relationship must exist between the principal and the assistant principal. They noted that the principal has a double responsibility within this relationship. If the assistant principal is aspiring to become an upper level administrator, the principal has an obligation to offer opportunities that prepare the assistant to assume an upper level administrative position. On the other hand, the individual may wish to make the assistant principalship a career goal. In either situation, the principal has a responsibility to the person assuming the position. From a personal standpoint, the principal should be concerned for the growth of the individual. From a professional standpoint, the principal must have the overall good of the school in mind and should foster the growth of the individual for the impact it may have on the school.

The mentoring relationship between the principal and assistant principal is generally formed by chance rather than by conscious choice. It is usually not a relationship
that is set forth or encouraged by central office staff in a formal way. However, Clabrese and Tucker-Ladd pointed out that by choosing to become a mentor to the assistant principal, "the principal trains the assistant principal for greater responsibility in terms of role, career, and commitment to the profession" (p.68).

According to Calabrese and Tucker-Ladd, the formation of a mentoring relationship between the principal and assistant principal follows a pattern of development within the context of the role. The mentoring relationship provides communication and activity in the following areas:

1. Initiation - During this time, the principal provides an introduction to the assistant principal concerning the administrative position. Most notably, a trusting relationship is established.

2. Inclusiveness - The principal must be willing to share control with the assistant principal. Neither individual will rule over the other, but a co-leadership relationship will emerge. The principal lets the faculty know that the leadership decisions of the assistant principal are important and will not be undermined by the principal’s authority. This action leads to the principal serving as a coach.
3. Coaching - Coaching offers a time for reflection or looking more closely at behavior, responses, and alternative approaches to situations within the school organization. Caution must be exerted because over-coaching will undermine the authority of the assistant principal, while under-coaching may cause a feeling of aloneness and lack of guidance on the part of the assistant principal.

4. Modeling - The principal may provide guidance through modeling on such things as dressing appropriately, exhibiting organized and ethical work habits, recognizing the contributions of the assistant principal, and developing the assistant principal’s ability to work in different situations and with people of differing personalities.

5. Reciprocation - A reciprocal relationship with the assistant principal gives the principal an opportunity to have a colleague with whom one may vent frustrations. A reciprocal relationship indicates a sense of shared responsibility and gives credibility to the assistant principal as a leader.

6. Development - The principal must be concerned with the development of the individual and provide opportunities for
growth. These areas of development include demonstrating abilities in social skills associated with the administrative position, leadership skills that are vital to personal and professional growth, and technical skills that lead to a competent, effective administrator.

7. Separation - The principal must recognize when the assistant principal has developed autonomy, and no longer needs to be dependent on another individual.

Calabrese and Tucker-Ladd (1991) surmised that "through the mentoring process a principal demonstrates commitment to people, excellence, and cooperation in the profession. In this role the principal acts as teacher, coach, adviser, facilitator, and colleague for the assistant" (p.74). Most significantly, the principal models appropriate behaviors that will be important as the assistant associates with other professionals.

Socialization of the Assistant Principal

Hess (1985) noted that "the socialization of the assistant principal in elementary and secondary schools is a topic with profound implications for American educational leadership" (p.93). Hess suggested that in order to serve society as a whole, the position must aid the instructional
process and provide individuals with tasks that develop skills and knowledge within this area. Also, the position must be structured in a way that the assistant principal realizes his or her potential within the area of administration and realizes job satisfaction within the role. He also noted that certain responsibilities such as mentoring, supervising, and managing people are necessary in order to facilitate the tasks of the organization as a whole. Taken cumulatively, Hess suggested that the assistant principalship could be restructured in a way that individuals assuming the position could be used much more effectively.

Heck (1995) noted that little is known about the socialization process of assistant principals or how socialization affects the performance of those assuming the assistant principalship. However, he pointed out that as the demand for accountability of administrators has increased over the past few years, the evaluation process of administrators has not improved. He believed that in order to improve the overall performance of administrators, it is necessary to look at the socialization process and the effects it may have over the overall performance of beginning administrators.
According to Heck (1995), “socialization refers to the process through which the individual acquires the knowledge, skills, and values to perform an organizational role effectively” (p. 31). He explained further the difference between organizational socialization and professional socialization.

Organizational socialization is the process by which the individual gains the skills and knowledge necessary to be a part of the organization. Organizational socialization usually occurs within the context of the job itself.

Professional socialization is the process by which an individual becomes a member of a particular profession and therefore identifies with the profession. Professional socialization for the school administrator generally occurs during the formal training or the coursework associated with the position of an administrator.

Heck (1995) conducted a study concerning the effects of socialization on beginning administrators. He reported that “organizational socialization may be more important in shaping the new administrator’s performance than aspects of professional socialization” (p. 45). He stated further that the effect of organizational socialization on the
performance of assistant principals was stronger than the effect of professional socialization or the formal training they received. He specifically noted that assistant principals who had been given opportunities to deal with the usual tasks associated with administration during their initial development obtained higher ratings on performance from principals than assistant principals who had not been given the same opportunities. However, Heck indicated that the quality of the initial professional socialization received by assistant principals had a significant impact on performance later in their career.

Heck concluded his study by noting that little support has been given to the socialization of assistant principals by school systems. He noted that school systems have the potential to improve the overall success of new administrators by supporting programs that give attention to the socialization of new administrators. Through his study he has shown that the overall impact of organization socialization may have a great impact on the initial success of new assistant principals. Therefore, programs which offer mentoring from principals focusing on issues at the school site level, implications at the district level, and skills to promote community awareness and involvement
may have a drastic impact on the success of beginning administrators and an impact on the success of schools. Marshall (1985) conducted a field study of assistant principals to determine how beginning administrators learn their role and expectations. She determined that initially new administrators go through a process in which separation from the old group occurs. In most cases beginning assistant principals must separate from the “teacher group”. As this separation occurs, new assistant principals must strive to become accepted in the new role of administration. During this process, assistant principals must conform to the norms, values, and expectations of the administrative group.

Marshall and Mitchell (1991) described new administrators as political actors. They noted further that these “political actors are socialized within their subcultures to adopt the shared understanding about what is right and proper in their policy environments” (p.397). Within the context of beginning assistant principals, there are norms and expectations within the administrative group. In order for new administrators to identify with the administrative group, there must be a demonstration of
appropriate behaviors, interactions and choices that will indoctrinate them into the group.

Marshall and Mitchell collected data from 20 schools in three eastern states. From their observations, they documented findings and outlined ideas and suggestions about positions of assistant principals and beginning administrators.

They reported that principals and assistant principals are middle managers who are responsible for carrying through district policy. Taken a step further, assistant principals are not only responsible for district policy, they are also responsible for site level policies, procedures, and responsibilities set forth by principals. Through this process, assistant principals must prove themselves as future leaders. However, they must exercise caution not to "cross the line" and violate the norms and values of the administrative group.

From their research, Marshall and Mitchell documented procedures that new administrators must follow to safeguard their acceptance into the administrative world. The researchers divided these procedures into three broad categories. The areas were identified as initiating
policy, knowledge of values within the organization, and patterns of expected behavior and expectations.

When considering the assistant principal's responsibility of carrying through with district and site policies, two important standards were noted. Namely, the assistant principal must limit risk taking when interpreting and implementing policies. Decisions must be made carefully and outcomes must be weighed in a manner that major disruptions will not occur.

The second important rule pertaining to the rights and responsibilities of the assistant principal involved policy procedures. This rule is closely related to the first rule of limited risk taking discussed by Marshall and Mitchell. The researchers noted that the assistant principal must change policy quietly. The assistant principal is responsible to the principal at the building level, and to district level administrators and the superintendent at the system level. The assistant principal is expected to follow the rules of the administrative world, although these rules are often unstated. Often within the world of the administrator, dilemmas occur and the assistant principal may have to ignore the bureaucratic system to solve problems. However, this is a risky procedure, and
the assistant principal must work carefully and quietly within the networks to solve such problems.

Marshall and Mitchell (1991) outlined two rules the assistant principal must follow in order to survive as an administrator. These two rules fit into the category of the value system of the administrative world. The researchers noted that the assistant principal should shy away from situations that may cause a moral dilemma. Secondly, the researchers noted that the assistant principal must not exhibit conflicting values with the system.

Through the socialization process, Marshall and Mitchell indicated that the assistant principal is expected to demonstrate behavioral patterns which are associated with an administrator. These behavioral patterns include committing to the overall program, avoiding conflict that will potentially identify one as a troublemaker, keeping disputes within the organization confidential, and not letting any area of the job affect expected performance in other areas of the job.

Marshall and Mitchell showed that within the ranks of school administration, there are rules and values that must be understood by the beginning administrator. For the
assistant principal who does not follow those rules, the findings of this study noted that sanctions were imposed upon the individual. Notably, assistant principals who were viewed as troublemakers were not considered for promotions. Therefore, to be able to exist in the administrative world, an individual must understand and comply with expected behaviors.

It appears that some districts are beginning to look at the importance of professional socialization of assistant principals. Cantwell (1993), noted that the SuperCenter, located in New York City, is a center established to provide continuing professional development for assistant principals beginning their administrative careers. The programs are designed in such a way that assistant principals may choose to participate in a year-long program, or may select a number of different activities. In addition, the program offers mentoring, small-group activities, retreats, consulting services and contact with other assistant principals. The SuperCenter also offers follow-up support for participants.
The Changing Role of the Assistant Principalship

Although there is little research regarding the role of the assistant principal, this seems to be slowly changing (NASSP Council On The Assistant Principalship, 1991; Sutter, 1996). One of the focuses of school improvement in the past few years has been on the role the administrator assumes within the context of the school. As this information has emerged, more emphasis has been placed on the role the administrative team assumes within the realm of school improvement. As a result, more emphasis has been placed on the role of the assistant principal.

It appears that programs and research articles pertaining to the assistant principalship are beginning to emerge and focus more closely on the position. Williams (1995) noted that assistant principals' responsibilities are changing to include teacher evaluation and curriculum development. She noted that in some cases, discipline is being shared with principals. As a result of these changes, she suggested that the assistant principalship should be considered part of the administrative team. She believed that the key to school improvement centers around the administrative staff working as a team. With such current demands placed on the school systems to meet...
students' diversified needs and the accelerated rate of change within the school, she noted that utilizing all personnel within the school is necessary for school improvement. Therefore, the role of assistant principals must encompass more than clerical functions and disciplinary issues. "Assistant principals should be expected, encouraged, and empowered to work beyond their disciplines, outside their cultures, and above their traditional roles" (Williams, 1995, p. 80).

In order for the role of the assistant principal to be considered by individuals as a career alternative, it will be necessary to restructure the role to include responsibilities for instructional and organizational matters (Cantwell, 1993; Greenfield, 1985a). Notably, Greenfield argued that the restructuring process needs to incorporate such responsibilities, but that merely adding these duties to the assistant principal's current obligations would not be sufficient. He noted that instructional and organizational responsibilities must replace some of the tasks associated with the position.

Toth and Siemaszko (1996) documented evidence that the role of assistant principal is beginning to change to improve the school organization as a whole. They noted
that at the Department of Defense School in Frankfort, Germany, the assistant principal primarily had been a position that dealt with discipline and attendance problems of students. However, behavioral and attendance problems did not improve. Consequently, there was some speculation about the value of the position. It was suggested that clerks and teachers could manage many of these problems. The role of the assistant principal was then restructured to include instructional leadership, public relations, supervision of staff, promoting positive student relations, curriculum, focusing on high expectations, and supporting a positive learning environment. Although the assistant principal still had some responsibility for discipline and attendance issues, many of the responsibilities were shifted to substitute teachers, teachers, and clerks.

Accordingly, Toth and Siemaszko reported that programs were restructured and duties were shifted to allow the assistant principal more time to work with teachers and curriculum. Although the shift of duties took time, the restructuring allowed the assistant principal to work with the principal in implementing instructional goals and building a quality school program. They noted that restructuring the assistant principalship improved
instruction, school environment, performance of teachers, achievement of the students, and relations with the community.

Panyako and Rorie (1987) noted several reasons the role for assistant principals is changing. In the past, assistant principals did not have much knowledge of school administration; therefore they were assigned duties that only required managerial type activities. Today however, assistant principals may have as much knowledge of administrative practices as the principal. The position now requires that individuals have an understanding of technical tasks and have training and insight about various areas of the school program. Notably, assistant principals "must be versed in all aspects of school management, ranging from financial accounting, school law, educational and psychological measurement, to staff supervision and evaluation, and effective communication with students, parents, and the general public" (Panyako & Rorie, 1987, p. 7).

The NASSP Council on the Assistant Principalship (1991) and Panyako and Rorie (1987) noted that assistant principals must be partially accountable for determining their role. One particular idea suggested by the council
was that assistant principals must let supervisors know about their capabilities and interest. Panyako and Rorie stated assistant principals must take an active role in choosing and guiding their own professional growth.

The council suggested that assistant principals should be actively involved in classroom and curriculum issues. Visiting classrooms allows assistant principals to be in a position to offer assistance to teachers. By pursuing this avenue, the council concluded that assistant principals would be in a position that would allow for growth and development in the areas of curriculum and instructional leadership.

**Professional Development of the Assistant Principal**

Fulton (1987) noted that the assistant principalship "should be the training ground for the principalship, and the principal should assume the responsibility to thoroughly prepare the assistant principal for the position" (p. 52). Panyako and Rorie (1987) noted that the principal plays a primary role in allowing the assistant principal to assume the new type of leadership role needed to change the position from a managerial type position to a leadership position.
Although the NASSP Council on the Assistant Principalship (1991) and Panyak and Rorie (1987) suggested that assistant principals must guide their own professional development, there are programs emerging that focus on development of school leaders.

Peterson, Marshall, and Grier (1987) discussed programs established to assist in the development of assistant principals. The assistant principals' academies were established with a similar notion of the principals’ academies for Tennessee. Notably, the assistant principals receive development in the areas of socialization and further knowledge pertaining to the role. One of the most important aspects of the academies is that ongoing professional development is offered. The first academy for assistant principals was held in McDowell County, North Carolina. The participants took part in a three-day workshop. Topics included such areas as effective schools, the role of principals and assistant principals, leadership, professional and personal issues. There were follow-up meetings that included presentations, readings, and topics for discussion.

Zellner and Erlandson (1997) described Leadership Laboratories which had been developed at Texas A&M.
Initially, Texas A&M established TEC (Texas Education Cooperative) to work with teachers and offer professional development in technology and field-based studies. In 1996, TEC expanded to include professional development for principals. The program was designed because schools have taken on roles once perceived as being outside the realm of education. The responsibilities of administrators are expected to increase, and knowledge to cope with these demands will be essential for future school leaders. The TEC Program is committed to offering development for future school leaders. The program is designed to last for two years, and by being involved in the program, school leaders will establish networks with other leaders and be able to work collaboratively with one another.

Tennessee’s State Model for Local Evaluation of Administrators and Supervisors

The Tennessee state model of evaluation for administrators and supervisors was revised in 1991 with an emphasis on “effective schools research” (Tennessee State Department of Education, 1991, p.11). The document reported that according to “effective school research”, certain leadership abilities were more significant than
others when promoting overall school improvement. Four primary domains were identified in the *State Model for Local Evaluation Of Administrators/ Supervisors* (1991) and labeled and defined as follows:

1. **Instructional Leadership** included: Implementing and establishing clear instructional goals and achievement objectives related to student learning; Planning, implementing, and evaluating instructional programs; Providing a school environment that is favorable to learning; Conducting an effective school program through evaluative measures of teachers and staff (Tennessee Department of Education, 1991).

2. **Organizational Management** involved: Developing and implementing procedures that follow federal law, state law, and the state board of education and local board of education policies; Performing delegated responsibilities in relation to fiscal operations of the school and school plant facilities, and keeping inventories and records according to guidelines that have been established (Tennessee Department of Education, 1991).

3. **Communication and Interpersonal Relations** involved: Developing and using communication avenues and managing conflict with teachers, staff, and other administrators or
supervisors, parents and community; Demonstrating respect and working in a supportive manner with teachers, staff and students (Tennessee Department of Education, 1991).

4. Professional Growth and Leadership included: Strategies for showing improvement of professional skills and knowledge; Taking a leadership role in the improvement of education (Tennessee Department of Education, 1991).

Within each domain, specific competencies were specified and a scale of one to five was presented to identify the level of achievement of the competency. On the scale, a score of one was unacceptable, a score of two was inadequate, a score of three was satisfactory, a score of four was commendable, and a score of five was outstanding.

Eight components of the administrative evaluation were presented. Those components included a pre-evaluation conference, two performance reviews, a structured interview, a professional staff questionnaire, a development plan, a summative report, a summative conference, and certification recommendations form.

The superintendent was identified as the person responsible for carrying out the evaluation. The superintendent had the option of appointing a designee to
complete the evaluation, but certain criteria were stipulated that the evaluator must meet. According to the criteria, the evaluator must be trained in the evaluative measures, and the evaluator must be a superior of the person being evaluated. Peer evaluators are not permitted. When the evaluation is complete, the evaluator must forward the instruments used in the evaluation to the District Office of the State Department of Education. The instruments are part of Tennessee’s State Model for Local Evaluation of Administrators/Supervisors (1991).

The same criteria for evaluation of principals and assistant principals were specified for use in the Tennessee model for evaluation of administrators and supervisors. Different criteria were specified for supervisors.

Karen Weeks (personal communication, March 17, 1998), an employee of the Tennessee State Department of Education provided information pertaining to the development of the evaluation process of principals and assistant principals in Tennessee. The evaluation criteria, which were part of the career ladder program, were developed during the early and mid 1980s, and the emphasis was placed on activities that were perceived to improve instruction and learning.
According to Weeks, the developers of the evaluation system did not assume the responsibilities of principals and assistant principals were the same, but in order to receive eligibility for the career ladder program, assistant principals had to have duties in the areas of supervision and improvement of instruction.

**Summary**

The position of assistant principal is often considered an entry-level position for beginning administrators. The position is commonly looked upon as a training ground for the principalship. Often however, the responsibilities associated with the assistant principalship do not include the types of responsibilities associated with the principalship. Generally, it is the assistant principal who is responsible for discipline issues and building maintenance. These areas, although important to the organization, do not usually allow for significant leadership growth of the individual who oversees them.

Assistant principals play a vital role within the school organization. Assistant principals are often recognized as the ones who maintain the stability of the
organization. Although assistant principals seem to recognize their contributions and importance within this area, the majority of assistant principals see the position as temporary. Assistant principals usually view the position as a stepping stone to higher administrative positions.

The assistant principalship is a position that has much to offer in the area of school administration. With the emphasis on accountability within the schools, the position needs to be studied more closely, and the effective use of this key role needs to be addressed.

Chapter three documents the procedures and methods for this study of the assistant principalship in the State of Tennessee.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY AND PROCEDURES

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to determine assistant principals’ actual and ideal involvement with the competencies specified by the Tennessee’s Department of Education in the State Model For Local Evaluation Of Administrators/ Supervisors (1991).

This chapter presents the research methods and procedures involved in the study. Chapter three includes information about the research design, population, sample, instrumentation, panel of experts, procedures, and data analysis.

Research Design

The study of assistant principals actual and ideal involvement with competencies identified from Tennessee’s model of evaluation of principals and assistant principals may be described as a causal-comparative study. A causal-comparative design was chosen because the variables selected for this study describe, analyze, and interpret existing conditions (Best & Kahn, 1986; Borg & Gall, 1989).
Population

The participants of this study were selected from Tennessee's public school systems for the school year 1996-1997. Janice Atkins, a representative of the Tennessee Education Association, secured a list of assistant principals' names. The Tennessee Education Association was able to secure the names of assistant principals in the State of Tennessee from the Tennessee Department of Education.

Sample

Random sampling of the population identified for this study was used. The use of random sampling allowed the researcher to generalize about the given population described in the study. By randomly selecting individuals from the given population, each person stood an equal opportunity of being chosen as a part of the sample (Borg & Gall, 1989). Gay (1996) indicated that although there is no sampling method that will guarantee a representative sample of a population, the use of random sampling is the best method for obtaining a representative sample. The probability of gaining a sample that is representative of the target population is higher if random sampling is used.
Nine hundred fifty-four names were provided on a list of assistant principals employed in Tennessee during the 1996-1997 school year. The list of names was categorized by school system and then listed alphabetically. A number was assigned to each of the names.

A list of random numbers was generated using Microsoft Excel random number generation analysis. The numbers were then correlated to the numbers assigned to the names of assistant principals from the Tennessee Department of Education. With an alpha level set at a .05 level of significance, the desired sample size of 281 was determined through the use of a table from Elementary Survey Sampling (Scheaffer, Mendenhall, & Ott, 1986). An over sampling method was used in order to obtain the desired sample size of 281. Three hundred sixty-one cover letters explaining the study and surveys were mailed to the targeted group. The initial cover letter mailed to the target group is included in Appendix C and the survey is found in Appendix B.

Instrumentation

A survey instrument was developed by the researcher to compare assistant principals' actual and ideal involvement
to competencies described by the State of Tennessee Model For Local Evaluation Of Administrators/ Supervisors (1991). Questions and statements regarding assistant principals' duties were derived from Tennessee's State Model for Local Evaluation of Administrators/ Supervisors. The evaluation instrument used to evaluate principals and assistant principals included four domains identified by the Tennessee State Department of Education in the State Model for Local Evaluation of Administrators/ Supervisors (1991). These domains included instructional leadership, organizational management, communication and interpersonal relations, and professional growth and leadership.

Although Tennessee's evaluation model for principals and assistant principals identified four domains, two domains consisted of two separate variables. In the evaluation tool, the area identified as "communication and interpersonal relations" was separated into two domains for the purpose of this study. The fourth domain of the evaluation tool identified as "professional growth and leadership" was also separated into two domains for the purpose of this study. These areas can be distinguished as separate variables therefore, the areas have been separated and treated as different variables within the survey.
Thus, within the survey, six variables were identified: instructional leadership, organizational management, communication, interpersonal relations, professional growth, and leadership.

The survey contained demographic data indicating gender, age, race, number of years in administration, educational level, type of system (rural, urban, or suburban school system), and locality of the school system (East Tennessee, Middle Tennessee, or West Tennessee).

The competencies from Tennessee's model of local evaluation of principals and assistant principals were used to develop the questions for the instrument. The subjects responded to the questions by using two Likert-type scales that indicated their varying degree of actual involvement in the competencies, and their ideal involvement within those same competencies. Each Likert-scale ranged from low(1) involvement to high(7) involvement. A score in each of the areas was calculated by adding the value indicated by the respondent in each of the competency areas.

There were 15 questions regarding Instructional Leadership within the survey. The potential scores for Instructional Leadership ranged from 15 to 105.
There were eight questions pertaining to Organizational Management. The potential scores for Organizational Management ranged from eight to 56.

There were three questions each referring to Communication, Interpersonal Relations, and Leadership. The potential scores for each of the areas ranged from three to 21.

There were four questions regarding Professional Growth. The potential scores ranged from four to 28. A copy of the survey is included in Appendix B.

Panel of Experts

A panel of former assistant principals was asked to complete the survey prior to the mailing. The panel consisted of a supervisor of instruction, principals, a classroom teacher, and a retired assistant principal.

According to Borg and Gall (1989) and Gay (1996) a questionnaire should be pre-tested prior to the actual study. The panel was asked to respond to the questionnaire in regards to clarity, format, and instructions. They were asked to make any suggestions that might enhance the survey.
Five surveys were mailed to the panel on March 10, 1998. All surveys were returned. No changes or suggestions were recommended by any members of the panel.

A copy of the cover letter mailed to each of the panel members is included in Appendix A. A copy of the survey is found in Appendix B.

Procedures

A review of related literature of the assistant principalship was compiled, reviewed, and summarized for this study. Permission was requested from East Tennessee State University's Institutional Review Board to complete the study. A panel of former assistant principals was asked to complete the survey and make suggestions for clarity and directions.

A list of assistant principals' names was secured from the Tennessee Department of Education through the Tennessee Education Association. The names from the original list provided by the Tennessee State Department of Education were numbered. A list of random numbers was generated using Microsoft Excel random number generation. The sample population was identified through the use of random numbers.
A sample of 281 was established using a table for selection of sample size (Scheaffer et al., 1986), but over sampling was used in an attempt to achieve the desired sample size. A cover letter explaining the study and 361 surveys were mailed in April 1998. A copy of the cover letter is found in Appendix C, and the survey is included in Appendix B.

One-hundred seventeen usable surveys were returned from the first mailing. Fourteen surveys were returned that were not usable for the study. The second mailing occurred in June 1998. A cover letter and 230 surveys were mailed to non-respondents of the sample group. Sixty-two usable surveys were returned from the second mailing. Seven surveys were returned that were undeliverable or not usable for this study. A copy of the second cover letter included in the mailing is included in Appendix D.

Statistical tests for causal-comparative studies were applied to the data using SPSS/PC (version 8.0). Demographic data was also analyzed using the SPSS/PC program. Reports of the statistical finding from this study are presented in Chapter 4.
Data Analysis

After surveys were returned, statistical procedures were applied to the data. Descriptive statistics for frequencies and percentages were calculated using SPSS (version 8.0). Frequencies and percentages were calculated for gender, race, years experience, educational level, career aspirations, assignment level, type of school system, and location of school system.

Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) and t-test procedures were used for hypothesis testing. According to Borg & Gall (1989), t-test are generally the most frequently used inferential statistical procedure for causal-comparative studies. t-tests were used in order to determine if a significant difference between the means of two groups existed (Gay, 1996). t-tests were used to test the hypothesis for Research Question One. Because no directionality was indicated within each of the hypotheses, a two tailed t-test was used to test each of the hypotheses.

Analysis of Variance or ANOVA was used to test the hypotheses of Research Questions Two, Three, and Four. An ANOVA was used to determine if significant difference
between the means of three or more groups was evident (Gay, 1996).

The alpha level for each hypothesis was established at 0.05 level of significance. Gay (1996) indicated that an alpha level of 0.05 was a reasonable probability level, and the probability level that is used most often.

**Summary**

Chapter 3 presented the methods and procedures used in this study. Information regarding the research design, population, sample, instrumentation, panel of experts, procedures, and data analysis was given.

Causal-comparative research design was used in this study. The population consisted of 954 assistant principals employed in the State of Tennessee during the 1996-97 school year. Using a chart from *Elementary Survey Sampling* (Scheaffer et al., 1986), a sample of 281 was chosen for the study. Random sampling procedures were utilized in order to obtain a representative sample of the population. Over sampling was used in order to obtain the desired sample size. Three hundred sixty-one surveys were mailed in April 1998. In June 1998, surveys were mailed to non-respondents of the initial survey.
The competencies from Tennessee's *State Model for Local Evaluation of Administrators/Supervisors* (1991) were used to establish an instrument for this survey. Participants were asked to respond to a Likert-scale instrument which identified their actual involvement and ideal involvement in the competencies identified by the *State Model for Local Evaluation of Administrators/Supervisors*. A panel of experts responded to the instrument prior to mailing it to the targeted sample group. The panel was asked to make comments regarding clarity of directions or to make any recommendations for improvement of the survey.

Hypotheses were tested using the t-test and analysis of variance (ANOVA). The data analysis concerning the findings of this study are presented in Chapter 4.
CHAPTER 4
PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

Chapter 4 contains the presentation of the analysis of data for this study. Survey response rates are included as well as demographic data from the sample. The research questions are presented and analyses of the data pertaining to those research questions are given.

Response Rate

A sample size of 281 was needed from a population of 954 in order to achieve a ±5% degree of accuracy in survey estimates. Over sampling was used in order to reach the desired response rate. Three hundred sixty-one surveys were mailed to the randomly selected group of assistant principals employed in the State of Tennessee during the 1996-1997 school year. One hundred seventy-nine surveys were returned. This represented a response rate of 63.7%.

Demographic Characteristics

Respondents were asked to provide demographic information. Demographic characteristics pertaining to age, race and gender are presented in Table 2.
### TABLE 2
FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTIONS OF RESPONDENTS’ GENDER, AGE, AND RACE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>175</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>81.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>175</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30–39</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40–49</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>46.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50–59</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60–65</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66 or over</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>169</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 175 respondents, 60% were male and 40% were female. The majority, 81.1% of the participants, was Caucasian, while 18.9% of the respondents were African American. No other ethnicity was indicated on the returned surveys.

The responses indicated that ages fell between the
30-39 age category to the 66 and over age category. The largest age group was the 40-49 age category with 46.1% of the participants indicating they fell within this age range. The second largest age group was the 50-59 age category with 38.5%. The 30-39 age category contained 8.9% of the sample population, and 5.3% of the participants indicated they ranged in ages of 60-65. Less than 2% indicated they were 66 or over.

Respondents were asked to reply to questions regarding their years of experience as an assistant principal, their educational level, and their career goal. This information is provided in Table 3.

The largest number of respondents, 40.6%, indicated that they had held the position from 0-5 years, while 28.8% had been in the position for 6-10 years. Approximately 10% had been an assistant principal for 11-15 years, and 7.6% had been in the position 16-20 years. Approximately 12% of the sample population indicated they had been in the position 21 or more years.
### TABLE 3

**FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTIONS OF RESPONDENTS’ YEARS EXPERIENCE AS AN ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL, EDUCATIONAL LEVEL AND CAREER GOAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years Experience as an Assistant Principal:</th>
<th>$f$</th>
<th>$%$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>40.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 or more</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>170</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Level:</th>
<th>$f$</th>
<th>$%$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Degree</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>69.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Specialist</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>169</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Aspirations:</th>
<th>$f$</th>
<th>$%$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career Goal</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Administrative Positions</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Return to classroom</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>167</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The educational level of the participants ranged from Bachelor’s Degree to Doctorate Degree. Less than 2% of assistant principals held only a Bachelor’s Degree, while
69.8% held a Master’s Degree. Approximately 20% held an Educational Specialist Degree, and 8.9% held a Doctorate Degree.

As for career aspirations, 56.3% indicated that they planned to seek other administrative positions. Approximately 25% of the participants planned to make the assistant principalship a career goal. Less than 2% indicated they planned to return to the classroom.

The participants of this study were asked to respond to questions regarding the level of their assignment (elementary school, middle school, or high school); the type of school system in which they are employed (rural, urban, or suburban); and the location of their school system within the state (East Tennessee, Middle Tennessee, or West Tennessee). The frequencies and percentages to these questions are presented in Table 4.

More than half, 56.9%, of the participants were employed at the high school level. Twenty-one percent were employed at the elementary level, and 22.1% were employed at the middle or junior high level.
TABLE 4

FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTIONS OF RESPONDENTS' ASSIGNMENT LEVEL, TYPE OF SCHOOL SYSTEM AND LOCATION OF SCHOOL SYSTEM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment Level:</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle/Junior High School</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>56.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of School System:</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of School System:</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Tennessee</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>48.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Tennessee</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Tennessee</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The type of school system indicated by the responses showed that 36.7% of the respondents were employed in a rural school system. Approximately 35% were employed in an urban school system, and 28.4% were employed in a suburban system.
Approximately one half, 48.2%, of the returned surveys were from East Tennessee. There were 26.5% of the participants who indicated they were employed in Middle Tennessee, and 25.3% from West Tennessee.

Reliability Analysis

In order to check for internal consistency of the survey, Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Coefficients were computed using the SPSS computer package. The findings are presented in Table 5.

TABLE 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency Area</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Ideal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Leadership</td>
<td>.9310</td>
<td>.9360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Management</td>
<td>.8151</td>
<td>.8759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>.8312</td>
<td>.7983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Relations</td>
<td>.7045</td>
<td>.6941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Growth (with question 33 omitted)</td>
<td>.7657</td>
<td>.8353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>.8098</td>
<td>.8588</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A preliminary reliability analysis indicated that the alpha level of actual involvement in the competency area of Professional Growth could be improved by omitting question 33 in the computation of scores of this scale. The alpha level for Professional Growth was .8067 with question 33 omitted. The reliability estimates for the other scales were at or above .70 and considered acceptable for this study.

A preliminary reliability analysis indicated that the alpha level of actual involvement in the competency area of Professional Growth could be improved by omitting question 33 in the computation of scores of this scale. The alpha level for Professional Growth was .8067 with question 33 omitted. The reliability estimates for the other scales were at or above .70 and considered acceptable for this study.

Research Questions and Hypothesis

Research Question 1

Is there a difference between actual competency scores and ideal competency scores of assistant principals in instructional leadership, organizational management,
communication, interpersonal relations, professional growth, and leadership?

The results of the paired t-tests are presented in Table 6.

TABLE 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency Area</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Actual Mean</th>
<th>Ideal Mean</th>
<th>Mean Diff.</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Leadership</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>67.45</td>
<td>88.78</td>
<td>21.33</td>
<td>17.25</td>
<td>&lt;.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Management</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>36.36</td>
<td>43.47</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>11.90</td>
<td>&lt;.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>16.71</td>
<td>18.50</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>8.02</td>
<td>&lt;.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Relations</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>16.64</td>
<td>18.79</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>11.76</td>
<td>&lt;.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Growth</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>16.05</td>
<td>18.57</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>11.78</td>
<td>&lt;.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>14.25</td>
<td>17.67</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>15.62</td>
<td>&lt;.005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The largest difference between actual involvement and ideal involvement in competency areas of the APCI for assistant principals in Tennessee was Instructional Leadership. The second largest difference between actual
involvement and ideal involvement was Leadership. The least difference between actual involvement and ideal involvement was Communication, followed by Interpersonal Relations, Professional Growth, and Organizational Management.

In testing the null hypothesis, the probability (p) value was compared to the preset alpha level (.05). When p was less than .05, the null hypothesis was rejected. When p was greater than .05, the null hypothesis was retained.

The hypotheses and conclusions for research question one are presented below:

**Ho1A:** There is no difference between actual competency scores and ideal competency scores of assistant principals in instructional leadership.

The actual mean competency scores for instructional leadership was 67.45 and the mean of the ideal competency scores for instructional leadership was 88.78. The mean difference between the scores was 21.33, and the t-value was 17.25. The difference was statistically significant (p < .005) therefore, hypothesis Ho1A was rejected. Assistant principals’ ideal instructional leadership scores were
higher than their actual scores for instructional leadership.

**HolB**: There is no difference between actual competency scores and ideal competency scores of assistant principals in organizational management.

The actual mean competency scores for organizational management was 36.36 and the mean of the ideal competency scores for organizational management was 43.47. The mean difference between the scores was 7.11, and the $t$-value was 11.90. The difference was statistically significant ($p < .005$) therefore, hypothesis HolB was rejected. Assistant principals’ ideal organizational management scores were higher than their actual organizational management scores.

**HolC**: There is no difference between actual competency scores and ideal competency scores of assistant principals in communication.

The actual mean competency scores for communication was 16.71 and the mean of the ideal competency scores for communication was 18.50. The mean difference between the scores was 1.79, and the $t$-value was 8.02. The difference was statistically significant ($p < .005$) therefore,
hypothesis HolC was rejected. Assistant principals’ ideal communication scores were higher than their actual communication scores.

**HolD:** There is no difference between actual competency scores and ideal competency scores of assistant principals in interpersonal relations. The actual mean competency scores for interpersonal relations was 16.64 and the mean of the ideal competency scores for interpersonal relations was 18.79. The mean difference between the scores was 2.15, and the $t$-value was 11.76. The difference was statistically significant ($p < .005$) therefore, hypothesis HolD was rejected. Assistant principals’ ideal interpersonal relations scores were higher than their actual scores for interpersonal relations.

**HolE:** There is no difference between actual competency scores and ideal competency scores of assistant principals in professional growth.

The actual mean competency scores for professional growth was 16.05 and the mean of the ideal competency scores for Professional Growth was 18.57. The mean difference between the scores was 2.52, and the $t$-value was 11.78. The difference was statistically
significant \( (p < .005) \) therefore, hypothesis Ho1E was rejected. Assistant principals' ideal professional growth scores were higher than their actual scores for professional growth.

**Ho1F:** There is no difference between actual competency scores and ideal competency scores of assistant principals in leadership.

The actual mean competency scores for leadership was 14.25 and the mean of the ideal competency scores for leadership was 17.67. The mean difference between the scores was 3.42, and the \( t \)-value was 15.62. The difference was statistically significant \( (p < .005) \) therefore, hypothesis Ho1F was rejected. Assistant principals' ideal competency scores for leadership are higher than their actual scores for leadership.

**Research Question 2**

Is there a difference between actual competency scores of assistant principals employed in rural, urban, and suburban schools?

In order to determine if a difference existed, an Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was applied to the data. The results are found in Table 7.
### TABLE 7
ANOVA RESULTS FOR RESPONDENTS’ ACTUAL COMPETENCY SCORES
BY EMPLOYMENT IN RURAL, URBAN, OR SUBURBAN SCHOOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual Scores</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>sd</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructional</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>68.52</td>
<td>17.55</td>
<td>.433</td>
<td>.649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>65.91</td>
<td>18.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>69.00</td>
<td>19.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>164</td>
<td>67.77</td>
<td>18.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>35.19</td>
<td>9.93</td>
<td>2.677</td>
<td>.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>35.31</td>
<td>10.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>39.06</td>
<td>9.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>162</td>
<td>36.38</td>
<td>9.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>16.58</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>.258</td>
<td>.773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>16.69</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>17.06</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>168</td>
<td>16.76</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpersonal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relations:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>16.71</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>.509</td>
<td>.602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>16.34</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>16.96</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>166</td>
<td>16.66</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>16.46</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>.872</td>
<td>.420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>16.18</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>15.55</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>165</td>
<td>16.10</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>14.61</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>.258</td>
<td>.773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>14.25</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>14.02</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>165</td>
<td>14.32</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
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In order to determine if a difference existed between actual competency scores of assistant principals between the groups according to type of school system in which they were employed, the alpha level was set at .05, and an ANOVA was applied to the data. In testing the null hypotheses, the probability (p) value was compared to the preset alpha level (.05). When p was less than .05, the null hypothesis was rejected. When p was greater than .05, the null hypothesis was retained. Analysis of the data produced information regarding the number of respondents in each area, the mean, the standard deviation, the F-value, and the significance level.

Results indicated the following for each hypothesis:

**Ho2A:** There is no difference between actual competency scores of assistant principals employed in rural, urban, and suburban schools in instructional leadership.

A comparison was made to determine if a difference existed in the instructional leadership scale of actual competency scores of assistant principals according to the type of school system in which they were employed. Because p (.649) was greater than the established alpha level
null hypothesis Ho2A was retained. There was no significant difference between actual instructional leadership scores of assistant principals employed in rural, urban, or suburban schools.

**Ho2B:** There is no difference between actual competency scores of assistant principals employed in rural, urban, and suburban schools in organizational management.

A comparison was made to determine if a difference existed in the organizational management scale of actual competency scores of assistant principals according to the type of school system in which they were employed. Because p (.072) was greater than the established alpha level (.05), null hypothesis Ho2B was retained. There was no significant difference between actual organizational management scores of assistant principals employed in rural, urban, or suburban schools.

**Ho2C:** There is no difference between actual competency scores of assistant principals employed in rural, urban, and suburban schools in communication.

A comparison was made to determine if a difference existed in the communication scale of actual competency scores of assistant principals according to the type of
school system in which they were employed. Because \( p \) (.773) was greater than the established alpha level (.05), null hypothesis Ho2C was retained. There was no significant difference between actual communication scores of assistant principals employed in rural, urban, or suburban schools.

**Ho2D:** There is no difference between actual competency scores of assistant principals employed in rural, urban, and suburban schools in interpersonal relations.

A comparison was made to determine if a difference existed in the interpersonal relations scale of actual competency scores of assistant principals according to the type of school system in which they were employed. Because \( p \) (.602) was greater than the established alpha level (.05), null hypothesis Ho2D was retained. There was no significant difference between actual interpersonal relations scores of assistant principals employed in rural, urban, or suburban schools.

**Ho2E:** There is no difference between actual competency scores of assistant principals employed in rural, urban, and suburban schools in professional growth.
A comparison was made to determine if a difference existed in the professional growth scale of actual competency scores of assistant principals according to the type of school system in which they were employed. Because $p (.420)$ was greater than the established alpha level (.05), null hypothesis $Ho2E$ was retained. There was no significant difference between actual professional growth scores of assistant principals employed in rural, urban, or suburban schools.

$Ho2F$: There is no difference between actual competency scores of assistant principals employed in rural, urban, and suburban schools in leadership.

A comparison was made to determine if a difference existed in the leadership scale of actual competency scores of assistant principals according to the type of school system in which they were employed. Because $p (.773)$ was greater than the established alpha level (.05), null hypothesis $Ho2F$ was retained. There was no significant difference between actual leadership scores of assistant principals employed in rural, urban, or suburban schools.
Research Question 3

Is there a difference between ideal competency scores of assistant principals according to their educational level?

In order to determine if a difference existed between the ideal competency scores of assistant principals according to their educational level, an ANOVA was used to analyze the responses of the participants. In testing the null hypotheses, the probability (p) value was compared to the preset alpha level (.05). When p was less than .05, the null hypothesis was rejected. When p was greater than .05, the null hypothesis was retained. The results of the analyses are presented in Table 8.

In order to gather information regarding the research question, respondents were asked to indicate their educational level. Responses included a Bachelor’s Degree, Master’s Degree, Educational Specialist Degree, or Doctorate Degree. Three respondents or 1.8% of the sample returning the surveys indicated their highest level of educational attainment was a Bachelor’s Degree. For the purpose of this study, responses for Bachelor’s Degree and Master’s Degree were combined.
### TABLE 8

**ANOVA RESULTS FOR RESPONDENTS' IDEAL COMPETENCY SCORES ACCORDING TO EDUCATIONAL LEVEL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ideal Scores</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>sd</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructional</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS or MS</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>88.58</td>
<td>12.03</td>
<td>.614</td>
<td>.543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED.S</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>88.06</td>
<td>14.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>92.50</td>
<td>9.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>88.77</td>
<td>12.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS or MS</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>43.73</td>
<td>8.78</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>.896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED.S</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>9.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>8.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>43.53</td>
<td>8.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS or MS</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>18.42</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>2.148</td>
<td>.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED.S</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18.31</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>18.53</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpersonal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relations:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS or MS</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>18.80</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED.S</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18.81</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18.93</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>18.81</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS or MS</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>18.58</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>.648</td>
<td>.524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED.S</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>18.39</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19.36</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>18.61</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS or MS</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>17.59</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.328</td>
<td>.721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED.S</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17.85</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18.29</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>17.70</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
An ANOVA was used to determine if there was a difference in the respondents' ideal competency scores according to their educational level. The hypothesis and analysis for research question three are presented below:

**Ho3A:** There is no difference between ideal competency scores of assistant principals by educational level in instructional leadership.

Because $p$ or the significance level (.543) exceeded the established alpha for ideal competency scores for assistant principals in instructional leadership, the null hypothesis $Ho3A$ was retained. There was no significant difference between instructional leadership ideal scores of assistant principals and their educational level.

**Ho3B:** There is no difference between ideal competency scores of assistant principals by educational level in organizational management.

Because $p$ or the significance level (.896) exceeded the established alpha for ideal competency scores for assistant principals in organizational management, the null hypothesis $Ho3B$ was retained. There was no significant difference between ideal organizational management scores of assistant principals and their educational level.
Ho3C: There is no difference between ideal competency scores of assistant principals by educational level in communication.

Because \( p \) or the significance level (.120) exceeded the established alpha for ideal competency scores for assistant principals in communication, the null hypothesis Ho3C was retained. There was no significant difference between ideal communication scores of assistant principals and their educational level.

Ho3D: There is no difference between ideal competency scores of assistant principals by educational level in interpersonal relations.

Because \( p \) or the significance level (.978) exceeded the established alpha for ideal competency scores for assistant principals in interpersonal relations, the null hypothesis Ho3D was retained. There was no significant difference between ideal interpersonal relations scores of assistant principals and their educational level.

Ho3E: There is no difference between ideal competency scores of assistant principals by educational level in professional growth.
Because p or the significance level (.524) exceeded the established alpha for ideal competency scores for assistant principals in professional growth, the null hypothesis Ho3E was retained. There was no significant difference between ideal professional growth scores of assistant principals and their educational level.

**Ho3F:** There is no difference between ideal competency scores of assistant principals by educational level in leadership.

Because p or the significance level (.721) exceeded the established alpha for ideal competency scores for assistant principals in leadership, the null hypothesis Ho3F was retained. There was no significant difference between ideal leadership scores of assistant principals and their educational level.

**Research Question 4**

Is there a difference between actual competency scores of assistant principals employed in elementary schools, middle/junior high schools, and high schools?

To determine if a difference existed, an Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was completed. The results are included in Table 9.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency Area</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>sd</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructional Leadership:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>69.91</td>
<td>17.03</td>
<td>2.275</td>
<td>.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>61.83</td>
<td>18.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>68.90</td>
<td>18.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>67.53</td>
<td>18.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Management:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34.47</td>
<td>9.07</td>
<td>1.062</td>
<td>.348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35.72</td>
<td>9.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>37.19</td>
<td>9.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>36.29</td>
<td>9.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16.83</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>16.89</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>16.72</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpersonal Relations:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>17.11</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>1.615</td>
<td>.202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15.86</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>16.80</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>16.66</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Growth:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16.77</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>1.277</td>
<td>.282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>15.42</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>15.95</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>16.01</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leadership:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14.85</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>.400</td>
<td>.671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14.06</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>14.11</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>14.25</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
In testing the null hypotheses, the probability (p) value was compared to the preset alpha level (.05). When p was less than .05, the null hypothesis was rejected. When p was greater than .05, the null hypothesis was retained.

The hypothesis for research question four and the determination regarding rejection or failure to reject are presented below:

**Ho4A**: There is no difference between actual competency scores of assistant principals employed in elementary schools, middle/junior high schools, and high schools in instructional leadership.

Actual competency scores of assistant principals were used to calculate an F value (2.275) and a significance level (p=.106) for instructional leadership. The levels of employment of assistant principals included elementary school (n=32), middle school (n=36), and high school (n=94). Null hypothesis Ho4A was retained because the value of p (.106) exceeded the alpha level of .05. There was no significant difference between actual instructional leadership scores of assistant principals employed in elementary, middle/junior high, and high schools.
Ho4B: There is no difference between actual competency scores of assistant principals employed in elementary schools, middle/junior high schools, and high schools in organizational management.

Actual competency scores of assistant principals were used to calculate an F value (1.062) and a significance level (p=.348) for organizational management. The levels of employment of assistant principals included elementary school (n=34), middle school (n=36), and high school (n=91). Null hypothesis Ho4B was retained because the value of p (.348) exceeded the alpha level of .05. There was no significant difference between actual organizational management scores of assistant principals employed in elementary, middle/junior high, and high schools.

Ho4C: There is no difference between actual competency scores of assistant principals employed in elementary schools, middle/junior high schools, and high schools in communication.

Actual competency scores of assistant principals were used to calculate an F value (.579) and a significance level (p=.562) for communication. The levels of employment of assistant principals included elementary school (n=35),
middle school (n=36), and high school (n=95). Null hypothesis Ho4C was retained because the value of p (.562) exceeded the alpha level of .05. There was no significant difference between actual communication scores of assistant principals employed in elementary, middle/junior high, and high schools.

**Ho4D:** There is no difference between actual competency scores of assistant principals employed in elementary schools, middle/junior high schools, and high schools in interpersonal relations.

Actual competency scores of assistant principals were used to calculate an F value (1.615) and a significance level (p=.202) for interpersonal relations. The levels of employment of assistant principals included elementary school (n=35), middle school (n=36), and high school (n=93). Null hypothesis Ho4D was retained because the value of p (.202) exceeded the alpha level of .05. There was no significant difference between actual interpersonal relations scores of assistant principals employed in elementary, middle/junior high, and high schools.

**Ho4E:** There is no difference between actual competency scores of assistant principals employed in elementary
schools, middle/junior high schools, and high schools in professional growth.

Actual competency scores of assistant principals were used to calculate an F value (1.277) and a significance level (p=.282) for professional growth. The levels of employment of assistant principals included elementary school (n=35), middle school (n=36), and high school (n=92). Null hypothesis Ho4E was retained because the value of p (.282) exceeded the alpha level of .05. There was no significant difference between actual professional growth scores of assistant principals employed in elementary, middle/junior high, and high schools.

Ho4F: There is no difference between actual competency scores of assistant principals employed in elementary schools, middle/junior high schools, and high schools in leadership.

Actual competency scores of assistant principals were used to calculate an F value (.400) and a significance level (p=.671) for leadership. The levels of employment of assistant principals included elementary school (n=33), middle school (n=36), and high school (n=94). Null hypothesis Ho4F was retained because the value of p (.671)
exceeded the alpha level of .05. There was no significant difference between the actual leadership scores of assistant principals employed in elementary, middle/junior high, and high schools.

**Additional Responses to the Survey**

Participants were asked other questions regarding their job assignment. They were asked if a job description had been provided for them. They were also asked if they believed the job description was or would have been beneficial. The responses indicated that a job description had been provided for approximately 50% of the respondents. The majority of the respondents, 86.5%, indicated they believed the job description was beneficial or would have been beneficial.

Two other open response statements were available on the survey. The first statement asked participants to list other tasks associated with the position. One hundred participants chose to respond to this statement. Their responses are included in Table 10.

Assistant principals identified various other tasks that were performed in their particular role. The duties were varied. The responsibility identified by most
assistant principals was discipline. Athletics and extra curricular activities were the second most noted assignments associated with the position. Bus and transportation issues, as well as special education responsibilities were performed frequently by assistant principals.

**TABLE 10**

**OTHER TASKS ASSOCIATED WITH THE POSITION OF ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>School Improvement</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athletics/Extra</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curricular</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Fundraising</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus/Transportation</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Substitute Teachers</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Social Services</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Grant Writing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(café &amp; hall)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Sounding Board/Complaints</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attendance/Truancy</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Free/Reduced Lunches</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business/Community Relations</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Main Office Manager</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Vocational</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbooks/Materials</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Safety/Security</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Maintenance / Facilities</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Medical</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court Issues</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Expenditures</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report Cards/Grades</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Hiring</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Development/ Evaluations</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parent Involvement</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mail Carrier</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The information presented in Table 10 describes tasks that are not generally associated with the instructional leadership activities noted by the Tennessee State Department of Education. Instructional Leadership duties specified by the Tennessee State Department of Education included implementing and establishing clear instructional goals and achievement objectives; planning, implementing, and evaluating instructional programs; providing a school environment conductive to learning, and conducting effective school programs through evaluation measures of teachers and staff. The tasks associated with the assistant principalship described in Table 10 do not reflect the type of responsibilities associated with instructional leadership activities characterized by the State of Tennessee. The differences associated with these types of duties may explain the findings of research question one and hypothesis Ho1A noting that there was a significant difference between assistant principals actual scores for instructional leadership and their ideal scores for instructional leadership.

Another statement allowed participants to provide other information that they wanted considered for this study. Assistant principals responded to the statement in
different ways. A few responses included statements pertaining to principals' influence on the responsibilities of the assistant principal. Some of these statements included:

1. Assistant principals are limited to what they do by the principals.
2. Assistant principal does what the principal says to do.
3. I feel the role of assistant principal is to do what the principal doesn't want to do at half the pay. Although I have a wonderful working relationship with my principal, there are times I feel used.
4. The style of the principal determines the assistant principal's role.

Other responses related to the numerous tasks associated with the position and the lack of time to complete tasks relating to the total school program. A number of responses included statements about discipline related issues. Some of those responses are indicated below:

1. With the way things are set up now in schools, it is almost impossible to do what I HAVE to do and still have time to be in the classrooms except for formal evaluations.
2. Most of my responsibilities are resolving conflicts between students, parents, and teachers. As most assistant principals, I deal with discipline and supervision 75% to 90% of my time.

3. With 800 students and one assistant principal, I don’t see many ideal situations. My situation as it actually is consists of handling many discipline problems.

4. Most of my time is taken handling tardies to school and classes, scheduling games, gate workers, and concession workers for games, filling out TSSAA forms, and handling discipline. I do not evaluate that many teachers, but we have a five minute walk through on most teachers. Most of your survey is not applicable to me.

5. For question #38 - job description would be ok, but “any other duties assigned” would probably best define most assistant principals.

6. Legal aspects beyond school law often come into play.

7. Some of the duties given to assistant principals do not require advanced degrees or certification. These duties could be handled by others such as ombudsman, relieving trained individuals to perform worthwhile jobs.
8. Need more time to work with teachers and students on improving curriculum. Less time on student discipline, M-teams, etc.

9. Assistant principals usually spend a good part of the day on discipline problems/other problems not related to the instructional program. Yet, they are evaluated on domains not directly related to their individual job description.

10. Any situation that arises.

11. Assistant principals are often trapped within the role of disciplinarian only. They should be included in various aspects of administration.

12. The buck does not stop with the assistant principal so he/she must always be aware of the philosophy of the principal. Several of the survey items are more applicable as principal responsibilities. An assistant principal does not want to get caught in the middle (boss vs. others) although it will occasionally happen.

13. If the position of assistant principal is a training position for future principals, then they should be more involved in running the building. Most of my work was devoted to discipline.

14. Paperwork and repeated student behavior problems with no support. Lack of needed secretarial support - not
enough manpower to complete jobs that are expected. The need of police and judicial knowledge needed today to deal with the problems that are created by today’s expectations.

15. My job is to be a policeman.
16. I am primarily the “attendance principal”. We have two others, one the “discipline” and the other the “instructional”. We all do discipline, share cafeteria, do teacher observations, etc. Most of the day is spent in crisis/putting out fires etc.
17. All assistants are thought of as discipline people. This should stop.
18. A large school should have enough administrative personnel to adequately handle students. My school has over 1000 students – grades 9-12. There is a principal and two assistants. This is not enough. Teachers’ classes are too large. The state is insensitive to the importance of a good education.
19. An assistant principal should be more than a “glorified aide” – (bus duty / lunch duty). Principal / assistant principal should be like a right and left hand – where if one is absent the other carries on. An assistant principal should not be in the dark when decisions are made, and be expected to carry out procedures.
20. In my particular situation (system), we have been provided some “serious” staff development: leadership, instructional leadership, managing change, etc. The problem is that many of us have the skills and desire to “step up” to those challenges, yet no one ever provides staff or resources to cover the other very vital tasks we do. Merely training and motivating folks to be instructional leaders is largely wasted effort until you allow them the time and means to pursue the vision. It seems like few people “at the top” understand this. I don’t think many have a clue what administrators need to handle on a daily basis.

21. I am often left out of communications among all people connected with the school.

The comments of some assistant principals appeared to relate frustration toward such areas as discipline issues, lack of time to complete tasks, and a lack of team effort within their schools. Although fewer in number, there were some assistant principals who indicated their situations may be somewhat different. Those comments are listed below:

1. We have one principal and two assistants. Our principal involves us in all aspects of education. He certainly has
the final call, but he always asks for our input on important issues. Teamwork is a vital part of our administration.

2. My situation is fully unique in that I am a significant part of the administrative team. We do practically all facets of our work together.

3. At building level, I participate 100% or as much as I desire to participate. As an individual, not as the role of assistant principal, I have input opportunities in building, to the director, and board.

4. I have had an opportunity to work with a head principal who has allowed many opportunities to learn and be involved in the total administrative program. That relationship is the key to the effective assistant in any building.

5. I am currently in a situation in which myself and the principal work very closely on all school issues. We are co-leaders. This is a very successful partnership. I feel fortunate to be given this opportunity, because I will be prepared for a school of my own.

6. I have many duties that were given to me after a few years of experience. This is my sixth year and most of my duties are shared responsibilities with my principal.
There were some assistant principals who wrote about their belief as it related to the role. They indicated their idea of what the job is and how it should change. Their ideas are listed below:

1. The role of the principal is one of leadership -- the instructional leader. The assistant principal is a manager. Management tasks must be completed in a timely manner in order for a school to run effectively.

2. As an assistant principal I feel it is my responsibility to "take the heat" on many matters - thus deflecting it away from the principal or the faculty members. One learns quickly that you will tend to be unpopular with many people. You either are born with a thick skin, or you must develop one. My motto is one that a local business leader told me: "Management is never popular."

3. Principal and assistant principal must be a team.

4. I feel that the assistant principal position is vital and is most effective as an administrative team effort.

5. I believe that assistant principals should be involved in every aspect of administration. However, some aspects should be limited in involvement at different times.

6. I view the assistant principalship as a partnership - "co-principals" rather than a traditional one of principal
in training or "gopher" type helper. I feel responsibilities should be equally shared by the principal and assistant. I see the assistant position as a career choice, not "one step on the way" to principal.

7. I continue to believe that the position of assistant principal must continue to change and evolve. The assistant principal must become a significant player on the administrative team. I feel that they contribute to the overall good of the school. Co-principalship and/or principals in charge of areas and responsibilities would be helpful.

Of the 65 participants who chose to respond, five indicted that they had been promoted to principal since their assignment in 1996-1997. Four of the responses were just statements that a promotion had occurred. One respondent chose to include information about his/her promotion:

I'm extremely glad that you've decided to look at the assistant principalship progressively. I spent three years in this position, thinking that I was being prepared for the principalship. There is nothing further from the truth, I feel like I wasted three years for nothing. The principalship has really been on the job training for me and others that I have communicated with.
An array of comments was included within this section of the survey. Comments pertaining to current assignments and tasks related to assistant principals' beliefs about how the job should be, and how it should change. The comments appear to reflect the current literature pertaining to the assistant principalship.

Summary

Chapter 4 presented information regarding the analysis and presentation of data. This chapter included the response rate of the study, the analysis of the data, explanations of the analysis, and demographic information about the population. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) and t-test were used to test hypotheses. A summary of statements from open-ended questions from the survey is also presented. Conclusions and recommendations of this study are presented in Chapter 5.
CHAPTER 5
RESEARCH SUMMARY, FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Research Summary

For beginning administrators, the assistant principalship is often considered a training ground for the principalship. Many principals and upper level administrators begin their careers as assistant principals. The tasks generally associated with assistant principals are usually described as managerial tasks. Often, the primary responsibility of assistant principals is discipline. Hartzell (1993) and Marshall (1992b) agreed that the job descriptions for assistant principals were not clear. Hartzell noted that assistant principals’ tasks usually contained many differing partial responsibilities while Marshall described the position as having areas that are not well defined.

Generally, tasks completed by assistant principals are not the type of tasks that prepare them to assume the principalship. Because assistant principals spend much of their time with discipline issues, there is not much time
to be involved in other tasks associated with the total school program.

The Tennessee Department of Education established competencies used in the State Model for Local Evaluation of Administrators/Supervisors (1991) to evaluate principals and assistant principals. The criteria set forth within the evaluation process are the same criteria for both positions. For this study, the competencies were divided into six competency areas. The six competency areas included instructional leadership, organizational management, communication, interpersonal relations, professional development, and leadership. The competencies and tasks were used to establish a Likert-scale survey in which assistant principals responded to an "actual involvement" scale and an "ideal involvement" scale for task areas derived from each of the competency areas. The Likert-scales ranged from (1)Low to (7)High for each area of actual involvement and ideal involvement.

Findings and Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to compare the degree to which assistant principals believed they were actually involved and the degree they believed they should be
involved in tasks identified as evaluative competencies of public school principals and assistant principals in the State of Tennessee.

Assistant principals in the State of Tennessee were randomly chosen for this study. A sample size of 281 was needed from a population of 954 in order to achieve a ±5% degree of accuracy in survey estimates. There was a return rate of 179 or 63.7%.

Sixty percent of the assistant principals in this study were male and 40% were female. Approximately 80% were Caucasian and 20% were African American. Approximately 82% of the assistant principals indicated that their ages fell between 40 and 59. Approximately 68% of the sample had held the position of assistant principal 10 years or less. Nearly 70% held a Master’s Degree, 20% an Educational Specialist Degree, and 9% a Doctorate Degree. Twenty-five percent of the participants indicated that they planned to make the assistant principalship a career goal, while 56% planned to seek other administrative positions.

Most (56.9%) of the assistant principals who responded to the survey were high school assistant principals. Twenty-one percent of the respondents were elementary
assistant principals, while 22% were middle/junior high assistant principals. The types of school settings, rural, urban, and suburban, were relatively close in percentages. Thirty-six percent of the respondents indicated they worked in rural settings, while approximately 35% reported they worked in urban settings. Approximately 28% indicated they were employed in suburban settings.

Almost one-half (48%) of the participants of this study reported they lived in East Tennessee. Twenty-six percent of the respondents indicated they were from Middle Tennessee and 25% were from West Tennessee.

Four research questions guided this study. There were six hypotheses for each of the research questions. The hypotheses related to each of the six competency areas. These questions were:

1. Is there a difference between actual competency scores and ideal competency scores of assistant principals in instructional leadership, organizational management, communication, interpersonal relations, professional growth, and leadership?

There was a significant difference found between each competency area and assistant principals' actual competency scores and ideal competency scores. The largest difference
was between the actual scores and ideal scores for Instructional Leadership. Leadership scores followed with the second largest difference between the scores. Organizational Management, Professional Growth, Interpersonal Relations, and Communication followed respectively.

Assistant principals in Tennessee perceived there was a difference between what they actually do in the role of assistant principal and what they should do for each of the six competency areas identified by the State of Tennessee as evaluative competency areas for assistant principals in Tennessee.

2. Is there a difference between actual competency scores of assistant principals employed in rural, urban, and suburban schools?

There was no significant difference between assistant principals’ actual competency scores between each competency area and rural, urban or suburban school settings. Assistant principals in Tennessee employed in rural, urban, and suburban school settings are involved in similar tasks in relation to the role.

3. Is there a difference between ideal competency scores of assistant principals according to their educational level?
There was no significant difference found between assistant principals' ideal competency scores in each competency area and their educational attainment. Assistant principals in Tennessee who have obtained higher degrees do not have higher "ideal scores" with tasks that are associated with competency areas from the evaluative domains.

4. Is there a difference between actual competency scores of assistant principals employed in elementary schools, middle/junior high schools, and high schools?

There was no significant difference found between the actual competency scores of assistant principals employed in elementary, middle/junior high school, and high schools. Although the age group assistant principals deal with according to assignment level do differ, the scores derived from assistant principals across the state did not indicate their actual scores between the competency areas differ.

Two other open-ended response questions were provided in the survey. The questions asked assistant principals to list other tasks associated with the position, and other comments they wished to be considered for the study.

One hundred assistant principals responded to the questions regarding other duties associated with the
position. Although various tasks were identified by assistant principals, discipline was listed more frequently than any other task. Athletics and extra curricular, bus and transportation duties, and special education responsibilities followed accordingly. Other duties included monitoring halls and cafeteria, as well as dealing with attendance and truancy. Notably, with research question one and hypothesis Ho1A, when assistant principals' actual competency scores and ideal competency scores were compared for the area of instructional leadership, a significant difference was found between those scores. It appears that much of the assistant principals' time is consumed with non-instructional tasks therefore, it may be necessary to reevaluate certain tasks identified by the Tennessee State Department of Education as evaluative measures for assistant principals.

Recommendations

The researcher investigating the differences between actual involvement scores and ideal involvement scores of assistant principals within competency area tasks derived from evaluative domains of Tennessee's State Model for
Local Evaluation of Administrators/Supervisors (1991), made the following recommendations:

1. A follow-up study that identifies actual tasks associated with the positions of assistant principals would be helpful in establishing criteria for evaluative measures.

2. Approximately 50% of the respondents indicated that a job description had not been provided for them, and approximately 87% of the respondents felt that a job description either was or would have been beneficial. The development of a job description would prove helpful for assistant principals.

3. When participants identified other tasks associated with their position, discipline was the number one task identified in the open response question. Athletic and extra curricular, and bus and transportation issues followed a close second and third as other tasks associated with the position. Upper level administrators should analyze these situations to see if other individuals could handle these tasks and release assistant principals as much as possible for curriculum and professional development tasks.

4. In order to develop assistant principals and expose them to issues related to the total school program, a team
management approach should be encouraged by school systems. Perhaps the Tennessee State Department of Education could provide development concerning a team management approach through the Principals Academies.

5. Approximately 25% of the respondents indicated that the assistant principalship was a career choice for them. The State Department of Education and universities should take an active role in providing development for these individuals at the state level and regionally at the university level. These agencies could further help in establishing networks for assistant principals across the State of Tennessee.

6. School systems in Tennessee may wish to study the assistant principalship within their own system and identify tasks that develop assistant principals for the principalship. In turn, the systems need to structure the position in such a way that assistant principals are exposed to the training needed to assume an upper level administrative position when called upon to assume a position.

7. Assistant principals should initiate self-improvement programs, request transfers to other school sites, or even transfer to other districts to broaden their school
experience. Becoming members of such organizations as Phi Delta Kappa, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD), National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP), and National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP) could help assistant principals keep abreast of current educational issues and provide development in educational related areas.

8. Discipline seems to be one of the tasks that consumes much of the assistant principals time. However, dealing with disciplinary situations allows the assistant principal to have contacts with other individuals and agencies concerned with student behavior. This task promotes a high visibility profile for the assistant by working with parents, community, faculty and staff. This in turn allows the assistant the opportunity to deal with different individuals, groups, or agencies and helps the assistant principal to grow professionally and build networks within the school and community.
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APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

PANEL OF EXPERTS COVER LETTER
March 10, 1998

Dear

I am working toward a Doctorate Degree at East Tennessee State University in Johnson City, Tennessee. I am requesting your assistance with this project. I am asking that you please complete the enclosed survey pertaining to assistant principals.

You were selected to complete the survey because you are considered an expert in the area of the assistant principalship. Since you have served as an assistant principal in a public school in the State of Tennessee, you have knowledge of the tasks associated with the position. This survey has been designed to identify assistant principals' actual and ideal involvement in tasks identified by the State of Tennessee as competencies for persons who are in the assistant principal's position.

After completing the survey, please return it in the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope by March 25, 1998. Please note any changes you feel would enhance the survey instrument. Your responses will be kept confidential.

I greatly appreciate you taking your valuable time to help me with this project. Your prompt reply is appreciated.

Sincerely,

Reba A. Bailey  
Assistant Principal,  
Bulls Gap School
APPENDIX B

APCI

ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL COMPETENCY INVENTORY
Please rate each of the following competencies (1-low - 7-high) in the first column on the basis of your actual situation as an assistant principal. In the second column, please rate the competencies (1-low - 7-high) on the basis of what you believe the ideal situation should be for an assistant principal within the competencies provided.

Actual situation: Your situation as it actually is within the competencies provided, according to your responsibilities either assigned or assumed.

Ideal situation: The assistant principal's situation within the following competencies as you believe it should be if ideal conditions could be met.
I. Instructional Leadership

To what extent do you establish and implement clear instructional goals and specific achievement objectives for the school by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Involving teachers in developing and implementing school instructional goals and objectives</th>
<th>Low ........ High</th>
<th>Low ........ High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Insuring that school and classroom activities are consistent with school instructional goals and objectives</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Evaluating progress toward instructional goals and objectives and making needed adjustments</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To what extent do you plan, implement, and evaluate instructional programs including learning objectives and instructional strategies by:

| 4. Working with teachers to plan, modify, and implement the instructional program consistent with student needs | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 5. Basing instructional program development on sound research and practice | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 6. Incorporating the designated state and/or system curriculum in the development of instructional programs | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 7. Developing and/or using appropriate procedures and criteria for evaluating the instructional program | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |

To what extent do you provide a Purposeful school environment conducive to learning by:

| 8. Establishing high expectations for student achievement which are directly communicated to teachers | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
| 9. Establishing clear rules and expectations for the use of time allocated to instruction | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 |
10. Supporting social and intellectual activities in the school

11. Establishing, implementing, and evaluating with teachers and students (as appropriate) codes for preventing, handling and correcting discipline problems

To what extent do you conduct an effective school program of utilization, induction, and evaluation of teachers and staff members by:

12. Reviewing and determining the utilization of personnel based on their capabilities and contributions and staffing needs as determined by school goals and objectives

13. Providing appropriate orientation and induction programs for teachers and staff members

14. Developing and/or implementing a fair, consistent, effective program of teacher evaluation

15. Establishing individual professional growth plans with teachers based on evaluation results

I. Organizational Management

To what extent do you develop and implement administrative procedures consistent with federal law, state school law, state board of education and local school board policy by:

16. Establishing, implementing, and maintaining legal and workable administrative procedures

17. Applying administrative procedures equitably and consistently

18. Seeking and/or providing clarification, as appropriate, of federal, state, and local school system policies and rule interpretations with making decisions and/or recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual situation</th>
<th>Ideal situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To what extent do you perform delegated management duties related to school fiscal operations, inventories, school plant facilities and equipment and keep records within established guidelines by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Actual Situation</th>
<th>Ideal Situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19. Developing and/or implementing a system of reporting, record keeping, written communication, and accounting</td>
<td>Low--------------High 1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>Low--------------High 1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Arranging use of shared equipment and facilities to benefit the school program</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Establishing and/or implementing procedures to improve modify, and/or make repairs of school plant facilities and equipment</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Establishing and/or maintaining safety and security arrangements for school plant facilities and equipment</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Administering school budget in accordance with system regulations and board policies and legal requirements</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Communication and Interpersonal Skills

Communication:

To what extent do you develop and utilize communication channels and manage conflict with teachers, staff, other administrators or supervisors, parents, and the community by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Actual Situation</th>
<th>Ideal Situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24. Providing for systematic, two-way communication with teachers, staff, parents, and the community</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Communicating with students, teachers, staff, parents, and other administrators</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Managing conflict with teachers, staff, parents, and other administrators/supervisors</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interpersonal Relations:

To what extent do you demonstrate respect for and work supportively with teachers, staff, and students by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual Situation</th>
<th>Ideal Situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27. Utilizing effective strategies for involving others in decision making</td>
<td>Low_________High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Demonstrating fair and equitable treatment of all teachers, staff, and students</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Considering interest and needs of teachers and staff in establishing work routines and requirements</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. Professional Growth and Leadership

Professional Growth:

To what extent do you improve your professional skills and knowledge by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual Situation</th>
<th>Ideal Situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30. Developing professional skills consistent with his/her own responsibilities and performance</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Participating in non-required professional development programs and activities</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Developing and/or using and evaluating ideas and innovative approaches to improve job performance</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Taking formal coursework related to administrative assignment or advancement</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Leadership:

To what extent do you take a leadership role in improving education by:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual Situation</th>
<th>Ideal Situation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34. Actively participating in professional organizations</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Disseminating ideas and information to other professionals</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
36. Providing leadership in identifying and solving issues and problems facing the profession. | Actual situation | Ideal Situation |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low.............High</td>
<td>Low.............High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37. Were you provided a job description when you assumed the position of assistant principal? Yes No

38. Do you believe the job description was or would have been beneficial? Yes No

Please identify any other tasks that you frequently do as an assistant principal that are not identified within the domains listed in the survey:

1. __________________________________________________________
2. __________________________________________________________
3. __________________________________________________________
4. __________________________________________________________
5. __________________________________________________________

Please provide any comments which you would like to be considered as part of this study:
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________

Providing the following information will enhance the interpretation of your responses. Please circle the number of your response.

39. Gender: 1. Male
2. Female

40. Race: 1. Caucasian
2. African American
3. Hispanic
4. Other
41. **Age:**

   1. Under 30
   2. 30 - 39
   3. 40 - 49
   4. 50 - 59
   5. 60 - 65
   6. 66 or over

42. **Years of experience as an assistant principal:**

   1. 0 - 5
   2. 6 - 10
   3. 11 - 15
   4. 16 - 20
   5. 21 - 25
   6. 25 - 30
   7. 30 or more

43. **Would you classify the school system in which you are employed as:**

   1. Rural
   2. Urban
   3. Suburban

44. **Which category best describes your school?**

   1. Elementary School
   2. Middle/Junior High School
   3. High School

45. **Your educational level:**

   1. Bachelor's Degree
   2. Master's Degree
   3. Educational Specialist Degree
   4. Doctorate Degree

46. **Is the assistant principalship a career goal for you, or do you plan to seek other positions?**

   1. Career goal
   2. I plan to seek other administrative positions.
   3. I plan to return to the classroom.
   4. Other

47. **Please indicate the general area of the State of Tennessee in which you are employed:**

   1. East Tennessee
   2. Middle Tennessee
   3. West Tennessee
April 27, 1998

Dear Colleague:

I am a fellow educator, currently employed as an assistant principal at Bulls Gap School in the Hawkins County School System. I am also a doctoral student in the Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis Department in the College of Education at East Tennessee State University in Johnson City, Tennessee.

There is a high regard for the importance of the assistant principalship within the school. The position is generally looked upon as the training ground for the principalship. The position itself however, has not been widely studied over the years.

Because you have served as an assistant principal, I am requesting that you please respond to a survey about the assistant principalship. The survey will take approximately fifteen minutes to complete. You were chosen in a random sampling of assistant principals in the State of Tennessee. This study will present findings related to assistant principals' perceptions of actual involvement and ideal involvement in administrative competencies in the State of Tennessee. In order to establish a reliable picture of assistant principals’ perceptions of these competencies, it is important that each questionnaire be completed and returned by May 22, 1998.

Your response to this questionnaire is completely confidential. The questionnaire has been numbered for mailing purposes so I may refer to a master list when the survey is returned. Your name will not be used in relation to your response. Your response and return of the survey implies consent to participate in this research project.

You may request a summary of the results of this study by writing the phrase “copy of results” on the return envelope. Please include your name and address along with the request. Please do not list this information on the questionnaire.

If you have any questions regarding this study, please write, call, or reach me by e-mail at your convenience.

I am personally grateful for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Reba A. Bailey
Dear Colleague:

I am a fellow educator, currently employed as an assistant principal at Bulls Gap School in the Hawkins County School System. I am also a doctoral student in the Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis Department in the College of Education at East Tennessee State University in Johnson City, Tennessee. To complete my studies, I am surveying individuals who are currently serving or have served as an assistant principal in the State of Tennessee within the last couple of years.

Recently, I sent you a letter requesting your response to a survey regarding your views of the assistant principalship in Tennessee. As a fellow administrator, I realize the busy schedule you face in your daily activities. I personally know that many added events occur at the end of the year, and time that is already limited becomes even more restricted and valuable. I also know that it may have been difficult for you to take time to sit down and complete the survey, or maybe the survey was misplaced during this hectic time. It is for these reasons that I am sending you another copy of the survey and respectfully requesting that you please take fifteen minutes of your time to complete the questionnaire about the responsibilities associated with the position. Your views concerning the assistant principalship are important, and I very much would like to include them in this study. The assistant principalship is one area of school administration that has not been widely studied over the years. I would greatly appreciate you filling out the survey and returning it by Tuesday, June 23, 1998. Your willingness to respond to the survey will strongly enhance this research project. As you may expect, I am very anxious to complete this part of my program, and your assistance is appreciated very much.

Your response to the survey is completely confidential. The questionnaires have been numbered so names and addresses can be deleted from the master list as surveys are returned. Your name will never be used in connection to your response.

You may receive a summary of the results of this study by writing "copy of results" on the return envelope. Please include your name and address as well. Please do not include this information on the questionnaire.

If you have any questions concerning this study, please do not hesitate to contact me at your convenience. You may write, call, or contact me through my e-mail address.

I am personally grateful for your assistance with this study.

Sincerely,

Reba A. Bailey
VITA

REBA A. BAILEY

Personal Data:  
Date of Birth:  February 2, 1959  
Place of Birth:  Kingsport, Tennessee  
Marital Status:  Single

Education:  
Public Schools, Hawkins County, Tennessee  
East Tennessee State University,  
Johnson City, Tennessee, B.S., 1980  
East Tennessee State University,  
Johnson City, Tennessee, M.Ed., 1988  
East Tennessee State University,  
Johnson City, Tennessee, Ed.S., 1991  
East Tennessee State University,  
Johnson City, Tennessee, Ed.D., 1998

Professional Experience:  
Teacher, Hawkins County Schools; Tennessee  
1981-1992  
Assistant Principal, Hawkins County Schools, Tennessee  
1992 - Present

Professional Memberships:  
Phi Delta Kappa  
Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development  
Hawkins County Education Association  
Tennessee Education Association  
National Education Association