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The purpose of this study was to determine if Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III Tennessee Elementary Principals perceived differently their role as instructional leaders. The amount of time principals spent in six identified dimensions of instructional leadership was examined. The study examined selected independent variables, such as, grade level configuration of the school, years of experience as a principal, number of years of classroom experience, and gender for any effect on the Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals' perceptions of their instructional leadership role.

The research design included three research questions with 16 null hypotheses testing for differences among Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals' perceptions of their instructional leadership role. Data were obtained using the Instructional Leadership Survey of Elementary School Principals, a 48-item instrument, administered to 125 elementary principals in the First Tennessee Development District. Both Career Ladder I and Career Ladder III elementary principals indicated significantly greater importance than Career Ladder II elementary principals in their perceptions of their instructional leadership role in the instructional leadership dimensions of observing teachers and classrooms, evaluating and supervising teachers, instructional problem-solving, and planning and developing instructional programs. Female principals indicated greater importance than did male principals in their perceptions of their instructional leadership role in all six identified dimensions of instructional leadership.
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CHAPTER 1
Introduction

The past decade was characterized by change as a variety of reform movements swept American education. Numerous reports from national commissions served to focus public attention toward the effectiveness of the nation's schools. One such report, *A Nation at Risk*, suggested that the schools were lagging behind those of other countries with resultanty decreased quality for students. The National Commission reported the presence of mediocrity in the schools that posed a threat to the nation's future (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983).

In response to the reports, many legislators, educators, and industrial leaders assumed a position that the educational system in the United States had to be improved. Numerous policymakers focused attention on solutions that were hastily implemented. The citizens of America were concerned about the plight of education. Although various changes were implemented in the nation's schools since the issuance of *A Nation at Risk*, America's populace continued to be concerned about the quality of education (Kosoy, 1993).
The United States Department of Education recently published national education goals for the public schools of America. *America 2000* (U.S. Department of Education, 1991) reported that America's educational performance must be unequaled in the 21st century. Education was cited as being essential to the quality of life and to America's international competitiveness.

With the thrust for national education goals in the 1990s, educators and policymakers continued to seek ways to improve schools. After a decade of regulations, controls, and mandates, a view that strong administrative leadership was important surfaced in the effective schools research (Burlingame, 1987). Although the elements associated with effective schools had been recognized earlier, the research enabled educators to plan for manageable, relevant courses of action for the schools (Renihan, Renihan, & Waldron, 1986). Characteristics identified as being associated with school effectiveness emerged consistently throughout the literature including clear school goals, rigorous academic standards, order and discipline, homework, strong leadership by the principal, teacher participation in decision-making, parental support and cooperation, and high expectations for student performance (Chubb & Moe, 1990).
The effective schools research highlighted instructional leadership by the principal as a key to improving schools (Manasse, 1982; Purkey & Smith, 1983; Clark, Lotto, & Astuto, 1984). Many state lawmakers, policymakers, and educators used the results of the effective schools research to prepare plans for educational change. In 1984 the Tennessee General Assembly passed the Comprehensive Education Reform Act that included a Career Ladder Program for Administrators to identify and monetarily reward school principals for outstanding performance in leading their schools (French, 1984; Achilles, Payne, & Lansford, 1986). Further emphasis was placed on the principal as instructional leader in Section 49-2-303 of the Tennessee Code Annotated (1990):

It is the duty of the principal to

(1) Supervise the operation and management of the personnel and facilities of the school or schools of which he [sic he/she] is principal as the local board of education shall determine.

(2) Assume administrative responsibility and instructional leadership under the supervision of the superintendent and in accordance with the written policies of the local board of education for the planning, management, operation, and
evaluation of the education program of the schools to which assigned. (p. 66)

The directive for principals in Tennessee Code Annotated emphasized the importance that policymakers in Tennessee placed on the role of instructional leadership in the schools. How much importance do Tennessee principals give to instructional leadership? How much time do they spend in their role as instructional leaders?

This study assessed the perceived level of importance that Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III Tennessee Principals gave to their role as instructional leaders. The amount of time principals spent in six identified dimensions of instructional leadership was examined. The identified dimensions of instructional leadership for this study were (1) establishing positive school climate, (2) observing teachers and classrooms, (3) evaluating and supervising teachers, (4) implementing curriculum, (5) instructional problem-solving, and (6) planning and developing instructional programs.

The results of the research provided the Tennessee Department of Education, the State Board of Education, and local school districts with insights into the role of instructional leadership as perceived by Career
Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals. The results of the study also assisted Tennessee school districts by providing information to define instructional leadership and to identify specifically the dimensions that were important to the instructional leadership role of the principal.

Statement of the Problem

Much money and effort have been expended establishing Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III levels regarding the instructional leadership role of elementary principals. It is not known if there are differences in the perceptions of principals who have attained these levels.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to determine if Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III Tennessee Elementary Principals perceived differently their role as instructional leaders.

Research Questions

1. Do Career Ladder I, Career II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals differ in the perceptions of their role as that of an instructional
leader based on the six identified dimensions of instructional leadership?

2. Do Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals spend time daily in the six identified dimensions of instructional leadership?

3. Will the Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals' perceptions of their instructional leadership role differ when the following independent variables are taken into consideration?

   A. Grade level configuration of the school
   B. Years of experience as a principal
   C. Number of years of classroom experience
   D. Gender

**Null Hypotheses**

The following hypotheses, stated in the null form, will be tested at the .05 level of significance.

1. There will be no significant difference among Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals regarding their perceptions of the instructional leadership role in the dimension of establishing positive school climate.
2. There will be no significant difference among Career Ladder I, Career II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals regarding their perceptions of the instructional leadership role in the dimension of observing teachers and classrooms.

3. There will be no significant difference among Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals regarding their perceptions of the instructional leadership role in the dimension of evaluating and supervising teachers.

4. There will be no significant difference among Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals regarding their perceptions of the instructional leadership role in the dimension of implementing curriculum.

5. There will be no significant difference among Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals regarding their perceptions of the instructional leadership role in the dimension of instructional problem-solving.

6. There will be no significant difference among Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals regarding their perceptions of their instructional leadership role in the dimension of planning and developing instructional programs.
7. There will be no significant difference among Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals regarding their perceptions of the estimated amount of time spent daily in the identified instructional leadership dimension of establishing positive school climate.

8. Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals will not differ significantly regarding their perceptions of the estimated amount of time spent daily in the identified instructional leadership dimension of observing teachers and classrooms.

9. There will be no significant difference among Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals regarding their perceptions of the estimated amount of time spent daily in the identified instructional leadership dimension of evaluating and supervising teachers.

10. Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals will not differ significantly regarding their perceptions of the estimated amount of time spent daily in the identified instructional leadership dimension of implementing curriculum.
11. There will be no significant difference among Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals regarding their perceptions of the estimated amount of time spent daily in the identified instructional leadership dimension of instructional problem-solving.

12. Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals will not differ significantly regarding their perceptions of the estimated amount of time spent daily in the identified instructional leadership dimension of planning and developing instructional programs.

13. There will be no significant difference among Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals regarding their perceptions of their instructional leadership role in the six identified dimensions of instructional leadership based on the grade level configuration of the school.

14. There will be no significant difference among Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals regarding their perceptions of their instructional leadership role in the six identified dimensions of instructional leadership based on the number of years served as a principal.
15. There will be no significant difference among Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals regarding their perceptions of their instructional leadership role in the six identified dimensions of instructional leadership based on the number of years of classroom experiences.

16. There will be no significant difference among Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals regarding their perceptions of their instructional leadership role in the six identified dimensions of instructional leadership based on gender.

Significance of the Study

An examination of how principals perceive their role as instructional leaders had implications for study. In 1984 the Tennessee General Assembly passed the Comprehensive Education Reform Act that included a Career Ladder Program for Administrators. The program included an evaluation system to identify and reward monetarily school principals for outstanding performance. Much time and money went into the development and implementation of the evaluation system. If no differences existed between the perceptions of Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and
Career Ladder III principals regarding their role as instructional leaders, consideration should be given to re-examine the evaluation system for identifying and rewarding school principals.

The results of this study should provide planning information for local and state education agencies regarding perceptions of Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III Tennessee Elementary Principals about their role as instructional leaders.

**Limitations**

1. The dimensions of instructional leadership were limited to those surveyed by the Instructional Leadership Survey of Elementary School Principals.

2. The participants in the study were limited to Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III Tennessee Principals in public elementary schools in the 17 school systems of the First Tennessee Regional Development District of the Tennessee Department of Education.

3. The results of this study, conducted in the First Tennessee Regional Development District, were not necessarily an accurate representation of conditions elsewhere.
Definitions

Perception

Perception is the awareness and understanding that principals have regarding their role as instructional leaders.

Principal

The principal of the school was responsible for the overall leadership and management of the facility, personnel, and students. The principal was responsible for carrying out the policies, procedures, and programs established by the state and the local board of education. The principal works with faculty, staff, students, parents, and community leaders to create appropriate conditions for learning (State Board of Education, 1991). Kimbrough and Burkett (1990) further defined the principal's leadership role "as the force that motivates people to do things they would not ordinarily do" (p. 31).

Career Ladder I Principal

A Career Ladder I Principal must have completed one year of service as an administrator. To obtain a Career Ladder I certificate, a principal must complete the local evaluation process and meet certification requirements. A Career Ladder I principal will work a 10-month contract and receive a state salary supplement.
of $1,000. Certificates, valid for 10 years, are renewable pending satisfactory local evaluation and attendance at the Tennessee Academy for School Leaders every five years (Career Ladder Administrator/Supervisor Orientation Manual 1992-93, p. 7).

Career Ladder II Principal

A Career Ladder II Principal must have two years minimum experience as an administrator. In the third year or thereafter, the state evaluation process must be completed. A Career Ladder II Principal will work an 11-month contract and receive a state salary supplement of $2200 for outstanding performance. A Career Ladder II principal will perform the regular duties assigned by the local board of education and other extended contract duties designated and approved by the local board of education. Career Ladder II certificates are renewable pending completion of satisfactory local evaluation and attendance at the Tennessee Academy for School Leaders every five years (Career Ladder Administrator/Supervisor Orientation Manual, 1992-93, p.7).

Career Ladder III Principal

A Career Ladder III Principal must have a minimum of four years experience as an administrator. In the
fifth year or thereafter, the state evaluation process must be completed. A Career Ladder III Principal will work a 12-month contract and receive a state salary supplement of $3600 for outstanding performance. A Career Ladder III administrator will perform the regular duties assigned by the local board of education and other extended contract duties approved by the local school system. Career Ladder III certificates are renewable pending a satisfactory state evaluation and attendance at the Tennessee Academy for School Leaders every five years (Career Ladder Administrator/Supervisor Orientation Manual, 1992-93, p. 7).

School Climate

A school's climate is defined as the atmosphere for learning. The climate encompasses the feelings people have about the school and whether it is a place where learning can occur. A positive climate creates conditions where the staff and students want to spend substantial amounts of their time (Howard, Howell, & Brainard, 1987).

Instructional Leadership

Instructional leadership, an important role of the principal, involves improving instruction and the teaching/learning environment. As instructional
leader, the principal is accountable for the academic achievement of students.

The principal guides the academic program of a school by emphasizing the curriculum; by assessing the performance of teachers and assisting them to improve; and by communicating expectations of policies, discipline, academic achievement, and culture of the school. The principal serves as a catalyst in building a positive school climate. Instructional leadership is the involvement of the principal relative to program development, analysis of curriculum content or instructional methods, instructional outcomes, staff development, use of effective schools research, assessing teaching-learning situations, and suggesting ways of improving them. The principal, as instructional leader, has a vital role in guiding the staff toward common goals and promoting collegiality (Honig, 1987).

**Effective Schools**

Effective schools are those characterized by strong building-level leadership, an orderly environment, clear goals, high expectations and standards, and frequent monitoring of student progress (Edmonds, 1979). Effective schools result from activities of effective principals (Hughes & Ubben,
1989). The effective school has a principal who is an instructional leader, who has established a positive school climate, and who has a faculty committed to teaching (Calabrese, 1986).

**Procedures**

The following procedures were followed in conducting this study:

1. A review of the current literature was conducted.

2. An appropriate instrument was developed for the assessment of the perceptions of Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals regarding their instructional leadership role.

3. A pilot study was conducted.

4. The final survey was developed from the preliminary survey instrument and the results of the pilot study.

5. The survey was administered to Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III principals in the First Tennessee Regional Development District of the Tennessee Department of Education in December 1993.

6. Data from the surveys were interpreted and analyzed using the Mann-Whitney U test and the Kruskal-
Wallis Analysis of Variance, SPSS/PC+ for the Social Sciences (SPSS, 1992).

7. Null hypotheses were tested and the results of the study were compiled.

8. Summaries, conclusions, and recommendations were presented.

Organization of the Study

This study was organized into five chapters. Chapter 1 contained the introduction, statement of the problem, purpose of the study, research questions, hypotheses, significance of the study, limitations of the study, definitions, and organization of the study.

Chapter 2 provided a review of literature and research relevant to the problem statement.

Chapter 3 described the methodology and procedures used in the study to obtain the relevant data.

Chapter 4 contained the data analysis.

Chapter 5 included the summary, findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the study.
CHAPTER 2
Review of the Literature

This chapter provided a review of the literature relevant to the role of the principal as an instructional leader. This chapter was divided into five sections: Historical Perspectives of the Principal in Instructional Leadership, Effective Schools Research, The Principal as Instructional Leader, Instructional Leadership in Tennessee, and Summary.

Historical Perspectives of the Principal in Instructional Leadership

The earliest image of leadership in the elementary school centered around the teacher/principal. The teacher/principal model was prevalent during the 200 years from the settling of the American colonies to the middle of the 19th century. The proprietors of the schools and the private tutors had complete authority regarding the content and instructional methods to be offered to the students. The only authority given to the teacher/principal was that of teaching. This view of administration persisted long after the colonies began enacting compulsory attendance laws and setting
up external agencies to control the schools (Hencley, McCleary, & McGrath, 1970).

The establishment of the Boston Quincy School in 1847 provided the setting for a change in the administrator's role by having a principal lead the staff. Prior to 1838, in Cincinnati, all school departments were placed under a single, formal head. Although the assignment of a principal was progress, the transition from the traditional image was slow to materialize (Pierce, 1935).

During the 19th century, the role of the principal evolved as a formal position in the structure of American education. The educational system became more complex as urban populations grew. The need for administrators at each building site grew as the one-room school became overcrowded. The early building level administrators were considered "master teachers" or "principal teachers." The principal's role was that of instructor with some administrative responsibilities. The principal's role continued to evolve to be that of an administrator. As the teaching duties were removed, the principal's role as a supervisor was also enhanced (Knezevich, 1984; Howell, 1983).
The principal, originally viewed as a master teacher, was a person to help teachers with teaching. The demands brought by teachers severed the bonds between principals and teachers. As a result, the role of the principal became that of an organizational manager (Medwid, 1982).

Pierce (1935) and Hencley et al. (1970) cited other forces in the development of the public elementary school principalship including the grading of the elementary schools and the establishment of specialized departments of the National Education Association concerned with elementary school administration. Grading of the elementary schools in larger cities was taking place in 1860; however, less than one-sixth of the population lived in cities. Most of the children in America continued to be educated in ungraded, one-room schools under the direction of a teacher/principal (Edwards & Richey, 1963).

As attention was focused on efficient organizations between 1920 and 1950, a leader image centered around organizational structure emerged. The task of the leader was to specify the nature and form of relationships within the organization that would serve its purpose. The leader became concerned with the uses of authority. Job descriptions,
organizational charts, devices such as departmentalization and decentralization helped the leader to keep the organization functioning smoothly (Gulick, 1937).

The National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP) began issuing profiles of the elementary school principal in 1928, updating them every 10 years. In 1978, only 5% of all principals were teaching principals (Knezevich, 1984).

Although the principalship existed for approximately a century and a half, the role of the principal continued to lack a clear, concise definition. Georgiades (1980) summed up the existing status of the principalship when he wrote:

Perhaps part of the tenuous nature of the principalship lies in its historical origins. In the past the principal was to accomplish established goals through the utilization of established means. The best principal was the one who not only adhered to established procedures, but who made others do likewise. However, society is no longer content with the caretaker principal. Rather, it demands a principal who exercises instructional leadership which utilizes established goals.
and assists staff in developing new goals as part of the renewal process. (p. 5)

Role expectations of the principal experienced significant, radical changes in recent years. Factors such as teacher militancy, tight budgets, student activism, declining test scores and enrollment, and an increased attempt to hold school administrators accountable for their schools brought contradictory feelings and uncertainty to the role of principal.

Principals in the 1960s were viewed as managers with time and attention given to discipline, scheduling, the physical plant, reports, busing, extracurricular activities, and other functions not directly related to instruction. The principalship experienced major changes in the 1980s. Principals devoted additional time to the evaluation of teachers, to the planning of in-service training, and to serving as instructional leaders. Accountability became a key word in public schools (Pulliam, 1987).

The ideas espoused by business and industry were embraced by the principalship during the 1980s. Peters and Waterman (1982) concluded that excellent organizations had profound respect for individual workers and stimulated exceptional effort by ordinary people. University programs were tapped to deal
effectively with multiple changes in the democratic system of education through enhanced training for school principals. The role of the principal encompassed themes of accountability, organizational climate, managing change for excellence, collective negotiations with teachers, emphasis on ethical values, and maintaining order and discipline in the schools.

Today, the school principal is recognized by many people as the most important, most influential, and most powerful person in the school. The role of the principal makes a difference. The principal is the person responsible for all the activities occurring in and around the school campus. The leadership of the principal sets the tone of the school, the climate for learning, the level of professionalism and morale for teachers, and the level of concern for student success. The principal serves as a link between school and community in shaping attitudes of students and parents about the school (Weldy, 1979).

American education saw the evolution of the principalship from the perspective of a master teacher to the view that the principal was the instructional leader of the school. Conant (1960) summarized the importance of the principal when he wrote, "The difference between a good school and a poor school is
often the difference between a good and poor principal" (p. 37).

**Effective Schools Research**

The emergence of the principal as the school's instructional leader was directly attributed to the effective schools research. With the advent of the educational reform movement of the 1980s, the effective schools research findings were quickly seized by policymakers, district administrators, and leadership trainers in focusing on the role of the principal as coordinator, developer, and controller of instruction. The research findings related to the leadership role of the principal were powerful in the influence on shaping expectations for principals as instructional leaders for their schools (Hallinger & Murphy, 1986).

School effectiveness became a matter of national concern following the publication of *A Nation At Risk* in which the National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983) suggested that schools in the United States were lagging behind those of other industrialized countries. An important result of the effective schools research and the reform movement that followed the publication of *A Nation At Risk* was the emergence of school principals in leading the effort to
make schools more effective (Walberg, 1983; Purkey & Smith, 1983; MacKenzie, 1983).

The literature revealed high level relationship between a healthy organizational climate as promoted by the principal and school effectiveness (Young, 1980; Licata, Willower, & Ellett, 1978). Strong administrative leadership in instruction was associated with student academic success (Weber, 1971; New York State Study, 1976). Other studies cited the relationship between direct principal involvement and interest in instruction and student achievement (Edmonds, 1979; Brookover & Lezotte, 1979; Brookover & Schneider, 1975; Young, 1980). Community-school relationships as enhanced by the principal led to more effective schools (Breckenridge, 1976).

Smith and Andrews (1989) reported that collectively the effective schools literature recognized the school principal as being directly responsible for improving instruction. Dwyer, Barnett, & Lee (1987) concluded that "the principal is the vital actor in the school setting who can bridge context and school, policy and program, means and ends." (p. 45) The effective schools researchers promoted the adage: effective principal, effective school.

Barth (1989) reported that "the success of a school depends
on interactions between teacher and teacher, teacher and administrator, and all school staff and parent." (p. 228) The school principal was the key person to influence these relationships. In an earlier study, Barth (1980) contended that principals should consider a major role to be the creator of supportive environments in which teachers want to work.

Bell (1993) predicted that the next decade will require dynamic leadership at the building level to carry out school improvement initiatives. The influence of the principal on the effectiveness of a school was strong. Krug (1992) reported that in the elementary school years "as much as 25% of the variance in student achievement can be attributed to effective school leadership and the learning climate that school leaders shape and nurture." (p. 441)

Agreement by administrators and teachers relative to curriculum and discipline was correlated with higher academic achievement (Rutter, Maughan, Mortimore, Ouston, & Smith 1979). Smith and Andrews (1989) wrote that the principal as an instructional leader (1) provided the necessary resources to achieve goals; (2) had knowledge and skill in curriculum so that teachers interact to improve instruction; (3) was a skilled communicator; and (4) was a visionary who
created a visible presence for everyone associated with the school concerning what the school was all about.

Webster (1992) found that school principals viewed themselves as leaders, although differences in exercising that leadership were noted. Two categories of principals were identified: (1) the visible leader and (2) the catalyst and supporter who worked behind the scenes. The visible leader worked directly with teachers and students while the catalyst worked through an assistant principal to be informed about curriculum and instruction.

Good and Brophy (1984) wrote that school effectiveness could be more quickly achieved if the principal became an instructional leader who understood classroom observation and staff evaluation. The effective principal focused on student responses when observing the classroom in an effort to extract more meaningful evaluations. The principal was cited as a key figure in improvement of instruction.

Sweeney (1982) wrote that principals in effective schools "dropped in" on classrooms frequently, organized teacher effectiveness training, held meetings with teachers to discuss students' achievement, presented in-service sessions and workshops for teachers, and supported teacher attendance and
participation in seminars and workshops. The literature consistently presented the principal in an effective school as being involved in the activities of the school.

Major contributors to the early effective schools research, Edmonds and Fredericksen (1978) found in studies involving 20 elementary schools in Detroit that school leadership made a difference. Results of these studies indicated that effective schools were characterized by leaders who:

1. Promoted an orderly environment;
2. Frequently monitored pupil progress;
3. Ensured that the staff was instructionally effective for all students;
4. Defined clearly stated goals and objectives for learning;
5. Developed and communicated a plan to deal with mathematics and reading problems; and
6. Demonstrated strong leadership with a combination of management and instructional leadership skills.

The research on effective schools and principals suggested that effective principals were more instructionally powerful than their colleagues and were
more active in decisions on curriculum and instruction (Wellisch, McQueen, Carriere, & Duck, 1987).

Dwyer (1987), as project director of the instructional management program at Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development in San Francisco, sought to determine what successful principals did, day in and day out, to develop and maintain effective instructional programs. Forty-two principals who were nominated by fellow administrators as successful instructional leaders were interviewed extensively by Dwyer and associates. For approximately 2000 hours, the researchers collaborated with 17 of the principals who varied by gender, age, ethnicity, and experience. Researchers observed the principals' activities, looked for consequences of their actions on teachers and on students, around their schools and in classrooms. The school settings were varied: urban, rural, large, small, poor, affluent. Dwyer found:

No single image or simple formula for successful instructional leadership existed. Principals were engaged in effective, routine acts. Their successes hinged on their capacity to connect these routine activities to their overarching perspectives of the contexts of their schools and their
aspirations for their students. These principals assessed their environments, knew their limitations and strengths, and understood the kinds of programs and outcomes they desired for students. They not only saw themselves as pivotal points around which these elements turned, but they believed in their ability to influence each of those parts. (p. 33)

In an attempt to elaborate on how principals contribute to effective instruction, a study pointed out the importance of providing consistent standards and expectations for teachers. Despite the need and desire for autonomy, "teachers need the backbone of organizational policy to sustain their efforts . . . with new strategies" (Duckworth & Carnine, 1983).

A 1981 study by Zerchykov cited administrative leadership, an orderly school, frequent monitoring of student progress, redirection of resources toward basic instruction, a good atmosphere, stress on basic skills, and realistic instructional expectations as factors creating school effectiveness (Pulliam, 1987).

The Connecticut School Effectiveness Project of 1982 reported instructional leadership by a principal who understood and applied the characteristics of instructional effectiveness as one of seven measures of
good schools. The other measures were a safe, orderly environment; a clear school mission; a climate of high expectations; high time on task; frequent monitoring of student progress; and positive home-school relations (Pulliam, 1987).

Krug (1992) summed up the important role of the principal when he wrote,

One of the most consistent characteristics that distinguished these 'effective schools' was the pivotal role played by the principals of effective schools. That is, the quality of leadership provided in these schools appeared to be the critical factor in explaining why they succeeded where others failed. (p. 430)

The effective schools research provided valuable information to educators regarding school improvement, especially in the area of leadership by the principal. Since the primary service offered by schools was instruction, effective school principals had to be aware of the special needs of the instructional areas. The principal's role was to provide leadership needed for teachers and staff to carry out the mission of the school. Without a clear understanding of the
constructs linking the influence of the principal's commitment to school curriculum, the process of school improvement and the search for quality in the classrooms were to remain elusive.

The Principal as Instructional Leader

The rebirth of the principal as the instructional leader of a school was directly attributed to the effective schools research. The release of the results of the effective schools research brought focus to the principal's role in coordinating, developing, and controlling instruction. Although the effective schools literature identified strong instructional leadership as a necessary factor for effective schools, little direction was given as to the behaviors of a strong instructional leader. Earlier studies (Madden, Lawson, & Sweet, 1977; Wellisch, 1987) generally concentrated on specific facets of instructional leadership such as personal traits, management behaviors, or organizational contexts. Current research tended to address interrelationships among the factors. De Bevoise (1984) predicted that future research must focus on clearly defining the behaviors that constitute principal functions as instructional leaders.
What is instructional leadership? Broadly defined, the concept of instructional leadership encompassed those actions taken by a principal, or delegated to others, to promote growth in student learning (De Bevoise, 1984). Krug (1992) described instructional leadership as "the process by which the actions of people within a social organization are guided toward the realization of specific goals" (p. 430).

Felder (1982) defined instructional leaders as individuals who demonstrated the following behaviors:

1. Helped people in the school and community define their instructional goals and objectives.
2. Targeted the development of effectiveness in teaching.
3. Built a productive organizational unit.
4. Created a climate for teacher growth and leadership.
5. Provided adequate resources for teaching (p. 3).

Lortie described the role of the principal as residuum, composed of tasks assigned to no one else. The principal's leadership role, never adequately defined, evolved as an accumulation of tasks teachers were unable or unwilling to perform. The principal's
role of instructional leader had be defined to be taken seriously (De Bevoise, 1984).

Greenfield (1987) recognized the complexity of defining instructional leadership when he wrote that instructional leadership referred to "actions undertaken with the intention of developing a productive and satisfying working environment for teachers and desirable learning conditions and outcomes for children" (p.60).

Controversy existed in the literature as to whether principals were managers or instructional leaders. Effective schools required managers competent in maintenance functions to ensure positive school climates. The building had to operate smoothly; activities had to be coordinated; students and teachers had to feel safe. At the same time, teachers in effective schools required instructional leaders who supported and encouraged their professional development. Both maintenance and development were identified as essential elements for effective schools. Usually, the dual roles were duties of the building level principal. The effective principal was expected to keep a school operating smoothly. The literature suggested that now the principal had to spend additional time as instructional leader visiting
classrooms and working cooperatively with teachers (Rallis & Highsmith, 1986).

Following the school effectiveness research came efforts to specify and validate the exact nature of leadership behaviors associated with high levels of student achievement. The method used to conceptualize instructional leadership was for researchers to review school effectiveness research and identify the frequently mentioned characteristics of principals in effective schools. Lists of these characteristics were used to generate items for rating scales or surveys of instructional leadership. The instruments were administered to teachers and school administrators and further refined. The results of the studies provided reasonably valid and reliable tools for measuring the extent to which school leaders exhibit instructional leadership characteristics (Duke, 1987).

Hallinger, Murphy, Weil, Mesa, and Metman (1983) identified the following broad areas of instructional leadership skills associated with effective school principals:

1. Defined the mission;
2. Managed curriculum and instruction; and
3. Promoted school climates.
Jackson, Logsdon, and Taylor (1983) posited four items related to school leadership based on their research. The effective instructional leader:

1. Established school goals and standards;
2. Established positive school climate and expectations for success;
3. Established curriculum and instruction that emphasized the basic skills; and
4. Established coordination linkages and parent-community support.

Results of the study conducted by Jackson, Logsdon, and Taylor (1983) indicated that in effective schools, the principal was likely to be found throughout the building interacting with the students. The principal assisted teachers in problem-solving, provided constructive feedback after classroom observations, and gave students recognition for achievement (p. 77).

One of the earliest attempts to study exceptional principals was made by Blumberg and Greenfield (1980). Eight principals, identified as exceptionally effective, were studied using open-ended interviews to determine commonalities. The researchers identified the following common characteristics for all or most of the eight principals:
1. Principals were highly goal-oriented and had a keen sense of goal clarity.

2. Principals were characterized by a high degree of knowing themselves, their capabilities, and what they were about.

3. Principals displayed a high tolerance for ambiguity.

4. Principals tended to test the limits of both the interpersonal and organizational systems they encountered.

5. Principals were sensitive to the dynamics of power.

6. Principals approached problem situations from a highly analytical perspective.

7. Principals behaved in ways that enabled them to be in charge of the job and not let the job be in charge of them (p. 246-249).

Instructional leaders had significant influence on student opportunities to learn in the classroom. Scheduling students into classes and protecting learning time were identified as two areas where instructional leaders had impact on curricular outcomes. Effective principals also influenced learning in the classroom when they took seriously the employment of teachers. The investment of time and
energy in carefully searching for teachers competent in curriculum and instruction was cited as important in effective schools. Donmoyer and Wagstaff (1990) wrote that "one of the most direct ways a principal influences instruction is by hiring teachers who deliver it" (p. 23).

Heck, Larsen, and Marcoulides (1990) found that effective school principals supported the faculty, pressed for performance, and were active in the organizational life of the school. An earlier study suggested that the number of elementary principals assisting teachers in improving instructional programs was small (Leithwood, Ross, Montgomery, & Maynes, 1978). According to Leithwood and Montgomery (1982), "Effective principals place the achievement and happiness of students first in their priorities" (p. 320).

Throughout the literature, a recurring theme appeared. A characteristic that continually was associated with effective schools and strong instructional leadership was the level of expectation teachers and administrators held for each other and for students. The research clearly described the high-achieving school as one where school personnel demonstrated attitudes of confidence that students were
capable of succeeding academically. Researchers noted an existing relationship between academic emphasis and student performance (Edmonds, 1979; Weber, 1971; Brookover & Lezotte, 1979).

Agreement by administrators and teachers relative to curriculum and discipline was correlated with higher academic achievement (Rutter, Maughan, Mortimore, Ouston, & Smith, 1979). Smith and Andrews (1988) wrote that the principal as an instructional leader (1) provided the necessary resources to achieve academic goals; (2) had knowledge and skill in curriculum so that teachers interacted to improve instruction; (3) was a skilled communicator; and (4) was a visionary who created a visible presence for everyone associated with the school concerning what the school was all about.

Public schools accepted the challenge of mandates targeting rigorous curriculum and effective instructional methods to ensure successful learning for all students. The challenges were brought together for implementation by the instructional leader of the school. As the national impetus for public policy to monitor quality continued, the burden for accountability was left to the school principal (Blome & James, 1985).
Georgiades (1980) wrote, "A school is but a reflection of the shadow of its principal" (p. 5). In an era of increasing administrative responsibilities, providing instructional leadership became one of the greatest challenges facing the principal. If schools existed for students, the challenge was to grow and renew constantly in the process of change. If the instructional program were to be designed to provide the necessary thrust for the 21st century, the reflections of the shadow of the school principal must focus on an individual who can motivate people to change, renew, and grow.

Effective instructional leadership was impossible to legislate since it involved what principals did and said. Principals who were directly involved with instruction, made frequent classroom observations, offered alternatives to unsuccessful classroom situations, and were active participants in the school's educational processes were considered effective instructional leaders. The effective principals exhibited three common characteristics including communicating and maintaining reasonable expectations to the staff, conducting frequent and substantive classroom observations, and actively
participating in the instructional program (Gibbs, 1989).

Excellence in schools occurred when instructional leaders challenged students and staff to take risks, to do their best, to be recognized for their teamwork, and to be rewarded for the quality of the work. An effective school resulted when instructional leaders encouraged exploration, innovation, and unique ideas. Leaders had a passion for excellence and were capable of instilling that spirit in others.

Local school districts, state departments of education, and instructional leaders continued to be challenged to develop job descriptions that provided clear direction for principal behavior. The descriptions had to be specific enough to guide principals in setting priorities, yet broad enough to allow them to determine how to implement those priorities given variations in the schools and communities in which they operated (Chase & Kane, 1983, p. 3).

**Instructional Leadership in Tennessee**

Effective schools literature revealed that strong instructional leadership was identified with schools where students were succeeding. The research made a
strong statement regarding the importance of the principal in making a school a positive place for students to learn. Today's schools and the schools for the 21st century require that principals be strong instructional leaders. The emergence of public accountability in the schools forced local school districts, state departments of education, state boards of education, local boards of education, and individual administrators to examine the role of the building level administrator.

The reform movement of the 1980s had direct impact on the educational system of Tennessee's public schools. The Comprehensive Education Reform Act of 1984 created a Career Ladder Program for Administrators. Principals were recognized for their success in leading schools through the attainment of Career Ladder III. According to the Career Ladder Administrator/Supervisor Orientation Manual (1992-93), the program was based on several assumptions and principles.

1. The primary goal of the Career Ladder Evaluation Program was to identify and reward outstanding administrator and supervisor performance.
2. Another important goal of the evaluation program was to improve instructional programs and instructional support systems.

3. A sound evaluation program focused on performance rather than credentials.

4. To be most useful, the evaluation program had to be coupled with a strong professional development program (p. 5).

Administrators were evaluated on five domains of competence: (1) instructional leadership; (2) organizational management; (3) communication and interpersonal relations; (4) professional growth and leadership; and (5) basic communication skills (Career Ladder Administrator/Supervisor Orientation Manual, 1992-93, p. 11).

In an effort to improve the instructional leadership skills of principals, the Comprehensive Education Reform Act of 1984, passed by the Tennessee legislature, created the Principals' Administrator Academy. The academy, to be conducted at several sites in the three grand divisions of the state, was operated under the auspices of the Tennessee Department of Education.

The academy, to be attended by each principal administrator at least once every five years, had the
following purposes and duties as defined by the 
Tennessee Code Annotated 49-5-5702:

1. Training opportunities for principals were made available. The purpose of the academy was to instill and reinforce instructional leadership for educational effectiveness.

2. Training in evaluation techniques and procedures was provided.

3. With the approval of the commissioner of education, department staff, university personnel considered to be experts, exceptional school practitioners, professional associations, and others provided training activities.

4. Summer institutes for school principals and administrators were provided at several sites throughout the state. (p. 284)

School principals in the state of Tennessee were provided with opportunities to build and strengthen their instructional leadership skills through their attendance at academies. Through attendance at the academies, principals obtained training in becoming instructional leaders for the 21st century.

School principals in Tennessee were given a directive presented in Section 49-2-303 of the Tennessee Code Annotated (1990):
It is the duty of the principal to:

(1) Supervise the operation and management of the personnel and facilities of the school or schools of which he [sic he/she] is principal as the local board of education shall determine.

(2) Assume administrative responsibility and instructional leadership under the supervision of the superintendent and in accordance with the written policies of the local board of education for the planning, management, operation, and evaluation of the education program of the schools to which assigned. (p. 66)

The directive clearly stated the importance that policymakers placed on the role of instructional leadership in the schools. The school principal was charged with the responsibility of providing instructional leadership. The role responsibilities of the principal continued to escalate in increasing student test scores, in supervising instruction in the classroom, and in evaluating teachers. Although the position of principal continued to be a complex one in terms of role identification, attempts to focus on
instructional leadership through providing appropriate development activities were strong.

As instructional leader, the principal had to set expectations for continual improvement of the instructional process and had to engage actively in his/her own staff development. Since a precise model of behavior for the principal as instructional leader was not developed to accompany the directives set forth by the Tennessee legislature, each principal had to pursue a course of action that was appropriate for his/her personality, the school, the school setting, the staff, and the community.

Summary

A review of selected literature related to the problem statement addressed in this study was undertaken. The evolution of the school principal as instructional leader was presented in the first section of the chapter. The impact of the results of the effective schools research on the reemergence of the principal as instructional leader was reviewed in the second section. The effective schools researchers gave importance to the maxim: effective principal--effective school. The leadership of the principal set the tone of the school, the climate for learning, the
level of professionalism and morale for teachers, and the level of concern for student success. The principal was the link between school success and failure.

The third section was a discussion of the principal as instructional leader including definitions of the instructional leadership role. The principal as instructional leader provided necessary resources to achieve academic goals, possessed knowledge and skill in curriculum, demonstrated skill in communication, and articulated a vision.

The fourth section reviewed instructional leadership in Tennessee. The Tennessee legislature passed laws that directed the principal to be an instructional leader. Attempts were made to provide training in developing and strengthening instructional leadership skills.
CHAPTER 3
Methods and Procedures

This chapter contained the research design, instrument development, description of the pilot study, and identification of participants of the study. Reliability and validity assessments for the instrument and data analysis procedures were also included in this chapter.

The techniques of descriptive research were used in gathering data to answer research questions relative to the perceptions of Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals concerning their instructional leadership role.

The purpose of the study was to determine if Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III Tennessee Elementary Principals perceived differently their role as instructional leaders. The researcher also attempted to determine if the Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals' perceptions of their instructional leadership role were altered when the following demographic variables were taken into consideration:

48
A. Grade level configuration of the school
B. Years of experience as a principal
C. Number of years of classroom experience
D. Gender

The method used to obtain the perceptions of the Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals was a survey that was completed by each responding Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principal. The procedures for developing and using the survey and for interpreting returned survey data were described in the following sections of this chapter.

Instrument Development

The review of literature and related research studies revealed a number of instruments currently in print. Several instruments were examined in an attempt to select the most appropriate instrument for the purposes of this study. Although not an inclusive listing, the instruments discussed below represent many that were examined.

Hallinger, Murphy, Weil, Mesa, and Mitman (1983) assessed secondary principals' behaviors in instructional management. The Instructional Management
Rating Scale (IMRS) contained 71 items measuring distinct job functions related to instructional management. This instrument was not used because it was designed for secondary principals.

Jackson, Logsdon, and Taylor (1983) developed a 41-item School Instructional Climate Survey (SICS) to assess instructional leadership behaviors. The instrument measured a principal's instructional leadership in terms of school effectiveness. To be effective, a school had to have half of the students at or above the 50th percentile on achievement tests in basic skills. This instrument was not selected because it assessed school effectiveness. Furtwengler (1985) developed the Leadership Expectation and Perception Inventories consisting of two instruments of 78 items each to assess expectations and perceptions of leadership. This instrument focused on leadership in general; therefore, it was not chosen for use in this study.

None of the instruments examined met the specific needs of assessing the perceptions of Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals regarding their role in instructional leadership. Since no instrument was available to measure the perceptions of Career Ladder I, Career
Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals, a survey was developed. The instrument was developed to assess dimensions of instructional leadership from two perspectives: level of importance and estimated amount of time spent.

Criteria for Pilot Instrument Development

The following section described the initial development of the pilot instrument. Criteria used in conducting the pilot study and in the administration of the pilot instrument were included.

The review of literature revealed dimensions of instructional leadership determined to be significant to the role of the principal as instructional leader. The dimensions included establishing positive school climate, observing teachers and classrooms, evaluating and supervising teachers, implementing the curriculum, assisting teachers with instructional problem-solving, and planning and developing instructional programs.

The following guidelines for the construction of the items and administration of the pilot instrument were formulated:

1. The literature was examined to determine specific dimensions of instructional leadership common to the elementary principal's role.
2. An attempt was made to design a homogeneous test based on the propositions regarding the nature of the instructional leadership role of the elementary principal.

3. Items were included to allow for collection of data to assess the research questions and hypotheses.

4. Adequate numbers of items were initially written to allow for elimination of unsatisfactory items resulting from item analysis procedures.

5. An attempt was made to write in clear, concise language to avoid as much as possible any nebulous interpretations.

6. The instrument was designed to collect responses on a five-point Likert-type scale. The use of a Likert design scale provided optimum reliability without having a cumbersome number of response options. The design was used to facilitate scoring and yield a greater degree of dependability.

7. Participants in the Pilot Study were not used in the actual study.

Validity of Pilot Instrument

The degree of success in any research endeavor is dependent on the design of the data collection instrument. The researcher must be able to base
conclusions and generalizations on valid, reliable, and usable data gathered on a properly designed instrument. The essential design qualities that should be incorporated into any data collection instrument include validity and reliability. The data collection tool should yield consistent information at a minimum of expense (Berdie, Anderson, & Niebuhr, 1986; Long, Conney, & Shwalek, 1985).

During the development of the instrument, the researcher examined the instrument's validity. According to Smith (1991), "Validity is defined as the degree to which the researcher has measured what he or she set out to measure." (p. 106)

The investigation of the instrument was limited to content validity and face validity. Borg and Gall (1983) defined content validity as "the degree to which the sample of test items represents the content that the test is designed to measure." (p. 276)

Borg and Gall (1983) also identified face validity of test items as necessary for gaining rapport of respondents, maintaining good public relations, and avoiding public negativism. Face validity refers to the evaluator's appraisal of what the content of the test measures. Content and face validity are often
determined by careful examination of objectives, item analysis, and judgments of subject matter specialists.

A panel of 10 subject matter specialists was invited to determine the validity of individual instrument items through pretesting the survey. The subject matter specialists were selected because of their experience and expertise in research, in school leadership, and in instrument development. All specialists had administrative experience. The specialists' professional judgments were elicited relative to the problem statement and to the content area. The subject matter experts made recommendations regarding the items' appropriateness for inclusion in the data gathering instrument. From the responses of the subject experts, a survey instrument composed of 48 items was developed.

Validation processes for this study consisted of the following procedures:

1. The pilot instrument was administered to 15 principals from selected school systems in Middle and West Tennessee.

2. A form for respondents to make suggestions in assessing the pilot instrument was attached.

3. Comments and suggestions from the attached assessment sheets were compiled and analyzed. Changes
in format and semantics of individual items were made to improve the instrument.

4. Pilot test responses were reviewed with test questions being altered or deleted as recommended by the pilot group.

5. The items on the instrument were reviewed to determine usability.

6. The revised instrument was examined again by subject area specialists for final approval.

Pilot Instrument for Principals

A 48 item pilot survey was developed for measuring the instructional leadership role perceptions of Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals. The pilot instrument contained 12 demographic items and 36 items measuring principals' perceptions of their roles as instructional leaders. The principals' perceptions were assessed from two perspectives: level of importance and estimated amount of time spent.

Responses were scored using a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from Highly Important (5) to Highly Unimportant (1) for assessing the perceived level of importance of the principals' role involvement in instructional leadership dimensions.
5 = HIGHLY IMPORTANT
4 = SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT
3 = NOT SURE
2 = SOMEWHAT UNIMPORTANT
1 = HIGHLY UNIMPORTANT

The survey consisted of three parts. Part I contained demographic data about the principal including age, gender, number of years as a principal, number of years as a teacher, educational attainment, number of curriculum and instruction courses taken, the year last enrolled in college/university classes, Career Ladder I, II, or III status, and the hours spent per week in professional reading. Part II of the survey requested information about the school organization including school setting (rural, urban, suburban), student enrollment, grade level configuration, and current Career Ladder status. Part III contained 36 questions related to six identified dimensions of instructional leadership including establishing positive school climate, observing teachers and classrooms, evaluating and supervising teachers, implementing curriculum, instructional problem-solving, and planning and developing instructional programs. An estimated percentage of
time spent daily in the six dimensions of instructional leadership was also requested.

**Pilot Test**

A pilot study was administered to selected principals from school systems in Middle and West Tennessee. Principals in Middle and West Tennessee, chosen for the pilot study because of their expertise in school leadership, were excluded from the actual study. The actual study was limited to public elementary school principals in the First Tennessee Regional Development District. The purposes for administering the pilot study were:

1. To determine that the wording of the items was clear and meaningful,
2. To evaluate the format of the survey for readability, clarity, and ease of use,
3. To obtain sample data to determine the extent the pilot instrument was internally consistent and reliable,
4. To determine content and face validity of the instrument, and
5. To delete items determined to be unsatisfactory before beginning the actual study.
Reliability of Pilot Instrument

The reliability of an instrument refers to the accuracy and consistency of its measurement. An instrument is considered reliable if it consistently yields the same results when repeated measurements are taken with the same subjects under the same conditions (Borg & Gall, 1983; Berdie & Anderson, 1986; Long, Conney, & Chwalek, 1985). Cronbach’s Alpha is one of the most commonly used procedures to establish reliability coefficients to determine internal consistency or reliability. Alpha is based on the average correlations of items within a test (SPSS, 1992).

The pilot study instrument was administered during September 1993 and analyzed during October 1993. Data results were then subjected to the Cronbach's Alpha procedure. Data results revealed an alpha of .9673, but due to the small number of cases, 11 participants, the results are not representative of the true reliability of the final revised instrument. Cronbach's Alpha and Split-Half Reliability Tests were run on the actual survey instrument.
Reliability of Actual Study Instrument

Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficients for the 36 item survey instrument was .9416 with an N of 121 cases. Split-half reliability procedures revealed the following reliability coefficients: correlation between forms .8690, equal length Spearman-Brown .9299, Guttman Split-half .9286, unequal-length Spearman-Brown .9299, alpha for the 18 items for parts 1 and 2 of .8817, and alpha for the 18 items for part 3 of .9004.

Identifying Participants in the Study

Data generated by the Tennessee Department of Education identified the population in the First Tennessee Regional Development District of the Tennessee Department of Education, located in Northeast Tennessee, as seven city and 10 county school systems. Elementary schools with any combination of kindergarten through grade eight were included. The elementary schools in the population were administrated by 43 Career Ladder III principals, 16 Career Ladder II principals, and 66 Career Ladder I principals.

The population was identified using data sources generated by the Tennessee Department of Education. One data source identified Career Ladder I elementary principals. The second data source identified Career
Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals. Since all Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals were included in the survey, no sampling selection was used. The Directory of Public Schools (State Department of Education, 1992-93) was consulted to obtain addresses for the schools.

Data Collection Procedures

A letter of introduction was written and mailed to each identified principal in the sample. The letter explained the purpose of the study and requested an immediate response. A stamped, self-addressed envelope and the survey instrument were enclosed. Return envelopes contained an identification number on the mailing label. The identification number provided the researcher with information to monitor the return of the survey instrument.

Follow-up procedures were used to contact those principals who failed to respond by the deadline. The nonrespondents were mailed a second letter and/or telephoned to encourage their participation and assistance.

Data from the returned instruments were compiled and analyzed using the SPSS/PC+ for the Social Sciences
(SPSS, 1992). Results of the analysis were found in Chapter 4.

**Statistical Tests and Analysis**

Data from the completed surveys were analyzed using the SPSS/PC+ for the Social Sciences (SPSS, 1992). Various statistical tests were used for data analyses including frequency distribution for demographic items, the Student-Newman-Keuls, Non-Parametric Kruskal-Wallis one-way ANOVA, Pairwise Mann-Whitney U Test or the Wilcoxon-Rank Sum W Test, and the t-test for differences. The t-test was used to assess significant differences among the perceptions of Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals based on gender.

The statistical test, Kruskal-Wallis Analysis of Variance, one-way ANOVA, was used to test differences between and among the groups where there were more than two categories. The statistical test, Kruskal-Wallis, was used to test for significant differences among the perceptions of Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals regarding their role as an instructional leader in the six identified dimensions of instructional leadership. The six dimensions of instructional leadership were
establishing positive school climate, observing teachers and classrooms, evaluating and supervising teachers, implementing the curriculum, assisting teachers with instructional problem-solving, and planning and developing instructional programs.

Research Questions

1. Do Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals differ in the perceptions of their role as that of an instructional leader based on the six identified dimensions of instructional leadership?

2. Do Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals spend time daily in the six identified dimensions of instructional leadership?

3. Will the Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals' perceptions of their instructional leadership role differ when the following dependent variables are taken into consideration:
   A. Grade level configuration of the school
   B. Years of experience as a principal
C. Number of years of classroom experience

D. Gender

**Null Hypotheses**

The following hypotheses, stated in the null form, were tested at the .05 level of significance.

1. There will be no significant difference among Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals regarding their perceptions of the instructional leadership role in the dimension of establishing positive school climate.

2. There will be no significant difference among Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals regarding their perceptions of the instructional leadership role in the dimension of observing teachers and classrooms.

3. There will be no significant difference among Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals regarding their perceptions of the instructional leadership role in the dimension of evaluating and supervising teachers.

4. There will be no significant difference among Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals regarding their perceptions
of the instructional leadership role in the dimension of implementing curriculum.

5. There will be no significant difference among Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals regarding their perceptions of the instructional leadership role in the dimension of instructional problem-solving.

6. There will be no significant difference among Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals regarding their perceptions of the instructional leadership role in the dimension of planning and developing instructional programs.

7. There will be no significant difference among Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals regarding their perceptions of the estimated amount of time spent daily in the identified instructional leadership dimension of establishing positive school climate.

8. Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals will not differ significantly regarding their perceptions of the estimated amount of time spent daily in the identified instructional leadership dimension of observing teachers and classrooms.
9. There will be no significant difference among Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals regarding their perceptions of the estimated amount of time spent daily in the identified instructional leadership dimension of evaluating and supervising teachers.

10. Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals will not differ significantly regarding their perceptions of the estimated amount of time spent daily in the identified instructional leadership dimension of implementing curriculum.

11. There will be no significant difference among Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals regarding their perceptions of the estimated amount of time spent daily in the identified instructional leadership dimension of instructional problem-solving.

12. Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals will not differ significantly regarding their perceptions of the estimated amount of time spent daily in the identified instructional leadership dimension of planning and developing instructional programs.
13. There will be no significant difference among Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals regarding their perceptions of their instructional leadership role in the six identified dimensions of instructional leadership based on the grade level configuration of the school.

14. There will be no significant difference among Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals regarding their perceptions of their instructional leadership role in the six identified dimensions of instructional leadership based on the number of years served as a principal.

15. There will be no significant difference among Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals regarding their perceptions of their instructional leadership role in the six identified dimensions of instructional leadership based on the number of years of classroom experience.

16. There will be no significant difference among Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals regarding their perceptions of their instructional leadership role in the six identified dimensions of instructional leadership based on gender.
Summary

The methods used for population identification, developing and piloting the instrument, collecting the data, statistical applications, and data analysis were described in this chapter. The Instructional Leadership Survey of Elementary School Principals was used to assess perceptions of Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III Tennessee Elementary Principals relative to their instructional leadership role.
CHAPTER 4

Presentation of Data

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to determine if Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III Tennessee Elementary Principals perceived differently their role as instructional leaders. In Chapter 4, the data analysis of a survey of 125 elementary principals in the First Tennessee Regional Development District, conducted during January and February of 1994, is reported.

Demographic Data

Of the 125 elementary principals contacted to participate in this study, 121 or 96.8%, responded by returning the completed survey. All returned responses were usable for the study.

Demographic and professional data obtained from items on the instrument included the following:
(1) age, (2) gender, (3) number of years experience as a principal, (4) number of years experience as a teacher, (5) highest academic degree attained, (6) number of curriculum and instruction courses taken; (7) number of years since last enrollment in
college/university classes; (8) number of hours spent per week in professional reading; (9) current Career Ladder status, (10) school setting, (11) grade level configuration, and (12) student enrollment.

Respondents by age indicated that 62 or 51.2% were from the age group of 40-49. Following this age category was 50-59 with 24 respondents or 19.8% of the population. The third highest age group was the 30-39 category with 23 respondents or 19.0%. The over 59 age category had nine respondents or 7.4%. The age category of under 30 had three respondents or 2.5%. The age distribution of elementary principal participants is shown in Table 1.
Table 1

Frequencies and Percentages for Elementary Principals by Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 30</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 39</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 - 49</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>51.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 59</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 59</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents by gender included 86 males or 71.1% and 35 females or 28.9%. The summary of data in Table 2 describes the gender composition of the participants in the study.
Table 2

Frequencies and Percentages for Elementary Principals by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender of Respondent</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>71.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of years experience as a principal is shown in Table 3. The years of experience 6-10 contained the largest number, 32 or 26.4%, participants. The experience group of 16 or more contained 31 participants or 25.6%. The smallest percentage was 0-2 years group with 13 participants or 10.7%.
Table 3

Frequencies and Percentages for Elementary Principals by Years Experience as a Principal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years Experience as Principal</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 or more</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 depicts data containing the number of years as a teacher of the participants in the study. The 6-10 years of experience range contained the largest number, 44 or 36.4%, participants. Those participants who had been teachers for 16 or more years numbered 35 or 28.9%. The 11-15 years of experience range had 26 or 21.5% participants. The smallest percentages were the 0-2 years group with 3 or 2.5% and the 3-5 years group with 13 or 10.7%.
Table 4

Frequencies and Percentages for Elementary Principals by Years of Classroom Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years of Classroom Experience</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 or more</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The educational levels of the elementary principals participating in the study are displayed in Table 5. The largest number of elementary principals, 55 or 45.5%, had a Masters degree plus 45 hours followed by those with Masters degrees, 38 or 31.4%. Elementary principals who had a Specialist degree consisted of 19 or 15.7%. The smallest number of elementary principals, two or 1.7%, had a Bachelor degree.
Table 5

Frequencies and Percentages for Elementary Principals by Highest Academic Degree Held

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Degree Earned</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor degree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters degree</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>31.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters +45</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist degree</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate degree</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 displays the number of curriculum and instruction courses taken by the elementary principal participants in the study. The elementary principals responding to more than seven courses comprised the largest group with 69 or 57.0%. The range of 4-5 courses was the next largest group with 24 respondents or 19.8%. The 6-7 range had 16 respondents or 13.2%. The smallest group was the 0-1 course with two respondents or 1.7%.
Table 6

Frequencies and Percentages of Elementary Principals
by Number of Curriculum and Instruction Courses Taken

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Courses</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 7</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>57.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of years since elementary principals were last enrolled in college/university classes is presented in Table 7. The most frequent number of responses, 44 or 36.4%, was in the 0-2 year category. For 33 or 27.3% of the respondents, enrollment was 6-10 years ago. Thirty respondents or 24.8% reported 3-5 years since last enrollment in college/university classes. Ten respondents or 8.3% reported 11-15 years since last enrollment in college/university classes. Four respondents or 3.3% reported 16 or more years since last enrollment in college/university classes.
Table 7

Frequencies and Percentages of Elementary Principals by Years Since Last Enrollment in College/University Classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years Since Last Enrollment</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants in the study were asked to respond to the number of hours spent per week in professional reading. Sixty-nine of the respondents or 57.0% reported 2-3 hours spent per week. Seventeen of the respondents or 14.0% indicated that 4-5 hours per week were spent in professional reading. The smallest group was 6-7 hours with six respondents or 5.0%. Data are displayed in Table 8.
Table 8

Frequencies and Percentages for Elementary Principals by the Number of Hours Spent in Professional Reading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours Spent in Professional Reading</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 3</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>57.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Responses</strong></td>
<td>121</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 reports the current Career Ladder status of elementary principals participating in the study. Elementary principals with Career Ladder I status numbered 63 or 52.1%. Career Ladder II elementary principals were 16 or 13.2%. Forty-two or 34.7% of the elementary principals had earned Career Ladder III status.
Table 9

Frequencies and Percentages for Elementary Principals by Current Career Ladder Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Ladder Status</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Career Ladder I</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>52.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Ladder II</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career Ladder III</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>34.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The school setting in which elementary principals participating in the study were located is presented in Table 10. The largest number of participants, 61 or 50.4%, was located in rural settings. Participants from urban areas represented 35 or 28.9%. The lowest number of participants, 25 or 20.7%, was from the suburban setting.
Table 10

Frequencies and Percentages for Elementary Principals by School Setting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Setting</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>50.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the 121 participants, 63 or 51.1% were elementary principals in schools with grades K-5, 37 or 30.6% were in K-8 schools, 16 or 13.2% were in schools categorized as other, one or .8% was in a K-2 school, and four or 3.3% were in K-4 schools. The grade level configurations for participants in this study are reported in Table 11.
Table 11

Frequencies and Percentages for Elementary Principals
by Grade Level Configuration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level Configuration</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K - 8</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K - 5</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>52.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K - 4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K - 2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The enrollment of students at schools of elementary principal participants is presented in Table 12. Thirty-five participants had student enrollments of 201-300 or 28.9%, comprising the largest interval group. Twenty-eight elementary principals or 23.1% had schools with student enrollments under 200. Twenty-two participants or 18.2% had schools with student enrollments in the 301-400 category. The smallest group of participants, 15 or 12.4%, had schools with student enrollments in the 401-500 category.
Table 12

Frequencies and Percentages of Elementary Principals by Student Enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Enrollment</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 200</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201 - 300</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>301 - 400</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>401 - 500</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 500</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings Related to Research Questions and Null Hypotheses

Data analyses of the three research questions and testing of the 16 null hypotheses were analyzed from data collected from the 121 elementary school principals. Presentation of data analyses and rejection or non-rejection of null hypotheses follow in Tables 1 - 44.
Research Question 1: Do Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals differ in their role as that of an instructional leader based on the six identified dimensions of instructional leadership?

The non-parametric data were subjected to the Mann-Whitney U Test. Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance test noted differences in the perceptions of Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals regarding their role as instructional leader in six identified dimensions of instructional leadership. The six dimensions of instructional leadership were establishing positive school climate, observing teachers and classrooms, evaluating and supervising teachers, implementing curriculum, instructional problem-solving, and planning and developing instructional programs. Alpha level was set at .05. The Pairwise Mann-Whitney U Test was used to test for statistical differences among Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals regarding their perceptions of their instructional leadership role in the six identified dimensions of instructional leadership.
Null hypothesis 1 stated there will be no significant difference among Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals regarding their perceptions of the instructional leadership role in the dimension of establishing positive school climate.

Data analysis revealed a mean score of 27.21 for Career Ladder I elementary principals in the instructional leadership dimension of establishing positive school climate and a standard deviation of 2.65. The mean of Career Ladder II elementary principals was 26.06 with a standard deviation of 2.67. Career Ladder III elementary principals had a mean of 27.36 and a standard deviation of 2.41. The Kruskal-Wallis analysis of variance yielded a $X^2$ score of 3.36 and a $p$ value of .1862. Since the $p$ value was greater than .05 level of significance, null hypothesis 1 was not rejected for the instructional leadership dimension of establishing positive school climate. Data for null hypothesis 1 are displayed in Table 13.
Table 13

Kruskal-Wallis Analysis of Differences Among Career Ladder I, II, and III Principals' Perceptions of Their Instructional Leadership Role in Establishing Positive School Climate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Ladder Status</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S. D.</th>
<th>X²</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.L. I</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>27.21</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>.1862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.L. II</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26.06</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.L. III</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>27.36</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Null hypothesis 2 stated there will be no significant difference among Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals regarding their perceptions of the instructional leadership role in the dimension of observing teachers and classrooms.

In the instructional leadership dimension of observing teachers and classrooms, Career Ladder I elementary principals' data analysis revealed a mean score of 25.78 and a standard deviation of 2.85. Data analysis for Career Ladder II elementary principals indicated a mean score of 23.43 and a standard deviation of 2.92. Career Ladder III elementary principals had a mean of 25.92 and a standard deviation
of 3.16. A $X^2$ score of 8.19 was noted with a $p$ value of .0166, a significant difference. Since a significant difference existed, the data were subjected to the Pairwise Mann-Whitney U Test. The Mann-Whitney U Test yielded significant differences between Career Ladder I and Career Ladder II elementary principals in the instructional leadership dimension of observing teachers and classrooms ($z = 2.52; p = .0116$). Significant differences were noted between Career Ladder II and Career Ladder III elementary principals ($z = 2.78; p = .0055$). Career Ladder I and Career Ladder III principals viewed their instructional leadership role of observing teachers and classrooms as more important than Career Ladder II principals. No significant difference was observed between Career Ladder I and Career Ladder III elementary principals. Null hypothesis 2 was rejected for the instructional leadership dimension of observing teachers and classrooms. The data for null hypothesis 2 are displayed in Table 14.
Table 14

Kruskal-Wallis Analysis of Differences Among Career Ladder I, II, and III Principals' Perceptions of Their Instructional Leadership Role in Observing Teachers and Classrooms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Ladder Status</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S. D.</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.L. I</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>25.78</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>8.19</td>
<td>.0166*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.L. II</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23.43</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.L. III</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>25.92</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

Null hypothesis 3 stated there will be no significant difference among Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals regarding their perceptions of the instructional leadership role in the dimension of evaluating and supervising teachers.

Career Ladder I elementary principals' data analysis in the dimension of evaluating and supervising teachers revealed a mean score of 25.85 and a standard deviation of 2.97. Data analysis for Career Ladder II elementary principals revealed a mean score of 23.88 and a standard deviation of 2.55. The data analysis for Career Ladder III elementary principals indicated a
mean score of 26.52 and a standard deviation of 3.02. A $X^2$ score of 8.19 was recorded with a $p$ value of .0062, a significant difference. Further analysis of the data using the Pairwise Mann-Whitney U Test reported significant differences between Career Ladder I and Career Ladder II elementary principals in the instructional leadership dimension of evaluating and supervising teachers ($z = 2.58; p = .0098$). Significant differences were noted between Career Ladder II and Career Ladder III elementary principals ($z = 3.08; p = .0020$). No significant difference was noted between Career Ladder I and Career Ladder III elementary principals. Career Ladder I and Career Ladder III principals perceived their instructional leadership role of evaluating and supervising teachers as being more important than Career Ladder II principals. Since significant differences existed, null hypothesis 3 was rejected for the instructional leadership dimension of evaluating and supervising teachers. Data for null hypothesis 3 are presented in Table 15.
Table 15

Kruskal-Wallis Analysis of Differences Among Career Ladder I, II, and III Principals' Perceptions of Their Instructional Leadership Role in Evaluating and Supervising Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Ladder Status</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S. D.</th>
<th>X^2</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.L. I</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>25.85</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>10.17</td>
<td>.0062*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.L. II</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23.88</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.L. III</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>26.52</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P < .05

Null hypothesis 4 stated there will be no significant difference among Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals regarding their perceptions of the instructional leadership role in the dimension of implementing curriculum.

Data analysis revealed a mean score of 26.50 for Career Ladder I elementary principals in the instructional leadership dimension of implementing curriculum and a standard deviation of 2.77. The mean of Career Ladder II elementary principals was 24.38 with a standard deviation of 4.22. Career Ladder III elementary principals had a mean of 26.74 and a
standard deviation 2.35. The Kruskal-Wallis analysis of variance yielded a $X^2$ score of 3.00 and a $p$ value of .2220. Since the $p$ value was greater than .05 level of significance, null hypothesis 4 was not rejected for the instructional leadership dimension of implementing curriculum. Data for null hypothesis 4 are displayed in Table 16.

Table 16

Kruskal-Wallis Analysis of Differences Among Career Ladder I, II, and III Principals' Perceptions of Their Instructional Leadership Role in Implementing Curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Ladder Status</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S. D.</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.L. I</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>26.50</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.2220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.L. II</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24.38</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.L. III</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>26.74</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Null hypothesis 5 stated there will be no significant difference among Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals regarding their perceptions of the instructional leadership role in the dimension of instructional problem-solving.

In the instructional leadership dimension of instructional problem-solving, Career Ladder I elementary principals' data analysis revealed a mean score of 25.67 and a standard deviation of 3.00. Data analysis for Career Ladder II elementary principals indicated a mean score of 22.62 and a standard deviation of 3.81. Career Ladder III elementary principals had a mean of 25.77 and a standard deviation 2.80. A $X^2$ score of 9.35 was noted with a $p$ value of .0093, a significant difference. The data were subjected to further analysis using the Pairwise Mann-Whitney U Test. Significant differences were revealed between Career Ladder I and Career Ladder II elementary principals ($z = 2.89; p = .0038$). Significant differences were reported between Career Ladder II and Career Ladder III ($z = 2.82; and p = .0047$). No significant difference was reported between Career Ladder I and Career Ladder III elementary principals.

In the instructional leadership dimension of problem-solving, Career Ladder I and Career Ladder III
elementary principals viewed their instructional leadership role as more important than Career Ladder II principals. Since significant differences between Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals were reported in the instructional leadership dimension of instructional problem-solving, null hypothesis 5 was rejected. Table 17 contains the data analysis for null hypothesis 5.

Table 17

Kruskal-Wallis Analysis of Differences Among Career Ladder I, II, and III Principals' Perceptions of Their Instructional Leadership Role in Instructional Problem-Solving

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Ladder Status</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S. D.</th>
<th>X²</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.L. I</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>25.67</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>9.35</td>
<td>.0093*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.L. II</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22.62</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.L. III</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>25.77</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
Null hypothesis 6 stated there will be no significant difference among Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals regarding their perceptions of the instructional leadership role in the dimension of planning and developing instructional programs.

Career Ladder I elementary principals' data analysis in the dimension of planning and developing instructional programs revealed a mean score of 25.34 and a standard deviation of 3.47. Data analysis for Career Ladder II elementary principals revealed a mean of 21.00 with a standard deviation of 3.86. The data analysis for Career Ladder III elementary principals indicated a mean score of 25.77 and a standard deviation of 3.34. A $X^2$ score of 16.62 was noted with a $p$ value of .0002, a significant difference. Since a significant difference existed, the data were further analyzed using the Pairwise Mann-Whitney U Test. Significant differences between Career Ladder I and Career Ladder II elementary principals in the instructional leadership dimension of planning and developing instructional programs were revealed ($z=3.71; p=0.0002$). Significant differences were noted between Career Ladder II and Career Ladder III elementary principals ($z=3.87; p=0.0001$). No
significant differences were reported between Career Ladder I and Career Ladder III elementary principals. Career Ladder I and Career Ladder III elementary principals perceived their instructional leadership role in the dimension of planning and developing instructional programs as being more important than Career Ladder II elementary principals. Null hypothesis 6 was rejected for instructional leadership dimension of planning and developing instructional programs. Data for null hypothesis 6 are presented in Table 18.

Table 18

Kruskal-Wallis Analysis of Differences Among Career Ladder I, II, and III Principals' Perceptions of Their Instructional Leadership Role in Planning and Developing Instructional Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Ladder Status</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S. D.</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.L. I</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>25.34</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>16.62</td>
<td>.0002*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.L. II</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.L. III</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>25.77</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
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Research Question 2: Do Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals spend time daily in the six identified dimensions of instructional leadership?

Principals were asked on the survey instrument to respond to a question regarding the estimated amount of time per day spent on instructional leadership. Of that amount of time spent daily in instructional leadership, principals were requested to estimate the amount of their time consumed in each of the six identified dimensions of instructional leadership.

The Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance was used to test for differences in the amount of time spent daily in the six identified dimensions of instructional leadership including establishing positive school climate, observing teachers and classrooms, evaluating and supervising teachers, implementing curriculum, instructional problem-solving, and planning and developing instructional programs.
Null hypothesis 7 stated there will be no significant difference among Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals regarding their perceptions of the estimated amount of time spent daily in the identified instructional leadership dimension of establishing positive school climate.

Data analysis using the Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance revealed a mean score of 21.67 for Career Ladder I elementary principals in the instructional leadership dimension of establishing positive school climate and a standard deviation of 13.61. The mean of Career Ladder II elementary principals was 24.31 with a standard deviation of 17.47. Career Ladder III elementary principals had a mean score of 22.50 and a standard deviation of 17.04. The Kruskal-Wallis analysis of variance yielded a $X^2$ score of 0.14 and a $p$ value of .9319. Since the $p$ value was greater than .05 level of significance, null hypothesis 7 was not rejected for the instructional leadership dimension of establishing positive school climate. Data for null hypothesis 7 are displayed in Table 19.

Data analysis of the overall responses for the six identified dimensions of instructional leadership using the Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance...
reported a mean score of 92.84 for Career Ladder I elementary principals and a standard deviation of 16.73. The mean of Career Ladder II elementary principals was 83.43 with a standard deviation of 29.30. Career Ladder III elementary principals had a mean score of 84.42 and a standard deviation of 25.17. The Kruskal-Wallis analysis of variance yielded a $X^2$ score of 2.68 and a $p$ value of .2613. No significant difference was noted since the $p$ value was greater than .05 level of significance. Data for the overall scores for the estimated amount of time spent daily in the six identified dimensions of instructional leadership are presented in Table 19.

Further analysis by the Student-Newman-Keuls analyzed multiple comparisons for all the groups. Comparisons made between the three different levels of Career Ladder status of elementary principals revealed no significant differences between groups and within the Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals. The F ratio was .1935 and probability was .8244. Therefore, no significant difference between or within Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals in the overall responses for the estimated
amount of time spent daily in the six identified dimensions of instructional leadership was reported.

Table 19

Kruskal-Wallis Analysis of Differences Among Career Ladder I, II, and III Principals' Perceptions of the Time Spent Daily in Establishing Positive School Climate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Ladder Status</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S. D.</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.L. I</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>21.67</td>
<td>13.61</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>.9319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.L. II</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24.31</td>
<td>17.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.L. III</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>22.50</td>
<td>17.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall-Instructional Leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Ladder Status</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S. D.</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.L. I</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>92.84</td>
<td>16.73</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>.2613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.L. II</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>83.43</td>
<td>29.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.L. III</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>84.42</td>
<td>25.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Null hypothesis 8 stated Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals will not differ significantly regarding their perceptions of the estimated amount of time spent daily in the identified instructional leadership dimension of observing teachers and classrooms.

In the instructional leadership dimension of observing teachers and classrooms, Career Ladder I elementary principals' data analysis revealed a mean score of 16.50 with a standard deviation of 6.87. Data analysis for Career Ladder II elementary principals indicated a mean score of 17.26 and a standard deviation of 9.15. Career Ladder III elementary principals had a mean of 15.33 with a standard deviation of 9.42. A $X^2$ score of 2.23 was noted with a $p$ value of .3285. Since the $p$ value was greater than .05 level of significance, null hypothesis 8 was not rejected for the instructional leadership dimension of observing teachers and classrooms. Data for null hypothesis 8 are displayed in Table 20.
Table 20

Kruskal-Wallis Analysis of Differences Among Career Ladder I, II, and III Principals' Perceptions of the Time Spent Daily in Observing Teachers and Classrooms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Ladder Status</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S. D.</th>
<th>X²</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.L. I</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>16.50</td>
<td>6.87</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>.3285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.L. II</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17.26</td>
<td>9.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.L. III</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>15.33</td>
<td>9.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Null hypothesis 9 stated there will be no significant difference among Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals regarding their perceptions of the estimated amount of time spent daily in the identified instructional leadership dimension of evaluating and supervising teachers.

Career Ladder I elementary principals' data analysis in the dimension of evaluating and supervising teachers revealed a mean score of 14.03 and a standard deviation of 7.88. Data analysis for Career Ladder II elementary principals revealed a mean of 12.57 and a standard deviation of 8.63. The data analysis for Career Ladder III elementary principals indicated a mean of 12.39 and a standard deviation of 7.42. A $X^2$
score of 1.85 was reported with a p value of .3946. No significant difference was noted; therefore, null hypothesis 9 was not rejected for the instructional leadership dimension of evaluating and supervising teachers. Data for null hypothesis 9 are presented in Table 21.

Table 21

Kruskal-Wallis Analysis of Differences Among Career Ladder I, II, and III Principals' Perceptions of the Time Spent Daily in Evaluating and Supervising Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Ladder Status</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S. D.</th>
<th>X²</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.L. I</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>14.03</td>
<td>7.88</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>.3946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.L. II</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.39</td>
<td>8.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.L. III</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12.39</td>
<td>7.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Null hypothesis 10 stated Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals will not differ significantly regarding their perceptions of the estimated amount of time spent daily in the identified instructional leadership dimension of implementing curriculum.

Data analysis revealed a mean score of 13.80 for Career Ladder I elementary principals in the instructional leadership dimension of implementing curriculum with a standard deviation of 7.88. The mean of Career Ladder II elementary principals was 9.62 with a standard deviation of 8.66. Career Ladder III elementary principals had a mean of 10.79 and a standard deviation of 6.35. The Kruskal-Wallis analysis of variance yielded a $X^2$ score of 8.75 and a $p$ value of .0125. Career Ladder I and Career Ladder III elementary principals reported a significantly greater difference than Career Ladder II elementary principals in the amount of time spent daily in the identified instructional leadership dimension of implementing curriculum. Career Ladder I elementary principals indicated a significantly greater difference than Career Ladder III elementary principals in the amount of time spent daily in the identified instructional leadership dimension of implementing curriculum. Since
the p value was less than .05 level of significance, null hypothesis 10 was rejected for the instructional leadership dimension of implementing curriculum. Data for null hypothesis 10 are displayed in Table 22.

Table 22

Kruskal-Wallis Analysis of Differences Among Career Ladder I, II, and III Principals' Perceptions of the Time Spent Daily in Implementing Curriculum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Ladder Status</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S. D.</th>
<th>X^2</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.L. I</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>13.80</td>
<td>10.45</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>.0125*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.L. II</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.62</td>
<td>8.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.L. III</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10.79</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
Null hypothesis 11 stated there will be no significant difference among Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals regarding their perceptions of the estimated amount of time spent daily in the identified instructional leadership dimension of instructional problem-solving.

In the instructional leadership dimension of instructional problem-solving, Career Ladder I elementary principals' data analysis revealed a mean score of 13.03 with a standard deviation of 6.41. Data analysis for Career Ladder II elementary principals indicated a mean score of 9.38 and a standard deviation of 3.59. Career Ladder III elementary principals had a mean of 12.14 and a standard deviation of 6.41. A $\chi^2$ score of 5.09 was recorded with a $p$ value of .0783. Since the $p$ value was greater than .05 level of significance, null hypothesis 11 was not rejected for the instructional leadership dimension of instructional problem-solving. Data for null hypothesis 11 are presented in Table 23.
Table 23

Kruskal-Wallis Analysis of Differences Among Career Ladder I, II, and III Principals' Perceptions of the Time Spent Daily in Instructional Problem-Solving

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Ladder Status</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S. D.</th>
<th>X²</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.L. I</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>13.03</td>
<td>6.41</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>.0783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.L. II</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9.38</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.L. III</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12.14</td>
<td>6.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Null hypothesis 12 stated Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals will not differ significantly regarding their perceptions of the estimated amount of time spent daily in the identified instructional leadership dimension of planning and developing instructional programs.

Career Ladder I elementary principals' data analysis in the dimension of planning and developing instructional programs revealed a mean score of 14.11 with a standard deviation of 7.40. Data analysis for Career Ladder II elementary principals revealed a mean of 11.26 and a standard deviation of 6.19. The data analysis for Career Ladder III elementary principals indicated a mean score of 11.52 with a standard
deviation of 7.09. The data analysis for Career Ladder III elementary principals indicated a mean score of 11.52 with a standard deviation of 7.09. A $X^2$ score of 3.84 was recorded with a $p$ value of .1463. No significant difference was noted since the $p$ value was greater than .05 level of significance. Null hypothesis 12 was not rejected. Data for null hypothesis 12 are displayed in Table 24.

Table 24

Kruskal-Wallis Analysis of Differences Among Career Ladder I, II, and III Principals' Perceptions of the Time Spent Daily in Planning and Developing Instructional Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Ladder Status</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S. D.</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C.L. I</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>14.11</td>
<td>7.40</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>.1463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.L. II</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.26</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.L. III</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>11.52</td>
<td>7.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question 3: Will the Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals' perceptions of their instructional leadership role differ when the following independent variables are taken into consideration?

A. Grade level configuration of the school
B. Years of experience as a principal
C. Number of years of classroom experience
D. Gender

The Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance test noted differences in the perceptions of Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals regarding their role as instructional leader in six identified dimensions of instructional leadership based on the selected variables of grade level configuration of the school, years of experience as a principal, the number of years of classroom experience, and gender. The six dimensions of instructional leadership were establishing positive school climate, observing teachers and classrooms, evaluating and supervising teachers, implementing curriculum, instructional problem-solving, and planning and developing instructional programs. Alpha level was set at .05. Further analysis using the Mann-Whitney U Test assessed
differences between and among the groups at the .05 level. The t-test was used to assess differences based on the gender variable.

Null hypothesis 13 stated there will be no significant difference among Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals regarding their instructional leadership role in the six identified dimensions of instructional leadership based on the grade level configuration.

For the instructional leadership dimension of establishing positive school climate, data analysis of the K-8 grade level configuration revealed a mean score of 26.78 with a standard deviation of 3.00. Data analysis for K-5 grade level configuration indicated a mean score of 27.20 and a standard deviation of 2.37. Grade level configuration of K-2/K-4 had a mean of 27.38 with a standard deviation of 2.47. A $X^2$ score of .3505 was noted with a $p$ value of .8392, greater than .05 level of significance. Therefore, null hypothesis 13 was not rejected for the instructional leadership dimension of establishing positive school climate. Data for null hypothesis 13 are displayed in Tables 25 - 30.
Table 25

Kruskal-Wallis Analysis of Differences Among Career Ladder I, II, and II Principals' Perceptions of Establishing Positive School Climate Based on Grade Level Configuration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level Configuration</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S. D.</th>
<th>X²</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K-8</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>26.78</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.3505</td>
<td>.8392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>27.20</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-2/K-4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27.38</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data analysis revealed a mean of 25.21 and a standard deviation of 3.23 in the K-8 grade level configuration for the instructional leadership dimension of observing teachers and classrooms. The K-5 grade level configuration mean was 25.61 with a standard deviation of 2.93. Grade level configuration of K-2/K-4 had a mean of 25.76 and a standard deviation of 3.23. A X² score of .8203 was noted with a p value of .8392, greater than .05 level of significance. Null hypothesis 13 was not rejected for the instructional dimension of observing teachers and classrooms. Data for null hypothesis 13 are presented in Table 26.
Table 26

Kruskal-Wallis Analysis of Differences Among Career Ladder I, II, and II Principals' Perceptions of Observing Teachers and Classrooms Based on Grade Level Configuration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level Configuration</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S. D.</th>
<th>X²</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K-8</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>25.21</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>.8203</td>
<td>.6636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>25.61</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-2/K-4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25.76</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data analysis of K-8 grade level configuration in the instructional leadership dimension of evaluating and supervising teachers had a mean score of 25.21 and a standard deviation of 3.80. The K-5 grade level configuration revealed a mean of 26.66 and a standard deviation of 2.62. K-2/K-4 grade level configuration had a mean of 26.23 with a standard deviation of 2.70. A $X^2$ score of 1.3672 was reported with a $p$ value of .5048. Since the $p$ value was greater than .05 level of significance, null hypothesis 13 was not rejected for the instructional dimension of observing teachers and classrooms. Data for null hypothesis 13 are depicted in Table 27.
In the instructional leadership dimension of implementing curriculum, analysis of data for the grade level configuration of the school indicated a mean score of 25.21 with a standard deviation of 3.80 for school grade level configuration of K-8. Grade level configuration K-5 revealed a mean score of 26.04 and a standard deviation of 2.59. The school grade level configuration of K-2/K-4 had a mean score of 26.23 and a standard deviation of 2.70. A $X^2$ of 5.4903 and a $p$ value of .0642 were noted. No significant difference was revealed; therefore, null hypothesis 13 was not rejected for the instructional leadership dimension of
implementing curriculum. Data for null hypothesis 13 are displayed in Table 28.

Table 28

Kruskal-Wallis Analysis of Differences Among Career Ladder I, II, and III Principals' Perceptions of Implementing Curriculum Based on Grade Level Configuration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level Configuration</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S. D.</th>
<th>X²</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K-8</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>25.21</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>5.4903</td>
<td>.0642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>26.66</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-2/K-4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27.14</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of data for K-8 school grade level configuration in the instructional leadership dimension of instructional problem-solving noted a mean of 24.43 with a standard deviation of 3.70. The K-5 grade level configuration indicated a mean of 25.58 with a standard deviation of 3.00. A mean of 25.95 and a standard deviation of 2.59 were reported for the K-2/K-4 grade level configuration of the school. A X² score of 2.5836 was noted with a p value of .2748. No significant difference was revealed; therefore, null
hypothesis 13 was not rejected for the instructional leadership dimension of instructional problem-solving. Data for null hypothesis 13 are reported in Table 29.

Table 29
Kruskal-Wallis Analysis of Differences Among Career Ladder I, II, and II Principals' Perceptions of Instructional Problem-Solving Based on Grade Level Configuration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level Configuration</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S. D.</th>
<th>X²</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K-8</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>24.43</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>2.5836</td>
<td>.2748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>25.58</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-2/K-4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25.95</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the instructional dimension of planning and developing instructional programs, data analysis of grade level configuration in K-8 revealed a mean score of 23.94 and a standard deviation of 4.16. The mean of grade level configuration K-5 was 25.11 with a standard deviation of 3.70. K-2/K-4 grade level configuration reported a mean of 26.04 and a standard deviation of 2.97. The Kruskal-Wallis analysis of variance yielded a X² score of 4.0505 and a p value of .1320. Since the
p value was greater than .05 level of significance, null hypothesis 13 was not rejected for the instructional leadership dimension of planning and developing instructional programs. Data for null hypothesis 13 are displayed in Table 30.

Table 30
Kruskal-Wallis Analysis of Differences Among Career Ladder I, II, and III Principals' Perceptions of Planning and Developing Instructional Programs Based on Grade Level Configuration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level Configuration</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S. D.</th>
<th>Χ²</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K-8</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>23.94</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>4.0505</td>
<td>.1320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-5</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>25.11</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K-2/K-4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26.04</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Null hypothesis 14 stated there will be no significant difference among Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals regarding their perceptions of their instructional leadership role in the six identified dimensions of instructional leadership based on the number of years as principal.

Data analysis using the Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance revealed a mean score of 26.92 for 0-2 years of experience as a principal with a standard deviation of 2.21 for the instructional leadership dimension of establishing positive school climate. Three to five years of experience yielded a mean of 26.70 and a standard deviation of 2.74. Six to 10 years of experience as a principal had a mean score of 27.19 with a standard deviation of 2.53. Eleven to 15 years of experience as a principal noted a mean of 27.61 and a standard deviation of 2.26. Analysis of data for principals with 16 or more years of experience as a principal revealed a mean of 27.07 and a standard deviation of 2.93. The Kruskal-Wallis reported a X² score of 1.6512 and a p value of .7996. Since the p value was greater than .05 level of significance, null hypothesis 14 was not rejected for the years of experience as a principal in the instructional leadership dimension of establishing positive school climate.
climate. Data for null hypothesis 14 are presented in Tables 31 - 36.

Table 31

Kruskal-Wallis Analysis of Differences Among Career Ladder I, II, and III Principals' Perceptions of Establishing Positive School Climate Based on Number of Years as a Principal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years as Principal</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S. D.</th>
<th>X²</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26.92</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>1.6512</td>
<td>.7996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26.70</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27.19</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27.61</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 or more</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27.07</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the instructional leadership dimension of observing teachers and classrooms based on the number of years as a principal, data analysis reported 0-2 years had a mean of 24.77 with a standard deviation of 3.03. Three to five years had a mean of 25.59 and a standard deviation of 3.24. The 6-10 category reported a mean of 24.62 with a standard deviation of 3.15. Principals with 11-15 years of experience as a
principal had a mean of 26.39 and a standard deviation of 2.83. The data analysis for 16 or more years of experience revealed a mean of 26.12 with a standard deviation of 2.83. A $X^2$ score of 6.6682 was noted with a $p$ value of .1545. Since the $p$ value was greater than .05 level of significance, null hypothesis 14 was not rejected for the instructional leadership dimension of observing teachers and classrooms. Data for hypothesis 14 are displayed in Table 32.

**Table 32**

**Kruskal-Wallis Analysis of Differences Among Career Ladder I, II, and II Principals' Perceptions of Observing Teachers and Classrooms Based on Number of Years as a Principal**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years as Principal</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S. D.</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24.77</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>6.6682</td>
<td>.1545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25.59</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24.62</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26.39</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 or more</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26.12</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Elementary principals' data analysis in the dimension of evaluating and supervising teachers based on the number of years as a principal indicated a mean of 24.76 with a standard deviation of 3.21 for 0-2 years of experience. Three to five years of experience reported a mean score of 25.66 with a standard deviation of 3.13. In the 6-10 years of experience range, a mean score of 25.65 and a standard deviation of 2.88 were reported. Principals with 11-15 years of experience had a mean of 26.42 and a standard deviation of 2.46. Analysis of data for 16 or more years of experience noted a mean of 26.16 and a standard deviation of 3.40. A $X^2$ score of 3.4973 was indicated with a $p$ value of .4783. No significant difference was reported; therefore, null hypothesis 14 was not rejected for the instructional leadership dimension of evaluating and supervising teachers. Data for null hypothesis 14 are reported in Table 33.
Table 33
Kruskal-Wallis Analysis of Differences Among Career Ladder I, II, and III Principals' Perceptions of Evaluating and Supervising Teachers Based on Number of Years as a Principal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years as Principal</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S. D.</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24.76</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>3.4973</td>
<td>.4783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25.66</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25.65</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26.42</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 or more</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26.16</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data analysis revealed a mean score of 25.48, standard deviation of 1.99 for principals with 0-2 years of experience for the instructional leadership dimension of implementing curriculum based on the number of years experience as a principal. Three to five years of experience had a mean score of 26.75 and a standard deviation of 2.50. Data analysis of principals with 6-10 years of experience reported a mean of 25.75 and a standard deviation of 3.28. For 11-15 years of experience, the mean was 27.14 with a standard deviation of 2.53. Principals with 16 or more
years of experience had a mean of 26.16 and a standard deviation of 3.44. The Kruskal-Wallis yielded a $X^2$ score of 4.1153 and a $p$ value of .3906. Since the $p$ value was greater than .05 level of significance, null hypothesis 14 was not rejected for the instructional leadership dimension of implementing curriculum based on years of experience as a principal. Data for null hypothesis 14 are depicted in Table 34.

Table 34

Kruskal-Wallis Analysis of Differences Among Career Ladder I, II, and III Principals' Perceptions of Implementing Curriculum Based on Number of Years as a Principal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years as Principal</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S. D.</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25.84</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>4.1153</td>
<td>.3906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26.75</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25.75</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27.14</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 or more</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26.16</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the instructional leadership dimension of instructional problem-solving based on principals'
years of experience as a principal, data analysis for 0-2 years reported a mean score of 25.07 and a standard deviation of 2.21. Three to five years of experience yielded a mean of 25.08 and a standard deviation of 3.20. In the 6-10 years of experience, analysis noted a mean of 24.68 with a standard deviation of 3.51. Principals with 11-15 years of experience had a mean of 26.47 and a standard deviation of 2.44. Analysis of data for 16 or more years of experience revealed a mean of 25.38 with a standard deviation of 3.61. A $X^2$ of 4.2415 was reported with a $p$ value of .3743, greater than .05 level of significance; therefore, null hypothesis 14 was not rejected for instructional leadership dimension of instructional problem-solving based on number of years experience as a principal. Data for null hypothesis 14 are presented in Table 35.
Table 35

Kruskal-Wallis Analysis of Differences Among Career Ladder I, II, and II Principals' Perceptions of Instructional Problem-Solving Based on Number of Years as a Principal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years as Principal</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S. D.</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25.07</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>4.2415</td>
<td>.3743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25.08</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24.68</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26.47</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 or more</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25.38</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of data for principals' perceptions of the instructional leadership role in the dimension of planning and developing instructional programs based on the number of years experience as a principal revealed a mean score of 24.38 and a standard deviation of 3.73 for 0-2 years. Three to five years had a mean of 24.83 and a standard deviation of 4.06. The 6-10 years of experience noted a mean of 24.15 with a standard deviation of 3.82. Analysis of data for 11-15 years indicated a mean of 26.19 and a standard deviation of 2.94. Principals with 16 or more years of experience...
had a mean of 25.12 with a standard deviation of 4.02. A $X^2$ score of 4.2496 with a $p$ value of .3733 was reported. No significant difference was indicated since the $p$ value was greater than .05 level of significance. Therefore, null hypothesis 14 was not rejected for the instructional leadership dimension of planning and developing instructional programs. Data for null hypothesis 14 are displayed in Table 36.

Table 36

Kruskal-Wallis Analysis of Differences Among Career Ladder I, II, and II Principals' Perceptions of Planning and Developing Instructional Programs Based on Number of Years as a Principal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years as Principal</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S. D.</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>24.38</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>4.2496</td>
<td>.3733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24.83</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>24.15</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26.19</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 or more</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25.12</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Null hypothesis 15 stated there will be no significant difference among Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals regarding their perceptions of their instructional leadership role in the six identified dimensions of instructional leadership based on the number of years of classroom experience.

For the identified instructional leadership dimension of establishing positive school climate, data analysis of 0-5 years of classroom experience revealed a mean score of 26.75 with a standard deviation of 2.62. Data analysis for 6-10 years of classroom experience indicated a mean of 27.20 with a standard deviation of 2.42. The 11-15 years of experience category had a mean of 27.03 and a standard deviation of 2.91. In the 16 or more years of classroom experience range, a mean score of 27.20 and a standard deviation of 2.59 were noted. A Χ² score of .5100 with a p value of .9167 was recorded. Since the p value was greater than .05 level of significance, null hypothesis 15 was not rejected for the instructional leadership dimension of establishing positive school climate. Data for null hypothesis 15 are displayed in Tables 37 - 42.
Table 37

Kruskal-Wallis Analysis of Differences Among Career Ladder I, II, and II Principals' Perceptions of Establishing Positive School Climate Based on Years of Classroom Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years in Classroom</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S. D.</th>
<th>X²</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26.75</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>.5100</td>
<td>.9167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>27.20</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27.03</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 or more</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27.20</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data analysis using the Kruskal-Wallis one-way analysis of variance reported a mean of 24.75 and a standard deviation of 3.95 for 0-5 years of classroom experience in the instructional leadership dimension of observing teachers and classrooms. Six to 10 years of experience had a mean of 25.25 and a standard deviation of 2.79. Eleven to 15 years of classroom experience noted a mean of 26.46 and a standard deviation of 2.59. Analysis of data for principals with 16 or more years of classroom experience indicated a mean of 25.51 and a standard deviation of 3.20. A X² score of 3.2805 with a p value of .3504 was recorded. Since the p value was
greater than .05 level of significance, null hypothesis 15 was not rejected for the years of classroom experience for principals in the instructional leadership dimension of observing teachers and classrooms. Data for null hypothesis 15 are depicted in Table 38.

Table 38
Kruskal-Wallis Analysis of Differences Among Career Ladder I, II, and II Principals' Perceptions of Observing Teachers and Classrooms Based on Years of Classroom Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years in Classroom</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S. D.</th>
<th>X^2</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24.75</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>3.2805</td>
<td>.3504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>25.25</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26.46</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 or more</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25.51</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Elementary principals' data analysis in the dimension of evaluating and supervising teachers based on the years of classroom experience indicated a mean score of 24.18 and a standard deviation of 3.56 for 0-5 years of classroom experience. The category of 6-10
years of classroom experience reported a mean score of 26.04 and a standard deviation of 2.69. In the 11-15 years of experience range, a mean of 26.07 and a standard deviation of 3.01 were noted. Principals with 16 or more years of classroom experience had a mean of 26.11 and a standard deviation of 3.08. A $X^2$ of 4.4935 with a $p$ value of .2129 was recorded. No significant difference at the .05 level of significance was noted; therefore, null hypothesis 15 was not rejected for the instructional leadership dimension of evaluating and supervising teachers. Data for null hypothesis 15 are presented in Table 39.

Table 39

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years in Classroom</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S. D.</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24.18</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>4.4935</td>
<td>.2129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>26.04</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26.07</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 or more</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26.11</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Analysis of data for principals' perceptions of
the instructional leadership role in the dimension of
implementing curriculum based on the years of classroom
experience revealed a mean score of 25.56 and a
standard deviation of 3.26 for 0-5 years of classroom
experience. A mean score of 26.34 and a standard
development of 2.73 were noted for 6-10 years of
classroom experience. Data analysis for 11-15 years of
classroom experience had a mean score of 26.65 with a
standard deviation of 3.32. Principals with 16 or more
years of classroom experience had a mean score of 26.34
and a standard deviation of 2.83. A $X^2$ score of 1.7622
with a $p$ value of .6232 was noted. No significant
difference was indicated since the $p$ value was greater
than .05 level of significance. Therefore, null
hypothesis 15 was not rejected for the instructional
leadership dimension of implementing curriculum based
on principals' years of classroom experience. Data for
null hypothesis 15 are displayed in Table 40.
Table 40

Kruskal-Wallis Analysis of Differences Among Career Ladder I, II, and III Principals' Perceptions of Implementing Curriculum Based on Years of Classroom Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years in Classroom</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S. D.</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25.56</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>1.7622</td>
<td>.6232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>26.34</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26.65</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 or more</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26.34</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the instructional leadership dimension of instructional problem-solving based on principals' years of classroom experience, data analysis for 0-5 years reported a mean score of 24.81 and a standard deviation of 3.52. The 6-10 years of classroom experience yielded a mean score of 25.27 with a standard deviation of 3.09. Principals with 11-15 years of classroom experience had a mean of 25.65 and a standard deviation of 3.07. Analysis of data for 16 or more years of classroom experience revealed a mean of 25.28 and a standard deviation of 2.99. A $X^2$ of 1.1905 was indicated with a $p$ value of .7553, greater than .05.
level of significance. Therefore, null hypothesis 15 was not rejected for instructional leadership dimension of instructional problem-solving based on years of classroom experience. Data for null hypothesis 15 are depicted in Table 41.

Table 41
Kruskal-Wallis Analysis of Differences Among Career Ladder I, II, and II Principals' Perceptions of Instructional Problem-Solving Based on Years of Classroom Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years in Classroom</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S. D.</th>
<th>X²</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24.81</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>1.1905</td>
<td>.7553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>25.27</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>25.65</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 or more</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25.28</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data analysis revealed a mean score of 23.43 with a standard deviation of 4.70 for principals with 0-5 years of classroom experience in the identified instructional leadership dimension of planning and developing instructional programs based on years of classroom experience. Principals with 6-10 years of classroom experience had a mean score of 25.20 and a
standard deviation of 3.25. For 11-15 years of experience, the mean was 24.96 with a standard deviation of 3.72. Analysis of data for principals with 16 or more years of classroom experience yielded a mean score of 25.20 and a standard deviation of 3.99. The Kruskal-Wallis noted a $X^2$ score of 2.2209 and a $p$ value of .5279. Since the $p$ value was greater than .05 level of significance, null hypothesis 15 was not rejected for the instructional leadership dimension of planning and developing instructional programs based on principals' years of classroom experience. Data for null hypothesis 15 are presented in Table 42.

Table 42

Kruskal-Wallis Analysis of Differences Among Career Ladder I, II, and II Principals' Perceptions of Planning and Developing Instructional Programs Based on Years of Classroom Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years in Classroom</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S. D.</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23.43</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>2.2209</td>
<td>.5279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>25.20</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24.96</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 or more</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25.20</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Null hypothesis 16 stated there will be no significant difference among Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals regarding their perceptions of their instructional leadership role in the six identified dimensions of instructional leadership based on gender.

For the identified instructional leadership dimension of establishing positive school climate based on gender, male principals had a mean of 26.70 and a standard deviation of 2.57. The mean score for female principals was 28.08 with a standard deviation of 2.38. The Mann-Whitney U Test yielded a z score of 3.1202 with a two-tailed probability score of .0018. Female principals perceived their role as instructional leader to be more important than male principals in the instructional leadership dimension of establishing positive school climate. Analysis of data indicated a significant difference at .05 level of significance; therefore, null hypothesis 16 was rejected for the identified instructional leadership dimension of establishing positive school climate.

Data analysis for the identified instructional leadership dimension of observing teachers and classrooms indicated a mean for male principals of 25.07 and a standard deviation of 2.98. Female
principals had a mean of 26.62 with a standard
deviation of 2.99. The Mann-Whitney U Test reported a
z score of 2.5076 with a two-tailed probability of
.0122. Female principals viewed their role as
instructional leader to be more important than male
principals in the instructional leadership dimension of
observing teachers and classrooms. Since the
difference was less than .05 level of significance,
null hypothesis 16 was rejected for the identified
instructional leadership dimension of observing
teachers and classrooms.

Analysis of data for the identified instructional
leadership dimension of evaluating and supervising
teachers based on the gender variable revealed a mean
score of 25.28 with a standard deviation of 3.03 for
male principals. Analysis of data for female
principals noted a mean of 27.17 with a standard
deviation of 2.60. A z score of 3.2213 and a two-
tailed probability of .0013, significant at .05 level
of significance, were reported from data analysis of
the Mann-Whitney U Test. Female principals perceived
their role as instructional leader to be more important
than male principals in the instructional leadership
dimension of evaluating and supervising teachers and
classrooms. Null hypothesis 16 was rejected for the
identified instructional leadership dimension of evaluating and supervising teachers.

Data analysis for the identified instructional leadership dimension of implementing curriculum based on the gender variable indicated a mean score of 25.70 with a standard deviation of 3.08 for male principals. Female principals had a mean of 27.78 and a standard deviation of 1.95. The Mann-Whitney U Test yielded a z score of 3.6655 with a two-tailed probability of .0002. In the instructional leadership dimension of implementing curriculum, female principals viewed their role as instructional leader to be more important than male principals. Analysis of data noted a significant difference at .05 level of significance; therefore, null hypothesis 16 was rejected.

For the identified instructional leadership dimension of instructional problem-solving based on the gender variable, male principals had a mean score of 24.70 with a standard deviation of 3.26. Female principals had a mean score of 27.00 and a standard deviation of 2.53. The Mann-Whitney U Test yielded a z score of 3.2816 with a two-tailed probability of .0010. Female principals perceived their role as instructional leader to be more important than male principals in the instructional leadership dimension of instructional
problem-solving. Analysis of data revealed a significant difference at .05 level of significance; therefore, null hypothesis 16 was rejected.

Analysis of data for the identified instructional leadership dimension of planning and developing instructional programs based on the gender variable noted a mean score of 24.33 with a standard deviation of 3.89 for male principals. Data analysis for female principals indicated a mean score of 26.34 and a standard deviation of 3.10. The Mann-Whitney U Test reported a z score of 2.6890 with a two-tailed probability of .0072. In the instructional leadership dimension of planning and developing instructional programs, female principals viewed their instructional leadership role to be more important than male principals. Analysis of data revealed a significant difference at .05 level of significance; therefore, null hypothesis 16 was rejected. Data for hypothesis 16 are displayed in Table 43.
### Table 43

**Mann-Whitney U Test of Differences Among Career Ladder I, II, and III Principals' Perceptions of their Instructional Leadership Role in the Six Identified Dimensions of Instructional Leadership Based on Gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S. D.</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>Two-Tailed P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establishing Positive School Climate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>26.70</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>3.1202</td>
<td>.0018*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28.08</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observing Teachers and Classrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>25.07</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>2.5076</td>
<td>.0122*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26.62</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating and Supervising Teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>25.28</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>3.2213</td>
<td>.0013*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27.17</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing Curriculum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>25.70</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.6655</td>
<td>.0002*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27.78</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 43 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S. D.</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>Two-Tailed P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructional Problem-Solving</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>24.70</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3.2816</td>
<td>.0010*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26.78</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning and Developing Instructional Programs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>24.33</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>2.6890</td>
<td>.0072*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26.34</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05

Data were further analyzed by the independent t-test to compare the mean scores of Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals' perceptions of their instructional leadership role in the six identified dimensions of instructional leadership based on the gender variable. For the instructional leadership dimension of establishing positive school climate, data analysis indicated a t-value of 2.82 with a two-tailed probability of .006, significant at the .05 level of significance. Data analysis for the instructional leadership dimension of observing teachers and classrooms revealed a t-value of 2.60 with a two-tailed
probability of .012, significant at the .05 level of significance. For the instructional leadership dimension of evaluating and supervising teachers, data analysis noted a t-value of 3.45 with a two-tailed probability of .001, significant at the .05 level of significance. Analysis of the data for the instructional leadership dimension of implementing curriculum reported a t-value of 4.40 with a two-tailed probability of .000, significant at the .05 level of significance. For the instructional leadership dimension of instructional problem-solving, data analysis indicated a t-value of 3.74 with a two-tailed probability of .000, significant at the .05 level of significance. Data analysis for instructional leadership dimension of planning and developing instructional programs revealed a t-value of 2.98 with a two-tailed probability of .004, significant at the .05 level of significance. Significant differences were noted between male and female Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals' perceptions of their instructional leadership role in the six identified dimensions of instructional leadership with female principals viewing their instructional leadership role as being more important than the perceptions of male elementary
principals. Null hypothesis 16 was rejected. Data for null hypothesis 16 are presented in Table 44.

Table 44

| Differences in the Mean Scores of Career Ladder I, II, and III Principals' Perceptions of the Six Identified Dimensions of Instructional Leadership Based on Gender |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Gender | N  | Mean | S. D. | t Value | Degrees of Freedom | Two-Tailed Probability |
| Establishing Positive School Climate |
| Male | 86  | 26.70 | 2.57 | 2.82 | 67.81 | .006* |
| Female | 35  | 28.08 | 2.38 | |
| Observing Teachers and Classrooms |
| Male | 86  | 25.06 | 2.98 | 2.60 | 63.09 | .012* |
| Female | 35  | 26.62 | 2.99 | |
| Evaluating and Supervising Teachers |
| Male | 86  | 25.27 | 3.03 | 3.45 | 73.00 | .001* |
| Female | 35  | 27.17 | 2.60 | |
| Implementing Curriculum |
| Male | 86  | 25.70 | 3.08 | 4.40 | 97.56 | .000* |
| Female | 35  | 27.77 | 1.95 | |
Table 44 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S. D.</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Two-Tailed Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>24.69</td>
<td>.352</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>80.75</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26.77</td>
<td>.428</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Instructional Problem-Solving**

**Planning and Developing Instructional Programs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S. D.</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Degrees of Freedom</th>
<th>Two-Tailed Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>24.33</td>
<td>.420</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>78.58</td>
<td>.004*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26.34</td>
<td>.525</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05
CHAPTER 5
Summary, Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine if Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III Tennessee Elementary Principals perceived differently their role as instructional leaders. The amount of time principals spent in six identified dimensions of instructional leadership was examined. The identified dimensions of instructional leadership for this study were (1) establishing positive school climate, (2) observing teachers and classrooms, (3) evaluating and supervising teachers, (4) implementing curriculum, (5) instructional problem-solving, and (6) planning and developing instructional programs. The study also attempted to determine if selected independent variables such as grade level configuration of the school, years of experience as a principal, number of years of classroom experience, and gender had any effect on the Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals' perceptions of their instructional leadership role.
A review of literature indicated that the effective schools research had an impact on the reemergence of the principal as instructional leader. Effective schools researchers gave importance to the maxim: effective principal—effective school. The leadership of the principal set the tone of the school, the climate for learning, the level of professionalism and morale for teachers, and the level of concern for student success. The principal was the link between school success and failure. The principal as instructional leader provided necessary resources to achieve academic goals, possessed knowledge and skill in curriculum, demonstrated skill in communication, and articulated a vision.

Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals from seven city and 10 county school systems in the First Tennessee Regional Development District of the Tennessee Department of Education, located in Northeast Tennessee participated in the study. Participants were asked to respond to a survey containing three parts. Parts I and II contained 12 demographic items. Part III contained 36 questions related to six identified dimensions of instructional leadership including establishing positive school climate, observing teachers and
classrooms, evaluating and supervising teachers, implementing curriculum, instructional problem-solving, and planning and developing instructional programs. An estimated percentage of time spent daily in the six dimensions of instructional leadership was also requested.

Responses were received from 121 or 96.8% of the 125 elementary principals who were contacted to participate in the study. Responses were keyed into the computer and statistical calculations were performed using SPSS/PC+ software. Statistical tests used for data analyses were frequency distribution for demographic items, the Student-Newman-Keuls, Non-Parametric Kruskal-Wallis one-way ANOVA, Pairwise Mann-Whitney U Test or the Wilcoxon-Rank Sum W Test, and the t-test for differences. The t-test was used to assess significant differences among the perceptions of Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals based on gender.

The statistical test, Kruskal-Wallis Analysis of Variance, one-way ANOVA, was used to test differences between and among the perceptions of Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals regarding their role as an instructional leader in the six identified dimensions of
Findings

The following findings are based on the data reported in Chapter 4 of this study:

1. There was no significant difference among Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals regarding their perceptions of the importance of their instructional leadership role in the dimension of establishing positive school climate. Null hypothesis 1 was not rejected.

2. A significant difference existed among Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals regarding their perceptions of their instructional leadership role in the dimension of observing teachers and classrooms. A significant difference was reported between Career Ladder I and Career Ladder II elementary principals. Career Ladder I elementary principals perceived their role as instructional leader in the dimension of observing
teachers and classrooms to be more important than did Career Ladder II elementary principals. A significant difference was revealed between Career Ladder III and Career Ladder II elementary principals. Career Ladder III elementary principals viewed their instructional leadership role in the instructional leadership dimension of observing teachers and classrooms as being more important than did Career Ladder II elementary principals. Since differences among Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals were less than .05 level of significance, null hypothesis 2 was rejected.

3. Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals differed significantly in their perceptions of their instructional leadership role in the instructional leadership dimension of evaluating and supervising teachers. Significant difference was indicated between Career Ladder II and Career Ladder II elementary principals. Career Ladder I elementary principals viewed their instructional leadership role as being more important than Career Ladder II elementary principals. Career Ladder III and Career Ladder II elementary principals differed significantly. Career Ladder III elementary principals considered their instructional leadership role in the
instructional leadership dimension of evaluating and supervising teachers as more important than Career Ladder II elementary principals. The differences among Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals were significant at the .05 level of significance; therefore, null hypothesis 3 was rejected.

4. Analysis of the data revealed no significant difference among Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals' perceptions of their instructional leadership role in the dimension of implementing curriculum. The difference was greater than .05 level of significance; therefore, null hypothesis 4 was not rejected.

5. The data indicated a significant difference among Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals' perceptions of their instructional leadership role in the instructional leadership dimension of instructional problem-solving. Career Ladder I and Career Ladder II elementary principals differed significantly. Career Ladder I elementary principals perceived their role as instructional leader in the instructional leadership dimension of instructional problem-solving as more important than Career Ladder II. Significant
differences were revealed between Career Ladder III and Career Ladder II elementary principals' perceptions of their instructional leadership role in the instructional leadership dimension of instructional problem-solving. Career Ladder III elementary principals viewed their role as instructional leader in the instructional leadership dimension of instructional problem-solving as more important than Career Ladder II elementary principals. Since the differences were less than .05 level of significance, null hypothesis 5 was rejected.

6. Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals differed significantly in their perceptions of their instructional leadership role in the dimension of planning and developing instructional programs. A significant difference was reported between Career Ladder I and Career Ladder II elementary principals. Career Ladder I elementary principals viewed their role as instructional leader in the instructional leadership dimension of planning and developing instructional programs as more important than Career Ladder II elementary principals. A significant difference was revealed between Career Ladder III and Career Ladder II elementary principals. Career Ladder III elementary principals perceived their
role as instructional leader in the instructional leadership dimension of planning and developing instructional programs as more important than Career Ladder II elementary principals. The differences were less than .05 level of significance; therefore, null hypothesis 6 was rejected.

7. There was no significant difference among Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals regarding their perceptions of the estimated amount of time spent daily in the identified instructional leadership dimension of establishing positive school climate. Since no significant difference was noted at the .05 level of significance, null hypothesis 7 was not rejected.

8. Analysis of data indicated no significant difference among Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals regarding their perceptions of the estimated amount of time spent daily in the identified instructional leadership dimension of observing teachers and classrooms. Null hypothesis 8 was not rejected.

9. Data analysis revealed no significant difference among Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals regarding their perceptions of the estimated amount of time spent daily
in the identified instructional leadership dimension of evaluating and supervising teachers. No significant difference at the .05 level of significance was reported; therefore, null hypothesis 9 was not rejected.

10. Career Ladder I and Career Ladder III elementary principals indicated a significantly greater difference than Career Ladder II elementary principals in the amount of time spent daily in the identified instructional leadership dimension of implementing curriculum. Career Ladder I elementary principals indicated a significantly greater difference than Career Ladder III elementary principals in the amount of time spent daily in the identified instructional leadership dimension of implementing curriculum. Null hypothesis 10 was rejected.

11. Analysis of data revealed no significant difference among Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals' perceptions of the estimated amount of time spent daily in the identified instructional leadership dimension of instructional problem-solving. Null hypothesis 11 was not rejected.

12. Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals did not differ
significantly in their perceptions of the estimated amount of time spent daily in the identified instructional leadership dimension of planning and developing instructional programs. Null hypothesis 12 was not rejected.

13. There was no significant difference among Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals' perceptions of their instructional leadership role in the six identified dimensions of instructional leadership based on the grade level configuration of the school. Null hypothesis 13 was not rejected.

14. Data analysis revealed no significant difference among Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals in their perceptions of their instructional leadership role in the six identified dimensions of instructional leadership based on the number of years as a principal. Null hypothesis 14 was not rejected.

15. Analysis of data indicated no significant difference among Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals regarding their perceptions of their instructional leadership role in the six identified dimensions of instructional
leadership based on the number of years of classroom experience. Null hypothesis 15 was not rejected.

16. Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals differed significantly regarding their perceptions of their instructional leadership role in all six identified dimensions of instructional leadership based on gender. The Mann-Whitney U Test noted significant differences; therefore, the t-test was executed. Female principals revealed greater differences. Differences were noted in the instructional leadership dimension of establishing positive school climate with a two-tailed probability of .006 and a t-value of 2.82; observing teachers and classrooms with a two-tailed probability of .012 and a t-value of 2.60; evaluating and supervising teachers with a two-tailed probability of .001 and a t-value of 3.45; implementing curriculum with a two-tailed probability of .000 and a t-value of 4.40; instructional problem-solving with a two-tailed probability of .000 and a t-value of 3.74; and planning and developing instructional programs with a two-tailed probability of .004 and a t-value of 2.98.

In the six identified dimensions of instructional leadership, female elementary principals perceived their role of instructional leader to be of greater
importance than male elementary principals. In each of the six identified dimensions of instructional leadership, differences were less than .05 level of significance; therefore, null hypothesis 16 was rejected.

Conclusions

As a result of the findings, the following conclusions are drawn regarding Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals' perceptions of their role as instructional leader:

1. Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals do not differ in their perceptions of the importance of their instructional leadership role in the identified instructional leadership dimension of establishing positive school climate.

2. In the identified instructional leadership dimensions of observing teachers and classrooms, evaluating and supervising teachers, instructional problem-solving, and planning and developing instructional programs, Career Ladder I elementary principals perceive their role as instructional leader to be more important than Career Ladder II elementary principals.
3. Career Ladder III elementary principals perceive their role as instructional leader to be more important than Career Ladder II elementary principals in the identified instructional leadership dimensions of observing teachers and classrooms, evaluating and supervising teachers, instructional problem-solving, and planning and developing instructional programs.

4. Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals do not differ in their perceptions of the estimated amount of time spent daily in the identified instructional leadership dimensions of establishing positive school climate, observing teachers and classrooms, evaluating and supervising teachers, instructional problem-solving, and planning and developing instructional programs. Career Ladder I and Career Ladder III elementary principals perceive their role as instructional leader to be more important than Career Ladder II elementary principals in the amount of time spent daily in the identified instructional leadership dimension of implementing curriculum. Career Ladder I elementary principals perceive their role as instructional leader to be more important than Career Ladder III elementary principals in the amount of time spent daily in the instructional leadership dimension of implementing curriculum.
5. Grade level configuration of the school is not a significant factor as to how Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals perceive the importance of their instructional leadership role in the six identified dimensions of instructional leadership.

6. The number of years as a principal does not determine how Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals perceive the importance of their instructional leadership role in the six identified dimensions of instructional leadership.

7. In the six identified dimensions of instructional leadership based on the number of years of classroom experience, Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals' perceptions of the importance of their instructional leadership role do not differ.

8. In all six identified dimensions of instructional leadership based on gender, female Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals perceive their role as instructional leader to be more important than Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III male.
elementary principals' perceptions of their role as instructional leader.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations are proposed:

1. The time element component of the Instructional Leadership Survey of Elementary School Principals should be revised to reflect closely the total percentage of time Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals spend daily in instructional leadership.

2. Further research in the area of instructional leadership should be conducted in other districts of Tennessee to determine whether the findings may be generalized to the rest of the state.

3. The Tennessee Department of Education should devote additional attention toward understanding the instructional leadership role of elementary principals as it relates to the effective schools literature.

4. Since the effective schools literature identified the principal as the key component in an effective school, local school boards should establish definitive guidelines and policies regarding the principal's role as instructional leader.
5. Further research should be conducted to determine other areas of instructional leadership in which Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals spend time.

6. Principal preparation and training programs should include instructional leadership components.

7. Further study of internal and external factors that impact principals' instructional leadership role should be conducted.

8. Considering the differences noted between Career Ladder I and Career Ladder II elementary principals and between Career Ladder II and Career Ladder III elementary principals regarding their perceptions of their instructional leadership role in the identified instructional dimensions of observing teachers and classrooms, evaluating and supervising teachers, instructional problem-solving, and planning and developing instructional programs, the Tennessee Department of Education should provide further training for principals to address specifically the issue of instructional leadership as mandated by the Tennessee Code Annotated.
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APPENDIX B

LETTER TO SUBJECT MATTER SPECIALISTS
After many years as a doctoral student, the light at the end of the tunnel is about to be reached. A research project, The Perceptions of Career Ladder I and Career Ladder III Elementary Principals Regarding Instructional Leadership, is currently being developed. A survey instrument with the necessary specifications for the study is being designed.

Because of your recognized expertise in school administration, I am requesting that you serve as a subject area specialist in validating the instrument being designed. Enclosed you will find the instrument, the statement of the research problem, research questions and hypotheses, a form for your comments and suggestions, and a self-addressed envelope for returning your reactions.

Your evaluation and input into the development of the instrument for my research project are greatly needed. Thank you in advance for giving your valuable time to assist in the validation of the instrument.

Sincerely,

Brenda Thompson Smith
Doctoral Student

Enclosures
APPENDIX C

LETTER FOR PILOT STUDY
Dear Principal:

The attached survey instrument, concerned with elementary principals' perceptions of their roles as instructional leaders, is a part of a pilot study. This project is designed specifically to determine if differences exist between perceptions of Career Ladder I and Career Ladder III elementary principals regarding their instructional leadership roles. The results of this study will provide information for local school systems and the Tennessee Department of Education to develop plans for training principals for their roles as instructional leaders in elementary schools.

Please take a few minutes of your valuable time to respond to the enclosed questionnaire. The responses should reflect your perception of the principal's role as instructional leader. The completion of the questionnaire should take 15 minutes or less. We are also interested in obtaining your input into the development of the survey instrument because of your leadership experience as a principal. Any comments directed toward the improvement of the instrument will be welcome.

It will be appreciated if you will complete and return the questionnaire in the enclosed stamped, self-addressed envelope by September 15, 1993. All data collected will be held in strictest confidence. In no way will you or your school be identified in any report or dissertation published from this study.

Your cooperation in completing the questionnaire will contribute to the success of this research and reveal valuable information about principals' perceptions of their roles as instructional leaders. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Brenda Thompson Smith
Doctoral Student
East Tennessee State University

Enclosures
Dear Principal:

Please complete the attached survey instrument that is a part of my research project. The responses should reflect your perception of the principal's role as instructional leader.

It will be appreciated if you will complete and return the survey in the enclosed stamped, self-addressed envelope. All data collected will be held in strictest confidence. Return envelopes are numbered to assure adequate response. In no way will you or your school be identified in any report or dissertation published from this study.

My research project is designed specifically to determine if differences exist among perceptions of Career Ladder I, Career Ladder II, and Career Ladder III elementary principals regarding their instructional leadership role. The results of the study will provide information for local school systems and the Tennessee Department of Education to develop plans for training principals for their role as instructional leaders in elementary schools.

Your cooperation in completing the survey will contribute to the success of this research and reveal valuable information about principals' perceptions of their role as instructional leaders. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Brenda Thompson Smith
Doctoral Student
East Tennessee State University

APPROVED:

Charles W. Burkett
Major Professor and Chairman,
Doctoral Committee
Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis
East Tennessee State University

Enclosures
APPENDIX E
SURVEY QUESTIONS EXPLANATION
INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP SURVEY
OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

Explanation: The six broad dimensions of instructional leadership as assessed by the survey instrument are given below. Individual measurement statements for each dimension are also listed. Following each measurement statement is a number referring to the question's position on the actual survey instrument.

I. ESTABLISHING POSITIVE SCHOOL CLIMATE
1. Facilitates good human relations within school and community. (III: B2)
2. Establishes coordination linkages and parent-community support. (III: B19)
3. Sets high expectations for the success of students and teachers. (III: B23)
4. Communicates positive school goals. (III: B13)
5. Defines the mission of the school. (III: B25)
6. Sends a school newsletter for linkages between school-home-community. (III: B8)

II. OBSERVING TEACHERS AND CLASSROOMS
1. Visits classrooms informally to observe attention to curricular content. (III: B3)
2. Observes content being taught in the classroom. (III: B28)
3. Establishes clear guidelines for use of time allocated to instruction. (III: B30)
4. Observes classrooms to measure time on task. (III: B14)
5. Observes teachers to determine appropriate use of materials. (III: B32)
6. Maintains high visibility daily throughout the school. (III: B9)

III. EVALUATING AND SUPERVISING TEACHERS
1. Conducts formal evaluations of teachers. (III: B6)
2. Evaluates and supervises teachers in the classrooms. (III: B34)
3. Suggests new ideas and approaches for instruction. (III: B36)
4. Offers suggestions to teachers to improve instruction. (III: B15)
5. Communicates expectations to teacher. (III: B24)

IV. IMPLEMENTING CURRICULUM
1. Develops appropriate procedures for evaluating curricular effectiveness. (III: B5)
2. Communicates knowledge of curriculum and instruction. (III: B31)
3. Works with teachers to implement instructional programs consistent with needs of students. (III: B16)
5. Provides resources necessary to implement the curriculum. (III: B35)
6. Acquires materials and supplies teachers need to implement curriculum. (III: B11)

V. INSTRUCTIONAL PROBLEM-SOLVING
1. Consults with teachers on problems related to instruction. (III: B4)
2. Participates in parent-teacher conferences conducted by the teacher. (III: B21)
3. Works directly with teachers in using test data for improving student performance. (III: B22)
4. Monitors and evaluates student progress. (III: B27)
5. Establishes procedures for analyzing and solving problems related to instruction. (III: B33)
6. Resolves problems related to curriculum and instruction with students. (III: B12)

VI. PLANNING AND DEVELOPING INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS
1. Provides time to plan instructional programs with teachers. (III: B7)
2. Schedules planning time for teachers. (III: B26)
3. Selects and employs teachers with competence in curriculum. (III: B29)
4. Participates in the planning of instructional programs. (III)
5. Conducts building level inservice for teachers. (III: B20)
6. Provides staff development activities for teachers (III: B1)
APPENDIX F

SURVEY OF ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS
INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP SURVEY OF ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

This survey is designed for elementary school principals to assess perceptions of their role as instructional leaders. PART I requests demographic data. PART II pertains to school organization. PART III consists of questions related to the principal's role as instructional leader.

PART I: DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

DIRECTIONS: Please respond to the following questions about yourself and your school by checking the appropriate box.

1. Age: □ < 30 □ 30 - 39 □ 40 - 49 □ 50 - 59 □ > 59

2. Gender: □ Male □ Female

3. Number of years experience as a principal:
   □ 0 - 2 □ 3 - 5 □ 6 - 10 □ 11 - 15 □ 16 or more

4. Number of years experience as a teacher:
   □ 0 - 2 □ 3 - 5 □ 6 - 10 □ 11 - 15 □ 16 or more

5. Check the highest academic degree you hold:
   □ B.S./B.A □ M.A. □ M.A. + 45 □ Ed.S. □ Ed.D./Ph.D.

6. Number of curriculum and instruction courses taken:
   □ 0 - 1 □ 2 - 3 □ 4 - 5 □ 6 - 7 □ >7

7. Number of years since last enrollment in college/university classes:
   □ 0 - 2 □ 3 - 5 □ 6 - 10 □ 11 - 15 □ 16 or more

8. Number of hours spent per week in professional reading:
   □ 0 - 1 □ 2 - 3 □ 4 - 5 □ 6 - 7 □ >7

9. What is your current Career Ladder status?
   □ Career Ladder I □ Career Ladder II □ Career Ladder III
PART II: SCHOOL ORGANIZATION

10. School Setting:

□ Rural □ Urban □ Suburban □ Other

11. Grade level configuration:

□ K - 8 □ K - 5 □ K - 4 □ K - 2 □ Other

12. Student Enrollment:

□ < 200 □ 201 - 300 □ 301 - 400 □ 401 - 500 □ > 500

PART III: INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP

A. Principal Estimated Time Spent in Instructional Leadership

Average percent of time per day spent on instructional leadership? _____________________

DIRECTIONS: Listed below are six dimensions of instructional leadership with which principals are typically involved. Please estimate the amount of your time that is consumed in each area. Functional overlap may occur in several areas; therefore, when estimating your time, do not replicate. For example, if during "Observing Teachers and Classrooms," data are gathered for use in teacher evaluation, do not include that time in "Evaluating and Supervising Teachers." Of that time spent in instructional leadership, what percent is spent in each of these areas?

I. Establishing Positive School Climate _____________________

II. Observing Teachers and Classrooms _____________________

III. Evaluating and Supervising Teachers _____________________

IV. Implementing Curriculum _____________________

V. Instructional Problem-Solving _____________________

VI. Planning and Developing Instructional Programs _____________________

TOTAL _____________________
## B. Principal Perceived Involvement in Instructional Leadership

**DIRECTIONS:** Listed below are 36 tasks that have been identified in the literature to be somewhat common to the role of principal as instructional leader. Please respond by indicating how important you perceive your level of involvement to be in your role as instructional leader. Please circle your response where:

- **5 = HIGHLY IMPORTANT**
- **4 = SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT**
- **3 = NOT SURE**
- **2 = SOMEWHAT UNIMPORTANT**
- **1 = HIGHLY UNIMPORTANT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>Level of Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>High</strong></td>
<td><strong>Low</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Providing professional development activities for teachers</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Facilitating positive human relations within school and community</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Visiting classrooms informally to observe attention to curriculum content</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Consulting with teachers on problems related to instruction</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Developing appropriate procedures for evaluating curricular effectiveness</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Conducting formal evaluations of teachers</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Providing time for personally planning instructional programs with teachers</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Sending a school newsletter for linkages among school, home, and community</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Maintaining high visibility daily throughout the school</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Keeping documentation of teacher performance</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Acquiring materials and supplies teachers need to implement curriculum</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Resolving problems related to curriculum and instruction with students</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Communicating school goals to teachers, students, and community</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Observing classrooms to measure student time on task</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LEVEL OF IMPORTANCE SCALE:

5 = HIGHLY IMPORTANT
4 = SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT
3 = NOT SURE
2 = SOMEWHAT UNIMPORTANT
1 = HIGHLY UNIMPORTANT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>Level of Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15. Offering suggestions to teachers to improve instruction</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Working with teachers to implement instructional programs</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consistent with needs of students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Monitoring progress in implementing curriculum</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Participating in the planning of instructional programs</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Establishing coordination linkages and parent-community support</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Conducting building level inservice for teachers</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Participating in parent-teacher conferences</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Working directly with teachers in using test data for improving</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Setting high expectations for the success of students and teachers</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Communicating performance expectations to teachers</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Defining the mission of the school</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Scheduling planning time for teachers</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Monitoring and evaluating overall student progress</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Observing content being taught in the classrooms</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Selecting and employing teachers with competence in curriculum</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and instruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Establishing clear guidelines for use of time allocated to</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instruction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Communicating current information relative to curriculum and</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instruction to teachers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LEVEL OF IMPORTANCE SCALE:

5 = HIGHLY IMPORTANT
4 = SOMEWHAT IMPORTANT
3 = NOT SURE
2 = SOMEWHAT UNIMPORTANT
1 = HIGHLY UNIMPORTANT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tasks</th>
<th>Level of Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32. Observing teachers to determine appropriate use of materials</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Establishing broad procedures for analyzing and solving problems</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Evaluating and supervising teachers in classrooms</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Providing resources necessary to implement the curriculum</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Suggesting new ideas and approaches for instruction</td>
<td>5 4 3 2 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Personal Data:
Place of Birth: Greene County, Tennessee
Marital Status: Married

Education:
Public Schools, Greene County, Tennessee
Tusculum College, Greeneville, Tennessee, Elementary Education, B.S., 1964
East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tennessee, Reading, M.A., 1974

Professional Experience:
Teacher, Holly Hall Elementary School, Elkton, Maryland, 1964-1965
Teacher, Highland Elementary School, Greeneville, Tennessee, 1965-1966
Teacher, Summer Reading Program, Eastview Elementary School, Greeneville, Tennessee, 1966
Teacher, Tusculum View Elementary, Greeneville, Tennessee, 1966-1973
Supervising-Demonstration Teacher/Guest Lecturer, Appalachian State University, Boone, North Carolina, 1972
Adjunct Faculty, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tennessee, 1977-Present
Instructor for Horizons for Youth Program for Gifted Students, Department of Human Development and Learning/Continuing Education, East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, Tennessee, Summer 1982

Team Leader and Teacher, Tusculum View Elementary School, Greeneville, Tennessee, 1973-1984

Associate Faculty, Tusculum College, Greeneville, Tennessee, 1987-Present


Principal, Highland Elementary School, Greeneville, Tennessee, 1988-Present

Appointments:

Teacher Representative on the 18-Member Master Teacher Interim Commission, appointed by the Governor of Tennessee, to develop criteria for selecting Master Teachers and Master Principals in Tennessee, 1983, 1984

Director of the East Tennessee Regional Certification Commission, a nine-member commission, an administrative component of the Comprehensive Education Reform Act of 1984, Tennessee Department of Education, 1986
Board of Directors,
Appalachian Literacy League,
Johnson City, Tennessee,
1988-1990
Advisory Council, Johnson City
Press Newspapers in
Education Program, Johnson
City, Tennessee,
1990-Present

Tennessee Endorsements: Elementary Teacher, Grades 1-9
Administrator/Supervisor, K-8
Special Teacher of Reading, K-8
Superintendent
Supervisor of Attendance

Honors and Awards: Distinguished Reading Teacher,
Allie Lou Felton Gilbreath
Council, International
Reading Association, 1976
Kiwanis Club Teacher of the
Month, Greeneville,
Tennessee, 1976
Tusculum View Elementary
School Teacher of the Year,
Greeneville, Tennessee,
First Tennessee District
Teacher of the Year, 1981
Tennessee Teacher of the
Year, 1981
Outstanding Tennessean Award,
1981
Individual Reading Award,
Outstanding Contributions to
Reading Council Activities
by the Tennessee
International Reading
Association, 1982
Distinguished Classroom
Teacher Award, Tennessee
Education Association, 1983
Certificate of Merit,
Outstanding Alumna, East
Tennessee State University,
1983
Certificates of Appreciation from the Governor of Tennessee for Outstanding Service to the State of Tennessee, 1983, 1986
Pioneer Award, Tusculum College, 1984
Outstanding Alumna, Tusculum College, 1985
Commended as a member of the Interim Certification Commission by the Tennessee General Assembly, in House Joint Resolution No. 632, for efforts on behalf of the improvement of education in Tennessee, 1986
Dean's Award for Outstanding Faculty Service, Tusculum College Adult and Graduate Programs, 1987
National Sallie Mae First Year Teacher Tribute Award, in the September 1993 issue of Newsweek
Tennessee Elementary Principal of the Year, 1994

Other Related Experiences:
Speaker and presenter for local, state and national conferences and organizations. Consultant, in-service coordinator, and workshop director for school systems and universities in ten states, 1968-Present

Affiliations:
First Tennessee Region Principals' Study Council (Chairman 1991-92; Vice Chairman, 1990-91; Secretary, 1989-90)
National Association of Elementary School Principals
Tennessee Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (Chairman for Spring Conference 1986)
Association for Supervision
and Curriculum Development

International Reading
Association

Tennessee Reading Association
(Recording Secretary
1983-84; Corresponding
Secretary 1982-83;
Chairman, Archives
Committee 1981-82;
Chairman Legislative
Committee 1984-86)

Gilbreath Council
International Reading
Association (President
1981-82; Vice-President
1980-81; Recording Secretary
1979-80)

National Education Association
(Convention Delegate,
Philadelphia 1983; Kansas
City 1990)

Tennessee Education
Association (Special
Services Committee 1982-83;
Credentials Committee for
Legislative Assembly 1982;
Committee to Select
Distinguished Classroom
Teacher 1986, 1987)

East Tennessee Education
Association

Greeneville Education
Association (President 1990-
91; 1983-84; First Vice-
President 1982-83; Second
Vice-President 1981-82;
Corresponding Secretary
1976-77; Reporter 1994-95;
Public Relations Committee,
1974-77; 1979-80; Chairman,
1982-83; Delegate
Representative Assembly
1977; 1981; 1982; Human
Relations Committee,
Chairman 1977-78;
Legislative Committee,
Chairman 1981-82)
National State Teacher of the Year
Tennessee Environmental Education Association
(Newsletter Editorial Staff 1979)
Alpha Delta Kappa
International Honorary Sorority for Women Educators
(President, Tennessee Tau Chapter 1976-78; Tennessee ADK Officer 1978-79;
Tennessee ADK Courtesy Committee 1977; Tennessee ADK Professional Rights and
Responsibilities Committee 1986-87)
Phi Delta Kappa, East Tennessee State University Chapter
Tusculum College Alumni Association (President 1993-94; Vice-President 1992-93;
Secretary 1991-92)
East Tennessee State University National Alumni Association (Board of Directors 1994-98)