4-1975

# A Comparative Study of Functions Performed by Principals of Community Schools and Principals of Non-Community Schools

Lawrence Russell Wilder
*Western Michigan University*

# A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF FUNCTIONS PERFORMED BY PRINCIPALS OF COMMUNITY SCHOOLS AND PRINCIPALS OF NON-COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

by

Lawrence Russell Wilder

Submitted to the
Faculty of The Graduate College
in partial fulfillment
of the
Degree of Doctor of Education

Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan
April 1975

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to express a heartfelt thanks to Dr. Donald C. Weaver, committee chairman, without whose endless help and never dying support this project might not have been finished. My thanks are also extended to committee members Dr. Uldis Smidchens and Dr. Clyde Willis for their willingness to serve and their valuable contributions.

A special note of appreciation is due to two school districts and many principals who allowed me to intrude into their already busy schedules. Their cooperation was greatly valued.

To the Mott Foundation and the Educational Leadership Department of Western Michigan University I shall ever be indebted for their financial support and educational enlightenment. Without the trust and confidence of both institutions, the long desired doctorate would have been much further down the line.

Finally, to my wife and typist, Shirley, who left the comforts of climate, home and friends in support of her husband's dream, I shall be eternally grateful. Like Ruth of old, her encouraging words have been, "Whither thou goest, I will go." A more supportive wife no man could ever hope to find.

Lawrence Russell Wilder

## INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.

5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

**Xerox University Microfilms**
300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont'd)

TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont'd)

## LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF TABLES (cont'd)

LIST OF TABLES (cont'd)

LIST OF TABLES (cont'd)

LIST OF TABLES (cont'd)

LIST OF TABLES (cont'd)

LIST OF TABLES (cont'd)

LIST OF TABLES (cont'd)

# CHAPTER I

## STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

### The Problem

The focus of this study was the comparison of administrative functions performed by community school principals and non-community school principals. Specifically, the study attempted to determine (1) if a difference exists between the percentage of time actually spent by community school principals and non-community school principals in given functions, (2) if a difference exists between the percentage of time actually spent by principals and what they would ideally like to spend in performing given functions and (3) if there is a difference in the skill mix (human, technical and conceptual) required of community school principals and non-community school principals.

The study concerned itself with the three main areas mentioned above and each area required specific discussion and analysis. A single questionnaire which would delineate the trichotomous data was designed for this specific study. A complete description of the instrument's design and utilization is presented in Chapter III.

## Background

Since community education is a relatively new and growing movement in education, many claims are made concerning its viability. One of the claims is that the principal of a community school is "different." Writers in the field (Keidel, 1969; Whitt & Burden, 1973; Clark, 1974) have attempted to infer a "difference" in the role and function of the community school principal. However, most of the studies referred to above have dealt with the roles and functions of community school directors. These studies of the roles and functions of community school directors bear little direct evidence to support inferences drawn from studies of the roles and functions of community school principals. However, it seems reasonable to assume that expectations for the role and function of the community school principal would differ from those of the non-community school principal.

This assumption of different role and function expectations of principals in community schools is based upon three basic differences between community and non-community schools. First, the traditional, or non-community, school has tended to be separated from the community. This is in direct opposition to the community school which seeks integration with the community and

openness of the institution. As Melby (1965) has said:

> The educative influence of the community upon the individual is apparent. This influence includes all agencies and institutions with which the individual comes into contact. The learning the individual acquires in the community may be more satisfying, more penetrating and more lasting than that which occurs in the classroom. Hence, learning is not something that starts and stops when the school bell rings (p. 27).

Minzey and LeTarte (1972) call this integration of the school and community "interaction between school and community (p. 25)." This process may distinguish the community school from the non-community school and, therefore, may indicate a difference between the two schools in the role and function of the principal.

Secondly, in addition to expecting the community school principal's role and function to be different by virtue of seeking interaction between the school and community, the role would also seem to be different because the community school seeks to be of service to the community. Seay (1945) wrote that the "community school...has two distinctive emphases--service to the entire community, not merely to the children of school age; and discovery, development, and use of the resources of the community as a part of the educational facilities of the school (p. 210)." This is contrasted with the non-community school which concerns itself primarily with the education of school age children. In the case

of the community school principal, one would expect, therefore, considerable time and effort devoted to providing services to the community; whereas, the principal in the non-community school would be expected to confine his services primarily within the school.

Finally, the community school seeks to match the needs of the community with the resources of the community (Minzey & LeTarte, 1972; Seay, 1974). Berridge (1973) has called this the "Marshaling of all resources of the community...to better serve individuals in the community. Groups, agencies, organizations and institutions assess their resources and join together to meet the wants and needs of people (p. 4)." Attempting this task would appear to require different roles and functions of the community school principal as opposed to the non-community school principal who is concerned basically with resources within the school.

It seems then that the community school principal would play a key role in integrating the school and community, in making the school of service to the community and in seeking to coordinate the needs and resources of the community.

One school district in southeastern Michigan recognized the implied key role of the principal in community education and in its reorganizational planning made community education "an accountable responsibility

of the school principal (Harris, 1974, p. 18)." No longer was the community education program left to the community school director, but the burden of the total educational plan was placed on the principal at each school.

In spite of inferences by writers in the field or movements by boards of education, no specific evidence exists to support the claim that the community school principal differs in any way from the non-community school principal. Additional studies often used to support a difference between these two groups will be cited in Chapter II.

## Questions Investigated

If all of the administrative functions were delineated, one might expect that the functions of the community school principal and the non-community school principal would differ in emphasis. Three questions were, therefore, investigated by this study. First, does a difference exist between the percentage of time actually spent by community school principals and non-community school principals in given functions? This question compared the community school principal and the non-community school principal in the perceptions of how they are actually dividing their time among the various functions. Second, does a difference exist between the two groups of principals in their ideal and actual

expenditures of time? Here the study compared how they would ideally prefer to spend their time. Finally, is there a difference in the skill mix among human, technical and conceptual skills between community school principals and non-community school principals in either actual or idealized roles? That is, do the principals differ in these three skill areas either actually or ideally?

An eighteen item instrument entitled Functions of the Principal Questionnaire (FPQ) was developed for this study. The population used was the principals from two school districts in lower Michigan. An analysis of variance was calculated for each of the questions being answered with the appropriate responses utilized for each item.

Definitions of all terms, a complete description of the sample and a detailed explanation of the procedures and data analyses used are included in Chapter III.

## Significance of the Study

This study was needed to help establish an empirical basis for claims of differences between community school and non-community school principals. A determination might be made concerning any differences. The results of this study were intended to (1) help to determine if there exists a difference between the time allocations of principals in community and non-community schools,

(2) assist in determining the skill mix exhibited by the two groups of principals and (3) suggest emphases in training for future community school principals.

## Limitations of the Study

A major limitation of this study was the school districts selected for the population. Since only two districts were used, generalizations based upon the conclusions and recommendations from the present study should be limited to comparable school districts as described in Chapter III.

Another limitation was the lack of previous studies dealing with the roles and functions of community school principals. Most of the former studies in community education have dealt with community school directors. Although many writers have attempted to infer a "difference" in the role and function of the community school principal, little direct evidence exists to support these implications.

## Organization of the Report

Chapter I has included a statement of the problem, a description of the background, the questions investigated and the significance of the study.

Chapter II contains a review of the literature and appropriate studies related to community education.

Specific areas covered include writers from business administration, educational administration and related studies of community school directors or other community educators and principals.

Chapter III presents a review of the problem, a description of the population, definition of all key terms and a description of the instrumentation with its development. Procedures used in gathering the data and the analyses of the data are also included in this chapter.

Chapter IV deals with the analysis of the data received. This chapter relates the results of the findings to the original questions posed. Also included in Chapter IV is a discussion of the major findings.

Chapter V summarizes the findings of the study, states conclusions and discusses implications for further study and research.

## CHAPTER II

## REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

### Introduction

For the purposes of this study the review of related literature covers three areas. These areas are writings in business administration, research in educational administration and studies of community school directors or other community educators including principals. Each of these areas of investigation serves as background for the remaining three chapters and constitutes an integral portion of the developmental position considered in this study.

### Literature Related to Business Administration

What might be termed a "general approach" to administration was first developed by Fayol, a French engineer turned administrator, in his book Administration Industrielle et Generale (1916). Fayol defined administration as "to plan, to organize, to command, to co-ordinate, and to control." These elements he called "elements of management" while they have become known as "Fayol's Elements" and are delineated as follows:

> To plan means to study the future and arrange the plan of operations.
>
> To organize means to build up the material and human

> organization of the business, organizing both men and materials.
>
> To command means to make the staff do their work.
>
> To co-ordinate means to unite and correlate all activities.
>
> To control means to see that everything is done in accordance with the rules which have been laid down and the instructions which have been given. (Fayol, 1916, pp. 6, 43-110)

Each of these elements entailed more than his surface definitions. For example, studying and preparing for the future--planning--necessitated the important plan of operations which contained the object in view, the course of actions to be followed, the various stages on the way and the means to be used. Unity, continuity, flexibility and precision were all characteristics of a good plan of operations according to Fayol.

Commanding involved getting the best out of employees in the interest of the concern as a whole as well as enforcement of obedience. To facilitate command, Fayol suggested that the manager should (1) acquire a thorough knowledge of his personnel, (2) eliminate the incompetent, (3) avoid pre-occupation with detail, (4) set a good example and (5) foster esprit de corps, initiative and loyalty among his staff (Campbell, Bridges, Corbally, Nystrand, & Ramseyer, 1971, p. 182).

Human concern was Fayol's main emphasis in organizing although both men and material were elements to be

considered. He recognized the need in a peopled organization to invest time and energy in the selection of employees, to situate men where they could be of most service and to adapt organizational requirements in light of available personnel.

Co-ordination concerned itself with harmonizing all the operations of the organization. This was evidenced by an up-to-date program of work and exact instructions for the various units and sub-units to combine their efforts. Fayol recommended regular staff meetings for departmental managers to assist in the co-ordination efforts.

Finally, controlling for Fayol was an evaluation and examination of the results not just a means of checking to see that everything was done. The object of control was to discover existing weaknesses or errors in order to rectify them in the future.

These "elements" of administration Fayol believed to be present in all business undertakings whether large or small, simple or complex. No matter where one was in the organizational hierarchy, he believed the members performed these functions to varying degrees. However, as one ascended in the organizational structure, the member's ability to perform these functions became increasingly important. If all the functions were properly exercised throughout the organization, it would be considered a successful operation.

Principles, to Fayol, were assertions based upon his own experience with industrial enterprises. "He considered science to be an accumulation of these assertions collated under a number of headings which he deemed appropriate (Gross, 1964, p. 41)." Although from an industrial background, Fayol's principles were to be applied to the public realm in later years by others such as Gulick and Urwick.

In 1937 Gulick and Urwick co-edited Papers on the Science of Administration which was a collection of eleven papers, four of which were split between the two authors. Building on Fayol's work and in response to, "What is the work of the chief executive? What does he do?" Gulick responded, "POSDCORB." These are the first letters of his expanded list of administrative functions. Gulick (1937) explained these activities as:

> Planning, that is working out in broad outline the things that need to be done and the methods of doing them to accomplish the purpose set for the enterprise;
>
> Organizing, that is the establishment of the formal structure of authority through which work subdivisions are arranged, defined and co-ordinated for the defined objective;
>
> Staffing, that is the whole personnel function of bringing and training the staff and maintaining favorable conditions of work;
>
> Directing, that is the continuous task of making decisions and embodying them in specific and general orders and instructions and serving as the leader of the enterprise;

> Co-ordinating, that is the all-important duty of interrelating the various parts of the work;
>
> Reporting, that is keeping those to whom the chief executive is responsible informed as to what is going on, which thus included keeping himself and his subordinates informed through records, research and inspection;
>
> Budgeting, with all that goes with budgeting in the form of fiscal planning, accounting and control (p. 13).

Planning, organizing, and co-ordinating in this list of seven functions can be seen to have been taken directly from Fayol. His command would fall under Gulick's direction while budgeting and reporting are instruments of both planning and control.

POSDCORB is one of the earliest and most memorable attemps at classifying the administrative functions. Griffiths (1965) calls this classification "an essential step which must be taken in the developmental path from art to science (p. 26)." Griffiths goes on to call POSDCORB "the most widely known administrative taxonomy" resulting from an attempt to put all the functions of administration into a single table.

Following the earlier writings of Fayol, Gulick and Urwick, Simon (1957) extended their work by treating administrative functions and activities within a decision-making framework. He maintained that "administrative processes were decisional ones and that their purpose was to facilitate the application of organized

effort to the group task (Campbell et al., 1971, p. 184)." In order to accomplish this purpose, the individual is deprived by the organization of his decisional autonomy. The organizational decision-making process is substituted for the individual. As Simon (1957) stated it:

> The decisions which the organization makes for the individual ordinarily (1) specify his functions, that is, the general scope and nature of his duties; (2) allocate authority, that is, determine who in the organization is to have power to make further decisions for the individual; and (3) set such other limits to his choice as are needed to co-ordinate the activities of several individuals in the organization (p. 9).

Simon's chief concern was how the behavior and decisions of employees are affected by the organization. He was interested with the administrative functions as delineated by his predecessors; however, each of the functions was to be examined in decisional terms. For example, the functions of review (Fayol called it controlling while Gulick used reporting) included diagnosing the quality of the decision, correcting erroneous decisions and enforcing sanctions upon subordinates to foster consistent decisions expected by organizational authority. Simon's emphasis on decision-making seems to have given his administrative analysis a unity and coherence not experienced by earlier theorists.

The clear purpose of administration in Simon's

view was to influence the decision-making process. He maintained the administrative activity does not dictate the content of the organization's work, but rather "how the decision-making function is to be advocated and influenced in that particular organization." He maintained that administrative processes were decisional ones.

More recently, Litchfield (1956) has drawn upon the works of Simon, Gulick, Urwick and Fayol to compose his own theory of administration which, not unlike Simon's, tends to be cyclical in nature. He saw the administrative process as being "at once a large cycle which constitutes the administrative process as a totality and a series of small cycles which provide the means for the performance of specific functions and sub-functions and individual technical activities (Litchfield, 1956, p. 4)." He wanted a generalizable theory of administration believing it was a most serious indictment that present thought had failed to achieve a level of generalization to other fields. Litchfield (1956) claimed, "We seem to be saying that there is business administration, and hospital administration, and public administration; that there is a military administration, hotel administration, and school administration. But, there is no administration (p. 3)."

In an effort to create a generalizable theory, Litchfield saw the administrative process including these functions: decision-making, programming, communicating,

controlling and reappraising. Accordingly, reappraisal makes the process cyclical by bringing the sequence substantially back to the point of origin. Litchfield (1956) set forth these propositions concerning the administrative process:

1. Decision making may be rational, deliberative, discretionary, purposive, or it may be irrational, habitual, obligatory, random, or any combination thereof. In its rational, deliberative, discretionary, and purposive form, it is performed by means of the following sub-activities:
   a. Definition of the issue
   b. Analysis of the existing situation
   c. Calculation and delineation of alternatives
   d. Deliberation
   e. Choice
2. Decisions become guides to action after they have been interpreted in the form of specific programs.
3. The effectiveness of a programmed decision will vary with the extent to which it is communicated to those of whom action is required.
4. Action required by a programmed and communicated decision is more nearly assumed if standards of performance are established and enforced.
5. Decisions are based on facts, assumptions, and values which are subject to change. To retain their validity, decisions must therefore be viewed and revised as rapidly as change occurs (p. 7).

A number of contributions were made by Litchfield to the thinking of administration. He sought to show how the activities of administration were interdependent and that they were actually connected with how an individual or group handles the problem plus the activities of the entire organization. With this split between the individual and the organization Litchfield approached what Getzels was

later to refer to in Administration as a Social Process (Getzels, 1958) when he makes the distinction between the nomothetic and idiographic dimensions. In addition to formulating this distinction, Litchfield also presented some theoretical propositions about the administrative process and urged their testing.

Recently, Brown (1972) has attempted to catalog what he considers to be the twelve most important functions of management after first laying a foundation for management. His list includes:

1. Developing purposes and objectives
2. Setting frames of reference
3. Forecasting and planning
4. Arranging for financing
5. Organizing
6. Obtaining and developing personnel
7. Coordinating and informing
8. Guiding and leading
9. Surveying performance; auditing
10. Testing and evaluating
11. Adjusting and integrating
12. Insuring proper external relationships

(Brown, 1972, p. 18)

For each of these functions, Brown adds a paragraph of explanation and definition. He further contends that "the study of management can be identified, described, and learned (Brown, 1972, p. 16)." Previous writers in the field of administration are evidenced in Brown's list of functions. Each writer builds upon the previous work.

## Summary of Business Administration Literature

The preceeding authors have made a valuable

contribution to the field of business administration. In seeking to delineate the functions of administration, they have seen elements which they considered essential to the administrative process. These functions are listed in summary form in Table I under the contributing author or authors. These and other functions will be discussed as the literature of school administration is examined.

It seems apparent from Table I that there is not complete agreement among writers in business administration concerning which functions constitute the administrative process. However, there is considerable agreement regarding certain functions. Simon's decision-making would encompass all of Brown's twelve administrative functions. Also, Brown's list might well be condensed among Fayol's five earlier classifications; however, Brown's list would lose much of its individual identification with current management practice in the condensation process. Guiding and leading does not have the negative connotation of commanding or directing. Likewise, surveying performance; auditing is much more positive than controlling. Table I appears to reflect what has been learned about human behavior over the years, namely, that there is more emphasis in recent years upon positive approaches to administration and less effort to coerce and control.

TABLE 1

Comparative Views of Administrative Functions
by Writers in Business Administration

| Fayol (1916) | Gulick Urwick (1937) | Simon (1945) | Litchfield (1950) | Brown (1972) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Planning | 1. Planning | 1. Decision-making | 1. Decision-making | 1. Purposes & objectives |
| 2. Organizing | 2. Organizing | | 2. Programming | 2. Frames of reference |
| 3. Commanding | 3. Staffing | | 3. Communicating | 3. Forecasting & planning |
| 4. Coordinating | 4. Directing | | 4. Controlling | 4. Financing |
| 5. Controlling | 5. Coordinating | | 5. Reappraising | 5. Organizing |
| | 6. Reporting | | | 6. Obtaining & developing personnel |
| | 7. Budgeting | | | 7. Coordinating & informing |
| | | | | 8. Guiding & leading |
| | | | | 9. Surveying performance, auditing |
| | | | | 10. Testing & evaluating |
| | | | | 11. Adjusting & integrating |
| | | | | 12. Proper external relations |

## Literature Related To Educational Administration

Writers in the field of school administration have long suggested functions of school principals and educational leaders. A sampling of published rule books of local school boards in fifty cities of over 30,000 population reveals the following duties:

To be present in building between specified hours
To keep certain records and accounts
To receipt for delivered supplies
To inventory equipment, books, and supplies
To check payroll list
To report injuries to pupils and employees
To conduct fire drills
To report needed building and equipment repairs
To supervise building at recess and noon hour
To notify parents of unsatisfactory work of pupils
To regulate, permit, or refuse entrance to visitors
To requisition and dispense supplies and equipment
To keep personnel records of teachers
To keep personnel records of pupils
To make curriculum schedules
To evaluate teachers' efficiency
To supervise instruction
To discipline pupils
(Jacobson, Reavis & Logsdon, 1963, p. 11)

Sears (1947) lists the following general school principal's duties claiming all duties might be classified under these headings:

1. Care of the children: their safety enroute to and from school, about the building, and on the playground; their health and development, mental and physical; their comfort and enjoyment; attendance supervision and records; student morale and government.
2. Instruction: counseling service; teaching efficiency; work schedule; scholastic records and reports; instructional supplies and equipment; suitable room assignment and physical surroundings; contact with parents.

3. Supervision: curriculum work; individual and group conferences with teachers; contact with counseling service; selection of text and library books; the social activities' program. (In a secondary school this might be made a major division.)
4. Research: assisting with any central office researches covering the school; planning and carrying through researches within and for the school; putting the results of research to work within the school.
5. Staff personnel: advising with superintendent on selection of teachers for the school on transfers to and from the school; recommending for assignments, promotions, or dismissals; aid in development or revision of salary schedules; in-service education program.
6. Plant: continuous inspection for safety and for advice as to maintenance, alteration and operation; aid in development of building plans.
7. Business service: aid in preparation of budget; requisitioning for supplies and equipment for the school; keeping business records; assisting with annual inventory; general oversight and care of all school properties.
8. Public relations: keeping close coordination between his school and the school system; providing exhibits, public programs, athletic events, conferences, addresses, and community meetings through which the local community may have suitable opportunity to know and appreciate and criticize their own school; cooperate with the central office public relations program.

(p. 384)

While these are general lists of duties authors have attempted to refine them drawing upon the work of earlier writers in business administration.

Business and public administration theoretical developments have held an extreme influence on the conceptualization of the educational administrative process. Sears (1950) in The Nature of the Administrative Process acknowledges the influence of Fayol and Gulick upon his

list of "elements". He visualized administration as consisting of five different kinds of activity--planning, organizing, directing, coordinating and controlling. A chapter each is devoted to these functions but are best defined when he states:

> Planning sets up purposes and outlines procedures and means of attaining the purposes; organization divides the labor and holds people to their jobs; direction authorizes and orders actions, plans, and policies and can penalize inaction or abuse; coordination holds parts together, to the end that each supports or supplements the others. All these are, indeed, contributions to control in a broad and general sense (Sears, 1950, p. 205).

Some have been critical of Sears (Griffiths, 1959; Callahan & Button, 1964) because of his major assumption that the administrative function springs from the services it directs. Also, his concept of authority creates difficulty by being limited to a small sphere in managerial work and then used liberally when he defines the terms of administration. Sears links authority with his elements. For example, direction is seen as "authority on the move" while "control can be effective only by the applying of some form of authority (Sears, 1950, pp. 127, 206)."

Following the work of Sears and departing from the short descriptive verbage of earlier writers Ramseyer, Harris, Pond and Wakefield (1955) attribute these major functions to administration:

1. Setting goals

2. Making policy
3. Determining roles
4. Coordinating administrative functions
5. Appraising effectiveness
6. Working with community leadership to improve effectiveness
7. Using educational resources of the community
8. Involving people
9. Communicating

Upon examination of this list, the specific infinitive determination of other authors (Fayol, Gulick, Litchfield) can be detected. Most, if not all, of these functions could be subsumed under broader classifications. Ramseyer et al., have perhaps attempted more pragmatic descriptors related to the world of educational administration work.

The administrative process as applied to education has been given careful examination by Gregg (1957). For him the process includes these components: decision-making, planning, organizing, communicating, influencing, co-ordinating and evaluating. Many of these components are now familiar but Gregg introduces a number of interesting distinctions. Decision-making is viewed as previous to and different from planning. Gregg stresses the importance of staff involvement in the administrative process. Both communicating and influencing stress the interrelatedness of staff and management if the organization is to achieve its purpose.

Griffiths (1958), like Simon writing in the field of business before him, maintained that administration is

essentially a decision-making process and that the central function of administration is directing and controlling this process. His version includes the following steps:

1. Recognize, define, and limit the problem.
2. Analyze and evaluate the problem.
3. Establish criteria and standards by which the solution will be evaluated or judged as acceptable and adequate to the need.
4. Collect data.
5. Formulate and select the preferred solution or solutions.
6. Put into effect the preferred solution.
   a. Program the solution.
   b. Control the activities in the program.
   c. Evaluate the results and the process.

(Griffiths, 1958, p. 132)

While working with a group of elementary school principals, Griffiths found a factor similar to his theoretical conception of the decision-making process. He names this factor Preparation for Decision v. Taking Final Action. When viewing executives at work in actual, as opposed to simulated, organizational settings, Griffiths found that much of the administrative behavior was unrelated to the decision-making process. As a result of this discovery he altered his thinking on decision-making but kept it as central to administration. Griffiths' new classification system included 142 characteristics arranged in an ordered relationship and allowed for outputs to occur with or without a decision being made (Griffiths & Lutz, 1969).

Likert (1961), writing concerning the nature of highly

effective groups, adds two dimensions not previously delineated. He sees the functions of leading groups and listening as essential to any highly effective group such as a school faculty. While they are considered parts of the other functions already mentioned, these two elements Likert believed deserved classifications of their own.

A year later Campbell, Bridges, Corbally, Nystrand and Ramseyer (1962) included an admittedly eclectic list of functions which included decision-making, programming, stimulating, co-ordinating and appraising. Subsequent editions (1966 and 1971) have retained the same terms which were modified from business to describe better the educational administrative process.

With all the pat descriptions of the administrative process Halpin's (1957) warning should be remembered.

> Unless one is extremely careful he can easily be tempted into talking about "process" as if it were a free-floating affair, detached from the behavior of individuals...An outside observer can never observe "process" qua "process"; he can observe only a sequence of behavior or behavior-products from which he may infer "process" (p. 195).

Campbell et al., (1971) are careful to emphasize that "the administrative process is a conceptualization--not an observed phenomenon (p. 190)." They seek, with their five descriptors, to set a pattern of how the practicing administrator would function to maintain maximum efficiency.

A similar list of functions is developed by Grider, Pierce and Jordan (1969) when they list seven items in the administrative process. For these functions the authors give a great deal of credit to the work of Gregg and Campbell. Grieder's list contains decision-making, planning, organizing, communicating, influencing, co-ordinating and evaluating. A similarity of functions to Gregg and Campbell is immediately discernible.

Griffiths and Hemphill (1961) took a problem solving approach to the administrative process maintaining these steps are vital: recognizing a problem; preparing to clarify the problem; initiating work in preparation; organizing and judging facts, opinions and situations; selecting alternatives; deciding and acting. Administration is seen as problem solving because "a problem is here defined as a state of affairs that is perceived with dissatisfaction (Hemphill, 1967, p. 218)." Griffiths and Hemphill would see administration as changing the dissatisfaction.

Boles (1970) suggests some other requirements of an administrator in discussing his theory of leadership. These functions are innovating, programming and risk-taking. Each function is explained in Boles' general discussion.

In addition to the administrative functions already mentioned, Farquhar and Piele (1972) in a review of lit-

erature relating to programs for administrators list managing change, making decisions and managing conflict as key skill areas.

Summary of Educational Administration Literature

Following and simultaneously developing along with business administration, a field of educational administration emerged. Business administration theory greatly influenced educational administration. From the early writings of Sears, where little if any difference is seen between business and educational administration, to the advent of contemporary authors, many of the administrative functions seem parallel. Perhaps then, one could assume that all functions performed by an administrator could be covered within these varied classifications of administrative elements. A summary of functions listed by educational writers can be seen in Table 2.

Table 2 indicates a lack of agreement among writers in the field of education administration concerning the administrative process elements. However, this lack of agreement does not disrupt the basic belief in an administrative process. Perhaps the disagreements arise from a desire to be more precise. For example, Ramseyer et al., (1955) seem to make manifest what is only implied in the other lists. They overtly recognize the importance of the community with its human and material resources.

TABLE 2

Comparative Views of Administrative Functions
by Writers in Educational Administration

| Sears (1950) | Ramseyer et al. (1955) | Gregg (1957) | Griffiths (1958) | Likert (1961) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Planning | 1. Setting goals | 1. Decision-making | 1. Decision-making | 1. Leading groups |
| 2. Organizing | 2. Making policy | 2. Planning | | 2. Listening |
| 3. Direction | 3. Determining roles | 3. Organizing | | |
| 4. Coordination | 4. Coordinating administrative functions | 4. Communicating | | |
| 5. Control | 5. Appraising effectiveness | 5. Influencing | | |
| | 6. Working with community | 6. Coordinating | | |
| | 7. Leadership to improve resources of the community | 7. Evaluating | | |
| | 8. Involving people | | | |
| | 9. Communicating | | | |

TABLE 2 (continued)

Comparative Views of Administrative Functions
by Writers in Educational Administration

| Griffiths Hemphill (1961) | Campbell et al. (1962) | Grieder et al. (1969) | Boles (1970) | Farquhar Piele (1972) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Recognizing problem | 1. Decision-making | 1. Decision-making | 1. Innovating | 1. Making change |
| 2. Preparing to clarify problem | 2. Programming | 2. Planning | 2. Programming | 2. Making decisions |
| 3. Initiating work in preparation | 3. Stimulating | 3. Organizing | 3. Risk-taking | 3. Managing conflict |
| 4. Organizing & judging facts, opinions, situations | 4. Coordinating | 4. Communicating | | |
| 5. Selecting alternative | 5. Appraising | 5. Influencing | | |
| 6. Deciding & acting | | 6. Coordinating | | |
| | | 7. Evaluating | | |

Likewise, Farquhar and Piele (1972) introduce the reality elements of change and conflict not often recognized by earlier writers but a definite part of the current administrative process.

Table 2 would also seem to indicate that what has been learned about human behavior in the last twenty years is not well reflected by educational administration writers. Likert (1961) appears to reflect some of the current thinking in the behavioral sciences when he indicates listening and leading groups as administrative functions. However, most writers continue to stress control, organization and management as functions of the administrative process.

By comparing Table 1 and 2 it would seem that business administration has greatly influenced educational administration and that the former has excelled the latter in the application of human behavior knowledge. However, all of the elements from the two tables continue to influence investigations into the field of educational administration. Some of these same elements have no doubt influenced the studies of the functions of principals, community school directors and other community educators.

## Literature Related to Principals and Community Educators

Some crucial activities of administration were acknowledged in a yearbook of the American Association of

School Administrators (1955). After acknowledging that administration is basically a way of working with people to accomplish the purpose of an enterprise, the activities of administration are listed as:

1. Planning or the attempt to control the future in the direction of the desired goals through decisions made on the basis of careful estimates of the probable consequences of possible courses of action.
2. Allocation or procurement and allotment of human and material resources in accordance with the operating plan.
3. Stimulation or motivation of behavior in terms of the desired outcomes.
4. Co-ordination or the process of fitting together the various groups and operations into an integrated pattern of purpose-achieving work.
5. Evaluation or the continuous examination of the effects produced by the ways in which the other functions listed here are performed.

There is evidenced in this formulation of activities the influence of writers in business and educational administration. One important difference is noted with the introduction of stimulation or motivation. Rather than commanding as Fayol used or directing as used by Gulick and Sears, stimulating seems more in line with what is known about group motivation toward a common goal.

While the administrative process has been under discussion for some time, more recently there has been an increasing number of empirical based studies upon the way principals spend their time. Such studies often investigate how principals spend their time and how

principals think they should spend their time. Since studies have been made at rather frequent intervals in recent years it is possible to make comparisons. The National Education Association Research Division reported such a study in 1958 (p. 98). The results are reported in Table 3.

TABLE 3

Time Allotments for Elementary Principals

| Function | 1928 | 1948 | 1958 |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Administration | 30% | 29% | 30% |
| Supervision | 34 | 39 | 35 |
| Clerical work | 18 | 15 | 14 |
| Teaching | 4 | 2 | 3 |
| Other functions | 14 | 15 | 18 |
| Total | 100% | 100% | 100% |

Another study cited in the same publication indicated how elementary principals would prefer to spend their time. The results of this study are reported in Table 4.

A seemingly obvious conclusion from this study is that elementary principals are not spending time where they would prefer to spend it. The NEA Research Division reported in 1958 that 29 percent of the principals felt they could not use their time the way they preferred because of a lack

of clerical help. Twenty-five percent indicated a lack of administrative assistance and office demands were prime reasons they could not make the best use of their time.

TABLE 4

Preferred Time Allotments for Elementary Principals

| Function | 1958 | |
|---|---|---|
| | Actual time | Preferred time |
| Administration: Organization and management of the school | 30% | 25% |
| Supervision: Working with teaching staff; Working with pupils; Program development | 35 | 49 |
| Clerical work | 14 | 4 |
| Teaching | 3 | 2 |
| Other functions: Community work; Public relations; Working with community groups; Working with parents | 18 | 20 |
| Total | 100% | 100% |

A study of secondary principals reported by Hemphill (1964) examined eighteen categories. Some of the categories were administrative planning, correspondence, meeting with students, supervision of extra-curricular activities, meeting with teachers, participation in professional groups, reading

professional literature and meeting with parents. This study, like the study of the elementary principals, indicated that principals are not spending their time where they believe it can do the most good. As Ovard (1966) claims, "There is often a conflict between how they (principals) do spend their time and how they think they should spend their time (p. 531)."

Principals have sought to overcome this conflict by extending their work week. Hemphill (1964) found that of those principals studied, over seventy-five percent spent 50 hours or more on the job with the average work week being 54 hours. The NEA Department of Elementary School Principals (1958) found that the average work week for the elementary principals was slightly lower at 47 hours. This was very close to McCloud's (1966) findings of principals and assistant principals in the Tulsa Public Schools where he reported 42 to 46 hours per week spent on the job.

Like studies which preceded it, the Tulsa study sought the "actual" and "ideal" use of time by the principals. Also, like other studies, there is a vast discrepancy between the principals' ideal and actual time profile. Most principals complained that too much time was spent in non-instructional functions such as office duties and supervision and counseling of students. Too little time remained for curriculum planning, classroom

supervision, or professional improvement activities with teachers. A lack of time was considered to be the major "roadblock" which hindered the principals from achieving their objectives.

Two studies (Melton, 1958; Snyder, 1968) of ideal and actual principal role perceptions done ten years apart in different geographical parts of the country but using the same design, instrument, sample selection procedure and data analysis methods yielded similar results. Using six separate categories with 20 cards in each category, the principals rank ordered the statements from "more important" to the "less important." The cards were sorted twice, first according to the "ideal" role as principal and then according to the "actual" role as principal. An interview was conducted with each subject to capture responses not disclosed by the Q-sorts. Findings in both of these studies revealed a disparity between principal perceptions of actual roles and ideal roles.

A survey (Bobroff, Howard, & Howard, 1974) of 350 randomly selected junior high and middle school principals from seven states revealed what the principals believed to be the most important functions of the junior high school. The results are seen in Table 5.

If the school is to serve specific functions, it seems reasonable to expect the principals to perform

certain roles and functions within the institution. As evidenced by the above studies, there is too frequently

TABLE 5

Functions of the Junior High in Order of Importance

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | Providing a school environment which specialized in helping the student make a smooth transition from childhood to adolescence | 131 |
| 2. | Providing a smooth and gradual transition from elementary school to senior high school | 45 |
| 3. | Providing a variety of academic and vocational experiences | 35 |
| 4. | Discovering areas of personal interest | 17 |

a conflict between what they should be doing and what they are doing. This is why Lesick (1974) suggests that after determining activities of the building principal, the principal question is whether these are commensurate with the district's expectations in these activities. He suggests four questions based upon McGregor's theory of integration. These questions are:

What do you spend most of your time doing?
What are the most crucial of your activities?
What do you feel is important to accomplish in the year ahead?
How do you feel the results should be appraised?

Answers to these questions will vary depending on the person and the job. However, Lesick sees them as key in determining the role and function of the principal.

A study of role perceptions of principals in innovative elementary schools as compared to the role perceptions of principals in more traditional elementary schools was conducted by Hellweg (1973). Thirty-two Minnesota schools were selected in each of the two school classifications. A six page questionnaire covering seven task areas was mailed to the selected schools. The task areas included:

1. Instruction and Curriculum
2. Pupil Personnel
3. Staff Personnel
4. Community School Leadership
5. Organization and Structure of the School
6. School Plant and School Transportation
7. School Finance and Business Management

Since community schools are considered to be innovative, a number of the conclusions from Hellweg's study seem to have significance for the role and function of the community school principal. These conclusions are:

1. Innovative schools utilize the services of more resource teachers and tutors than do more traditional schools.
2. In all schools, there is a shared responsibility between principals and teachers in the area of instruction, curriculum development and implementation of the curriculum.
3. Innovative schools have a greater responsibility than more traditional schools in the formulation of objectives.
4. Principals in innovative schools have greater freedom to modify plant facilities than do principals in more traditional schools.
5. All principals communicate with parents and the community by utilizing various media.

Lindquist (1974) in discussing critical tasks for

the secondary school principal of the future concludes, "the future secondary school principal will be less the efficient manager and more the instructional leader, systems specialist, planner, coordinator, and change agent (p. 18)." Many of these functions are similar to those advanced by writers in administration mentioned elsewhere in this study. Other conclusions are mentioned in the Lindquist article. He sees school organization, community involvement, increased delegation, union negotiations and team management all as critical roles for future secondary principals. These roles seem to parallel a 1972 policy statement of the National Association of Secondary School Principals in which principals were urged to "consult fully and directly with parent-citizen school committees" because "new programs should be a cooperative effort among the principal, teachers, parents and students involved in the school (Lindquist, 1974, p. 20)."

A study done of the perceptions of the roles and functions of Philadelphia high school principals as expressed by the principals themselves and other members of the school community (Costanzo, 1972) revealed that while all segments of the school community were demanding a greater voice in the decision-making process, they still saw the principal as the educational leader responsible for final determinations. Additionally,

the data suggest that students and parents want more visibility and accessibility on the part of the principal.

Three recent studies of community school directors seem significant if community education is to become "an accountable responsibility of the school principal (Harris, 1974)." Becker (1972) in examining the leadership effectiveness of the community school director as perceived by groups of educators working within the same educational organization found a high perception of effectiveness by all groups. The three items rated highest by all groups were (1) attitude toward job, (2) appearance and (3) achievement drive, supportiveness and innovativeness. Three items were also selected by the entire population as being most important to leadership effectiveness. These items were (1) attitude toward job, (2) leadership skill and (3) managerial skill.

A study done by Johnson (1973) sought to develop a leadership training model for community school directors. The model as conceived contained twelve functions based upon the findings of Weaver (1972). The functions identified by Johnson were:

1. Administering
2. Involving community
3. Coordinating
4. Demonstrating leadership
5. Financing
6. Managing personnel
7. Planning

8. Programming
9. Relating to public
10. Recruiting
11. Surveying
12. Training

The model operates at three levels with Johnson using Katz (1955) human, technical and conceptual skill areas. Katz maintained that all administrative skills could be classed in one of these three areas. Human skills involve working with people in a team effort. Technical skill involves processes, procedures or techniques unique to a particular institution. The ability to see the total operation and how the parts fit together is encompassed in the conceptual skill area. Johnson saw these skills having various mixes in the training program with conceptual and technical skills receiving primary emphasis at the third or top level of training. Katz himself saw conceptualization of increasing importance as one climbed the organization hierarchy.

Kliminski (1974) also used Katz's skills classification while studying two groups of community school directors in Michigan. He examined a group of forty predetermined successful community school directors and another group of forty community school directors to see if there was any significant differences between the technical, human and conceptual skills of the two groups. The results revealed that the successful group of

community school directors exhibited significantly higher levels of technical, conceptual and human skills when rated by themselves and their superordinates. These findings appear to be especially significant for the role and function of the community school principal.

As indicated in Chapter I, inferences have been drawn from studies of the roles and functions of community school directors and applied to the roles and functions of the community school principal. Other writers have claimed a difference for the community school principal with no empirical support. Keidel (1969) is a case at point when he says, "The building principal in an ongoing community school program must be a different kind of person than his counterpart in a regular school...a strong commitment to the community education is a prime requisite (p. 82)." No evidence seems to exist to support a difference between community school principals and non-community school principals. Clark (1974) realized the importance of the principal when he said:

> A critical role in successful incorporation and administration (of community education) is that of the principal. School building principals have often been identified as the "culprits" in lack of assimilation of basic community education principles into the regular school day instructional programs (p. 34).

Indirectly speaking to this problem and addressing the need of in-service, Minzey and LeTarte (1972) seem to imply that the administration holds a key role in the

community education concept.

> The administration, for example, must have a fairly sophisticated understanding of the concept before true support can be gained. An in-service program for this group must be designed to clearly portray the concept and define the role the administrator will play within the concept. It must be done on an intellectual, sophisticated level, incorporating a rationale for the concept based upon existing knowledge in the field (pp. 190-191).

Writing earlier, Minzey and Olsen (1969) discussed how the role and function of the community school principal should differ from the role and function of his counterpart in the traditional school.

> In general, the administrators will face similar problems in regard to a new and wider perception of responsibility. Their role, however, will call for a greater degree of leadership. They will be working with people and programs in a far less structured manner that will demand personal characteristics different from those needed in the traditional school setting. In addition to knowing children and curriculum, they will have to be more expert in the sociological aspects of their community, working with adults, problem solving and use of community resources. Their role will change from that of the chief administrator for a building or a school system to one of a community leader and facilitator. New skills and attitudes must necessarily accompany this change in role for the administrator (p. 34).

This role change is reflected in Totten's (1970) suggestion that "the community school...may be viewed as a cafeteria of human services--a human development laboratory serving needs of the people from their prenatal stage to their expiration (p. 6)." A principal for

this school would seemingly play a different role. Campbell (1969) in discussing administration of community schools sees the need for administrators to "move toward community schools in a big way (p. 46)."

Principals of community schools, it seems will have different roles and functions because:

> In the new education, leaders will think not only of schools, but also of all agencies and resources in the community that can make a contribution. All will see the whole community as education centered. The growth and development of children, teachers, and parents will be seen as the community's primary reason for being (Kerensky & Melby, 1971, p. 99).

As Sumption and Engstrom (1966) remind us, "As an educational leader of the community, he (the principal) should never forget that the school serves all the people and he is responsible to all the people (p. 26)."

Writing in Education II, Kerensky and Melby (1971) list ten characteristics of people who possess leadership abilities. Some of these might well be included in a list of functions for principals. Their list of characteristics is:

1. They have vision.
2. They have faith in peoples' ability to grow.
3. They are optimistic.
4. They make a gift of themselves.
5. They are imaginative.
6. They are good listeners.
7. They are not jealous people.
8. They are accessible.
9. They are more interested in what is right than who is right.
10. They are secure people.

Each of the characteristics listed by Kerensky and Melby seems to be applicable to community education because it would appear that institutional openness is a prerequisite to fulfillment of the job role in community education and each of the characteristics contributes to the maintenance of the open system. Without openness perhaps the potential leader would not be appreciated nor ever emerge.

## Summary

Similarities between writers in the field of business administration and educational administration are evidenced by the use of such common terms as planning, organizing and coordinating (Fayol, 1916; Gulick & Urwick, 1937; Sears, 1950: Gregg, 1957). Writers in both business administration and educational administration have attempted to reduce the myriad daily duties to an organized administrative process of basic functions or elements. Attempts to remain current in light of new evidence and trends are evidenced in both groups with the use of terms such as evaluating, stimulating and appraising (Litchfield, 1956; Brown, 1972; Gregg, 1957; Campbell et al., 1962). Neither administrative field has remained static over the years but each has seemingly responded to demands to stay relevant.

While there is some basic agreement between writers

In the fields of educational administration regarding the functions of the administrative process, studies of principals' roles and functions have shown discrepancies between what "should" and "does" take place on the job. Studies (NEA, 1958; Melton, 1958; Hemphill, 1964; Snyder, 1968) tend to support the need to bring the "actual" and "ideal" role perceptions closer together. In doing so, it would seem that the principal would have more personal satisfaction and meet with less personal frustration.

Since principals are administrators, it would appear that they would perform functions common to the fields of business and educational administration. However, it would seem further that since community education seeks to integrate the school with the community, open the institution and involve the community, some functions of the community school principal might differ from that of the non-community school principal. More time and emphasis of the community school principal might well be placed on involving the community, leading groups, communicating, listening or surveying.

A synthesis of all the various functions from business administration, educational administration, and selected studies of principals and community educators would seem to yield a possible starting point to determine if a difference does exist between community school principals and non-community school principals in their

roles and functions. The design and method of analysis in such an investigation are the subjects of Chapter III.

# CHAPTER III

## DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

This chapter is divided into the following major divisions: review of the problem, the sample, instrumentation, procedures, data analyses and limitations.

### Review of the Problem

As stated in Chapter I, this study compared the precentage of time spent in administrative functions between community school principals and non-community school principals in two districts. Three areas were investigated: (1) if a difference existed between the percentage of time actually spent by community school principals and non-community school principals in given administrative functions; (2) if a difference existed between the percentage of time actually spent by community school principals and non-community school principals and what they would ideally like to spend in performing given functions; and (3) if there was a difference in the skill mix (human, technical and conceptual) between community school principals and non-community school principals in either their ideal or actual roles.

## The Sample

For the purposes of this study, a district was considered a community school district if the term "community" was incorporated in the district's official name. A principal in this district would be considered a community school principal if he (1) had the major responsibility of community education activities (needs assessment, programs, parental involvement, etc.) in his job description and (2) had a full time community school building director responsible to him. A non-community school principal was a principal (1) not in a designated community school district, (2) not having the major responsibility of community education activities in his job description and (3) not having a full time community school building director responsible to him.

With the help of staff from the Community School Development Center at Western Michigan University, two school districts--one a community school district and one a non-community school district--were selected from lower Michigan. These two districts were selected for comparison on the basis of (1) geographic proximity, (2) comparable industrial-economic base and (3) similarity in district size and number of schools.

Preliminary study showed the community school district to have 52 schools while the non-community school

district had 40 schools. However, at the time the data were collected the number of schools had changed to 55 and 36, community school district and non-community school district, respectively. A decrease was experienced in the one district due to consolidation of facilities while the increase in the other district was attributed to increased services through new and specialized programs.

A total of 90 principals from the two districts were investigated. Of this number, 35 were principals in the non-community school district. The difference of one between the number of schools in the non-community school district and the number of principals is attributed to one principal being responsible for two schools.

No attempt was made during the study to collect demographic data on the principals nor was any distinction made between the responses of elementary and secondary principals. However, the community school district had 41 elementary schools and 14 secondary schools while the non-community school district was comprised of 27 and 9, elementary and secondary schools, respectively.

## Instrumentation

The instrument used to obtain the percentage of time spent by the two groups of principals--community school and non-community school--in given administrative functions was the Functions of the Principal Questionnaire

(FPQ). This instrument was constructed by the investigator for this specific study. The FPQ (Appendix A) required the reporting of time percentages for the ideal role (the way it should be) and the actual role (the way it is).

Eighteen administrative functions were gleaned from a review of literature in business administration, educational administration and studies of principals and community educators roles and functions. The eighteen functions were selected on the basis of (1) frequency of occurrence and (2) relevance to the study. These functions and common definitions included:

1. Evaluating is the process of examining the pros and cons of an action, staff member, or program, after the fact, with the aim of future improvement.
2. Listening is hearing the spoken word to use the information in decision-making.
3. Planning is setting up purposes and outlining procedures and means of attaining the purposes.
4. Surveying is the process of gathering information from the community to use in decision-making.
5. Stimulating is eliciting individual efforts and contributions in implementing decisions.
6. Controlling is seeing that everything is done according to the rules and instructions which have been given.
7. Decision-making is a judicial process which issues into action.
8. Training is systematic instruction, drill, etc., to render skillful, proficient, or qualified in a given area.
9. Programming is the act of arranging and scheduling classes, workshops, meetings, etc.
10. Communicating is a process by which directions, information, ideas, explanation, and questions are transmitted from person to person.
11. Innovating is the introduction of new and improved

changes for the sake of improvement.

12. Directing is the authorizing and ordering of actions, plans, and policies.
13. Budgeting is the financing and allocating of monies.
14. Leading groups is having the responsibility of being in charge of a group at a scheduled faculty meeting, administrative staff session, community council, etc.
15. Organizing is the building up of the material and human organization of the business. Divides the labor and holds people to their jobs.
16. Staffing is the whole personnel function of bringing and training the staff.
17. Involving the community is action which seeks community input into the educational process.
18. Coordinating is uniting and correlating all activities. Interrelating the various parts of the work.

Functions were randomly placed on the questionnaire after each was classified as basically either a human, technical or conceptual skill area. The classifications were made by a panel of experts from The Community School Development Center at Western Michigan University who were familiar with the skill areas through (1) formal classroom exposure, (2) use in internship experiences, (3) hours of indepth discussion and (4) evaluations or studies utilizing the three skill areas. The functions were divided by basic skill areas as follows:

Human Skill Area (5 functions)
Listening, Stimulating, Communicating Leading groups and Involving community (functions numbered 2, 5, 10, 14 and 17)

Technical Skill Area (8 functions)
Evaluating, Surveying, Controlling, Training, Programming, Directing, Budgeting and Staffing (functions numbered 1, 4, 6, 8, 9, 12, 13 and 16)

Conceptual Skill Area (5 functions)
Planning, Decision-making, Innovating, Organizing and Coordinating (functions numbered 3, 7, 11, 15 and 18)

These determinations were made using Weaver's (1968) definitions of the three skill areas. His definitions were:

> Human skill--the ability to understand people and how they work and live and get along together and to use that understanding in getting the best out of people, individually and in groups.
>
> Technical skill--(for an educational leader) include the abilities to organize instructional programs; schedule learning activities; account for learners and funds; secure and allocate resources; plan, schedule, operate and maintain facilities, provide services, etc.
>
> Conceptual skill--the ability to see the totality of an enterprise as well as its parts, to grasp the interrelationships among the elements in a complex situation, and to establish and maintain the delicate balance that fosters both unity and diversity.

The instrument was field tested with 17 principals not employed in either of the two districts under investigation. No substantive changes were made as a result of this testing since minor suggestions were made by only two individuals. In addition, the instrument was submitted to personnel in the Educational Leadership Department at Western Michigan University for comments and reaction. Minor format modification was suggested and incorporated into the final instrument.

The questionnaire was printed on two different

colors of paper for the two groups of principals being questioned. This was done for ease of identification when the returns were made.

The dependent variable in the study was the perception of time spent in a given administrative function. Operationally this was principals' responses to the 18 functions on the Functions of the Principal Questionnaire (FPQ). These functions were listed earlier in this section.

The independent variable was the characteristics listed in this chapter under The Sample which divided the principals into either community school principals or non-community school principals.

## Procedures

Permission to conduct the study and complete cooperation was obtained from the heads of research departments in the two districts. These individuals were kept informed of the study's progress at periodic intervals. In addition, they received copies of all materials sent to the principals in the respective districts.

Charts were made (Appendix B) containing the names of the schools in the two districts. This was to facilitate and record the flow of materials between the researcher and the schools. Columns were made opposite the schools to record the date (1) the questionnaire was mailed, (2) the

questionnaire was returned, (3) a follow-up letter was sent, (4) a phone call was made and (5) a personal visit was made. Each of these steps, with the exception of number two, were taken approximately a week apart with the entire process requiring a month.

First, a personally typed letter was mailed to each principal (Appendix C) describing the information desired. Enclosed with the letter was a questionnaire (Appendix A) and a stamped, self-addressed envelope in which to return the questionnaire. The principal was to place a percentage of time spent in the 18 functions for the ideal and actual situations. Some of the functions might not apply to a given principal. Responses to the time percentage were based on the principal's personal perception of his ideal and actual roles.

After a week, those principals who had not returned the questionnaire were mailed a personally typed follow-up letter (Appendix D). Again, a questionnaire was mailed with a stamped, self-addressed envelope. Record was made of those to whom a second letter was mailed.

During the third week after the initial mailing, those principals who had still not responded were contacted by phone and asked to return the questionnaire. Additional questionnaires were mailed to those who may have lost or misplaced them. Questionnaires were sent this time only upon request.

The final attempt to obtain a return was a personal visit to the principal. This was done during the fourth week after the first questionnaire was mailed. Again, if a questionnaire was requested, one was left. No attempt was made by the researcher to obtain a return from the principals after this final step.

## Data Analyses

The responses to the 18 administrative functions cannot be considered independent since the sum of all percentages for the functions was to equal 100%. The response to one function of necessity affected an individual's response to the other functions. For example, if a response of 10% were given to one function, then only 90% remained for possible distribution to the other 17 functions. However, it was predetermined that those responses which did not equal 100% would be adjusted proportionately through all 18 functions.

The first question investigated dealt with the difference in the percentage of time actually spent in the 18 functions between the community school principals and non-community school principals. A one way analysis of variance for unequal group sizes (Glass & Stanley, 1970) was used with each of the 18 functions to determine if a difference existed. An

analysis was made between the mean percentage of time actually spent by the community school principals and the non-community school principals in different administrative functions to determine if it was possible to reject the null hypothesis at either the .05 or .01 level of significance. Since the percentage of time actually spent in each function was not independent of the other functions, it is well to assume that if a significant difference between the mean percentage of time is found in one function, a difference between the mean percentage of time might well be expected in other functions.

From an individual analysis of the 18 functions it was possible to determine how many of the functions showed a significant difference between the mean percentage of time actually spent in the functions between the community school principals and the non-community school principals. This helped to answer the first question under investigation which was whether a difference existed between community school principals and non-community school principals in the percentage of time spent in given functions.

The second question compared each group's--either community school principals or non-community school principals--ideal with their actual perception of the percentage of time spent in given administrative functions.

Since the ideal and actual observation was of the same individual, a one way analysis of variance with repeated measures (Glass & Stanley, 1970) was used with each of the 18 functions for the two groups of principals. An analysis was made of the mean percentage of time between the ideal and actual roles in 18 functions spent by the community school principals and the non-community school principals to determine if it was possible to reject the null hypothesis at either the .05 or .01 level of significance.

From these findings it was possible to determine how many of the 18 functions showed a significant difference between the mean percentage of time between the ideal and actual roles. This would help to answer whether either group is closer to their ideal role.

The third and final question dealt with the human, technical and conceptual skill classifications in both the actual and ideal roles of the two groups of principals. An analysis of variance for unequal group sizes (Glass & Stanley, 1970) was used since the comparison was made between the community school and non-community school principals.

Levels of significance to be tested were set at the .05 and .01 level for the null hypothesis of no difference between the mean percentage of time spent in the human, technical and conceptual skill areas. The two groups

of principals were compared in both the ideal and actual roles for the three skill areas. To determine this, each respondent's adjusted percentages of time were summed for the individual skill areas in both the ideal and actual roles. This summation was performed with functions 1, 4, 6, 8, 9, 12, 13 and 16 for the technical skill area. Adjusted percentages for functions 2, 5, 10, 14 and 17 were added to obtain a percentage of time spent in the human skill area. The remaining adjusted percentages for functions 3, 7, 11, 15 and 18 were added to give the percentage of time spent in the conceptual skill area. This procedure was followed for both the actual and ideal adjusted percentages for community school principals and non-community school principals. From this it was determined if either group had a significantly different mean percentage of time spent in the human, technical and conceptual skill areas.

## Limitations of the Study

Any study is subject to certain seemingly inherent limitations. Generalizability to wider populations is hampered because of these limitations. However, such limitations can often suggest directions for possible future studies. Since two rather similar districts from lower Michigan were used, generalizations based upon the conclusions and recommendations from the present study

should be limited to comparable school districts.

The seemingly large number of functions (18) to which principals were asked to respond may also have presented certain limitations. For example, to keep track of 18 percentages which should equal 100% required some mathematical skill. This problem might be diminished with fewer functions. Future studies of this type might seek to further delimit the functions or redesign them in another pattern.

## Summary

Chapter III has been a discussion of the design and methodology for this comparative study of the functions performed by community school principals and non-community school principals. A review of the problem, the sample, the instrumentation, procedures, data analyses and limitations were major divisions. Chapter IV deals with the major findings and an analysis of the data that were received.

# CHAPTER IV

## PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

### Introduction

This chapter includes a report of the findings with an analysis and indication of the results for the three questions raised in Chapter I. These questions were (1) whether a difference existed between the percentage of time actually spent by community school principals and non-community school principals in given functions, (2) whether a difference existed between the percentage of time actually spent by each group of principals and what they would ideally like to spend in performing given functions and (3) whether there was a difference in the skill mix (human, techn'cal and conceptual) between the community school principals and non-community school principals in either their ideal or actual roles. Following each section is a summary of the findings for that section.

### Report of the Findings

#### General

As stated in the previous chapter, 35 questionnaires were mailed to non-community school principals. Of

this number 31 or 89% were returned. However, only 24 of the 31 or 77% were useable. Seven were returned either partially completed or totally incomplete. In each case notes were attached explaining the respondents' actions. Explanations ranged from "too ambiguous" to a lack of time to complete the questionnaire.

Of the 55 questionnaires mailed to community school principals 45 or 82% were returned. Only 38 of these or 84% could be used in the data tabulation. Two were returned completed but too late to use in the analysis. The other five were returned not completed. Explanations accompanied these questionnaires and were similar to those used by the non-community school principals.

Comparison of community school and non-community school principals' responses to actual percentages of time spent in given administrative functions

The first question examined was whether a difference existed between the percentage of time actually spent by community school principals and non-community school principals in given administrative functions. It was the researcher's belief that a difference existed between the two groups of principals. To answer the question the results of 18 one way analyses of variance are examined below. It should be noted that while all figures are only to the hundredths place, this is the result of rounding off from the original figures which were carried out much

farther.

Function number one--evaluating. As reported in Table 6, an analysis of function one--evaluating--failed to reveal a significant difference at the .01 level in the mean percentage of time spent in evaluating. The alternate hypothesis of a significant difference between the two groups of principals at this level of significance must be rejected. However, the probability of .08 is quite low and would be accepted at the .10 level of significance. This indicated a tendency toward a significant difference in the mean percentage of time spent in evaluating, but cannot be considered significant for the purposes of this study.

TABLE 6

Analysis of Variance: Function 1--Evaluating Comparing Non-Community School Principals' and Community School Principals' Actual Responses

| Type of Principal | N | Mean | SD | F | DF |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Non-Community School | 24 | 5.0 | 3.38 | 3.11* | 1,60 |
| Community School | 38 | 6.93 | 4.79 | | |

*p = 0.08

Thus, the results of an analysis of function one--evaluating--indicated that non-community school principals and community school principals do not differ

significantly in the percentage of time spent in the administrative function of evaluating. However, there would seem to be a tendency for community school principals to spend more time in evaluation than non-community school principals.

Function number two--listening. An analysis of function two--listening--as reported in Table 7, failed to reveal a significant difference at the .01 level in the mean percentage of time spent in listening. The alternate hypothesis of a significant difference between the two groups of principals at this level of significance must be rejected.

TABLE 7

Analysis of Variance: Function 2--Listening Comparing Non-Community School Principals' and Community School Principals' Actual Responses

| Type of Principal | N | Mean | SD | F | DF |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Non-Community School | 24 | 10.54 | 6.30 | 1.49* | 1,60 |
| Community School | 38 | 8.65 | 5.72 | | |

*p = 0.23

Thus, the results of an analysis of function two--listening--failed to indicate that non-community school principals and community school principals differ significantly in the percentage of time spent in the administrative

function of listening.

Function number three--planning. As reported in Table 8, an analysis of function three--planning failed to indicate a significant difference at the .01 level in the mean percentage of time spent in planning. The alternate hypothesis of a significant difference between the two groups of principals at this level of significance must be rejected.

TABLE 8

Analysis of Variance: Function 3--Planning Comparing Non-Community School Principals' and Community School Principals' Actual Responses

| Type of Principal | N | Mean | SD | F | DF |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Non-Community School | 24 | 7.10 | 4.65 | 0.10* | 1,60 |
| Community School | 38 | 7.40 | 3.89 | | |

*p = 0.76

The results of an analysis of function three--planning--did not indicate that there was a difference in the percentage of time spent in planning between non-community school principals and community school principals.

Function number four--surveying. An analysis of function four--surveying--as reported in Table 9, indicated

a significant difference in the mean percentage of time spent in surveying at the .05 level but not at the .01 level. The alternate hypothesis of a significant difference at the .05 level can be accepted but must be rejected at the .01 level between the two groups of principals in the mean percentage of time spent in surveying.

TABLE 9

Analysis of Variance: Function 4--Surveying Comparing Non-Community School Principals' and Community School Principals' Actual Responses

| Type of Principal | N | Mean | SD | F | DF |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Non-Community School | 24 | 2.13 | 1.60 | 4.82* | 1,60 |
| Community School | 38 | 3.33 | 2.38 | | |

*p = 0.03

The results of an analysis of function four--surveying--indicated that the community school principals spend significantly more time in the administrative function of surveying than do the non-community school principals.

Function number five--stimulating. As reported in Table 10, an analysis of function five--stimulating--failed to indicate a significant difference at the .01 level in the mean percentage of time spent in stimulating. The

alternate hypothesis of a significant difference between the two groups of principals at this level must be rejected.

TABLE 10

Analysis of Variance: Function 5--Stimulating Comparing Non-Community School Principals' and Community School Principals' Actual Responses

| Type of Principal | N | Mean | SD | F | DF |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Non-Community School | 24 | 4.38 | 2.55 | 0.32* | 1,60 |
| Community School | 38 | 4.80 | 3.01 | | |

*p = 0.57

Thus, the results of an analysis of function five--stimulating--did not indicate that there was a difference in the percentage of time spent in stimulating between non-community school principals and community school principals.

Function number six--controlling. An analysis of function six--controlling--as reported in Table 11, failed to indicate a significant difference at the .01 level in the mean percentage of time spent in controlling. The alternate hypothesis of a significant difference between the two groups of principals at this level must be rejected.

TABLE 11

Analysis of Variance: Function 6--Controlling Comparing Non-Community School Principals' and Community School Principals' Actual Responses

| Type of Principal | N | Mean | SD | F | DF |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Non-Community School | 24 | 8.10 | 7.03 | 0.22* | 1,60 |
| Community School | 38 | 5.87 | 4.81 | | |

*p = 0.14

Thus, the results of an analysis of function six--controlling--did not indicate that there was a difference in the percentage of time spent in controlling between non-community school principals and community school principals.

Function number seven--decision-making. As reported in Table 12, an analysis of function seven--decision-making--failed to indicate a significant difference at the .01 level in the mean percentage of time spent in decision-making. The alternate hypothesis of a significant difference between the two groups of principals at this level must be rejected.

The results of an analysis of function seven--decision-making--did not indicate that there was a difference in the percentage of time spent in decision-making between non-community school principals and

community school principals.

TABLE 12

Analysis of Variance: Function 7--Decision-making Comparing Non-Community School Principals' and Community School Principals' Actual Responses

| Type of Principal | N | Mean | SD | F | DF |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Non-Community School | 24 | 8.33 | 3.76 | 0.27* | 1,60 |
| Community School | 38 | 7.56 | 6.63 | | |

*p = 0.61

Function number eight--training. An analysis of function eight--training--as reported in Table 13, failed to indicate a significant difference at the .01 level in the mean percentage of time spent in training. The alternate hypothesis of a significant difference between the two groups of principals must be rejected.

Thus, the results of an analysis of function eight--training--did not indicate that there was a difference in the percentage of time spent in training between non-community school principals and community school principals.

TABLE 13

Analysis of Variance: Function 8--Training Comparing Non-Community School Principals' and Community School Principals' Actual Responses

| Type of Principal | N | Mean | SD | F | DF |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Non-Community School | 24 | 3.25 | 3.00 | | |
| | | | | 0.05 | 1,60 |
| Community School | 38 | 3.10 | 2.46 | | |

*p = 0.83

Function number nine--programming. As reported in Table 14, an analysis of function nine--programming--failed to indicate a significant difference at the .01 level in the mean percentage of time spent in programming. The alternate hypothesis of a significant difference between the two groups of principals at this level must be rejected.

TABLE 14

Analysis of Variance: Function 9--Programming Comparing Non-Community School Principals' and Community School Principals' Actual Responses

| Type of Principal | N | Mean | SD | F | DF |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Non-Community School | 24 | 3.92 | 2.55 | | |
| | | | | 0.30* | 1,60 |
| Community School | 38 | 3.50 | 3.17 | | |

*p = 0.59

Function number ten--communicating. An analysis of function ten--communicating--as reported in Table 15, failed to indicate a significant difference at the .01 level in the mean percentage of time spent in communicating. The alternate hypothesis of a significant difference between the two groups of principals at this level must be rejected.

TABLE 15

Analysis of Variance: Function 10--Communicating Comparing Non-Community School Principals' and Community School Principals' Actual Responses

| Type of Principal | N | Mean | SD | F | DF |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Non-Community School | 24 | 9.71 | 5.99 | 0.63* | 1,60 |
| Community School | 38 | 8.60 | 4.94 | | |

*p = 0.43

Thus, the results of an analysis of function ten--communicating--failed to indicate that there was a difference in the percentage of time spent in communicating between non-community school principals and community school principals.

Function number 11--innovating. As reported in Table 16, an analysis of function 11--innovating--failed to indicate a significant difference at the .01 level in

the mean percentage of time spent in innovating. The alternate hypothesis of a significant difference between the two groups of principals at this level must be rejected.

TABLE 16

Analysis of Variance: Function 11--Innovating Comparing Non-Community School Principals' and Community School Principals' Actual Responses

| Type of Principal | N | Mean | SD | F | DF |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Non-Community School | 24 | 4.40 | 3.08 | 0.54* | 1,60 |
| Community School | 38 | 3.86 | 2.61 | | |

*p = 0.47

The results of an analysis of function 11--Innovating--failed to indicate that there was a difference in the percentage of time spent in innovating between non-community school principals and community school principals.

Function number 12--directing. An analysis of function 12--directing--as reported in Table 17, failed to indicate a significant difference in the mean percentage of time spent in directing at the .01 level. The alternate hypothesis of a significant difference between the two groups of principals must be rejected.

Thus, the results of an analysis of function 12--directing--failed to indicate that either group of principals tend to spend a significantly larger percentage of time in the administrative function of directing.

TABLE 17

Analysis of Variance: Function 12--Directing Comparing Non-Community School Principals' and Community School Principals' Actual Responses

| Type of Principal | N | Mean | SD | F | DF |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Non-Community School | 24 | 5.06 | 5.12 | | |
| | | | | 0.01* | 1,60 |
| Community School | 38 | 5.18 | 3.63 | | |

*p = 0.91

Function number 13--budgeting. As reported in Table 18, an analysis of function 13--budgeting--indicated a significant difference in the mean percentage of time spent in budgeting at the .01 level. The null hypothesis of no significant difference between the mean percentage of time spent in budgeting must be rejected in favor of the alternate hypothesis of a significant difference between the two groups of principals.

Thus, the results of an analysis of function 13--budgeting--indicated that non-community school principals

tend to spend a significantly larger percentage of time in the administrative function of budgeting than do the community school principals.

TABLE 18

Analysis of Variance: Function 13--Budgeting Comparing Non-Community School Principals' and Community School Principals' Actual Responses

| Type of Principal | N | Mean | SD | F | DF |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Non-Community School | 24 | 4.17 | 3.40 | 7.53* | 1,60 |
| Community School | 38 | 2.35 | 1.81 | | |

*p = 0.01

Function number 14--leading groups. An analysis of function 14--leading groups--as reported in Table 19,

TABLE 19

Analysis of Variance: Function 14--Leading Groups Comparing Non-Community School Principals' and Community School Principals' Actual Responses

| Type of Principal | N | Mean | SD | F | DF |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Non-Community School | 24 | 3.67 | 2.32 | 1.86* | 1,60 |
| Community School | 38 | 4.65 | 2.99 | | |

*p = 0.18

failed to indicate a significant difference at the .01 level in the mean percentage of time spent in leading groups.

The alternate hypothesis of a significant difference between the two groups of principals at this level must be rejected.

The results of an analysis of function 14--leading groups--did not indicate that there was a difference in the percentage of time spent in leading groups between non-community school principals and community school principals.

Function number 15--organizing. As reported in Table 20, an analysis of function 15--organizing--failed to indicate a significant difference at the .01 level in the mean percentage of time spent in organizing. The alternate hypothesis of a significant difference between the two groups of principals at this level must be rejected.

TABLE 20

Analysis of Variance: Function 15--Organizing Comparing Non-Community School Principals' and Community School Principals' Actual Responses

| Type of Principal | N | Mean | SD | F | DF |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Non-Community School | 24 | 6.58 | 4.29 | 1.45* | 1,60 |
| Community School | 38 | 5.52 | 2.71 | | |

*p = 0.23

The results of an analysis of function 15--

organizing--did not indicate that there was a difference in the percentage of time spent in organizing between non-community school principals and community school principals.

Function number 16--staffing. An analysis of function 16--staffing--as reported in Table 21, failed to indicate a significant difference at the .01 level in the mean percentage of time spent in staffing. The alternate hypothesis of a significant difference between the two groups of principals at this level must be rejected.

TABLE 21

Analysis of Variance: Function 16--Staffing Comparing Non-Community School Principals' and Community School Principals' Actual Responses

| Type of Principal | N | Mean | SD | F | DF |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Non-Community School | 24 | 2.58 | 2.19 | 2.73* | 1,60 |
| Community School | 38 | 3.91 | 3.51 | | |

*p = 0.10

Thus, the results of an analysis of function 16--staffing--did not indicate that there was a difference in the percentage of time spent in staffing between non-community school principals and community school principals.

Function number 17--involving community. As reported in Table 22, an analysis of function 17--involving community--indicated a significant difference in the mean percentage of time spent in involving the community at the .01 level. The null hypothesis of no significant difference between the mean percentage of time spent in involving the community must be rejected in favor of the alternate hypothesis of a significant difference between the two groups of principals.

TABLE 22

Analysis of Variance: Function 17--Involving Community Comparing Non-Community School Principals' and Community School Principals' Actual Responses

| Type of Principal | N | Mean | SD | F | DF |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Non-Community School | 24 | 4.00 | 3.38 | 14.22* | 1,60 |
| Community School | 38 | 8.53 | 5.23 | | |

*p = 0.00

Thus, the results of an analysis of function 17--involving the community--indicated that community school principals tend to spend a significantly larger percentage of time in the administrative function of involving the community than do the non-community school principals.

Function number 18--coordinating. An analysis of function 18--coordinating--as reported in Table 23,

failed to indicate a significant difference in the mean percentage of time spent in coordinating at the .01 level. The alternate hypothesis of a significant difference between the two groups of principals at this level must be rejected.

TABLE 23

Analysis of Variance: Function 18--Coordinating Comparing Non-Community School Principals' and Community School Principals' Actual Responses

| Type of Principal | N | Mean | SD | F | DF |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Non-Community School | 24 | 5.67 | 4.17 | 0.74* | 1,60 |
| Community School | 38 | 6.61 | 4.19 | | |

*p = 0.39

The results of an analysis of function 18--coordinating--did not indicate that there was a difference in the percentage of time spent in coordinating between non-community school principals and community school principals.

Summary

Of the 18 functions examined, only three--surveying, budgeting and involving the community--showed a significant difference in the mean percentage of time spent in these functions between the community school principals and the

non-community school principals. The null hypothesis of no difference between the mean percentage of time spent in given functions was not rejected for 15 of the 18 functions while the alternate hypothesis of a difference between the mean percentage of time spent in given functions was for three of 18 functions.

Comparison of ideal and actual percentage of time responses in given administrative functions for non-community school principals and community school principals

The second question examined whether a difference existed between the percentage of time actually spent by community school principals and non-community school principals and what they would ideally like to spend in performing given functions. The belief of the researcher was that a difference existed between the ideal role and the actual role in performing the given administrative functions. To answer this question the results of 18 one way analyses of variance are examined for each of the two groups of principals. These data and analyses are listed below.

Function number one--evaluating. An analysis of function one--evaluating--as reported in Table 24, indicated a significant difference in the mean percentage of time spent in evaluating at the .01 level. The null hypothesis of no significant difference between the ideal time

percentage and actual time percentage must be rejected in favor of the alternate hypothesis.

TABLE 24

Analysis of Variance: Function 1--Evaluating Comparing Non-Community School Principals' Ideal and Actual Percentages of Time Responses

| Type of Role | N | Mean | SD | F | DF |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ideal | 24 | 8.40 | 5.37 | 12.58* | 1,23 |
| Actual | 24 | 4.96 | 3.38 | | |

*p = 0.00

Thus, the results of an analysis of function one--evaluating--indicated that the non-community school principals studied differed significantly in the percentage of time spent in their ideal and actual roles. The non-community school principals ideally would like to spend more time evaluating.

Function number two--listening. As reported in Table 25, an analysis of function two--listening--failed to indicate a significant difference at the .01 level in the mean percentage of time spent in listening. The alternate hypothesis of a significant difference between the ideal time percentage and actual time percentage must be rejected. However, the probability of 0.058 is quite low and would be accepted at the .10 level of significance. This indicates a a tendency toward a

significant difference in the mean percentage of time spent between the ideal and actual roles.

TABLE 25

Analysis of Variance: Function 2--Listening Comparing Non-Community School Principals' Ideal and Actual Percentages of Time Responses

| Type of Role | N | Mean | SD | F | DF |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ideal | 24 | 8.31 | 4.73 | 3.97* | 1,23 |
| Actual | 24 | 10.54 | 6.30 | | |

*p = 0.06

The results of an analysis of function two--listening--failed to indicate that non-community school principals differ significantly in the percentage of time spent in their ideal and actual roles. However, there would seem to be a tendency for non-community school principals to spend too much time listening.

Function number three--planning. An analysis of function three--planning--as reported in Table 26, indicated a significant difference in the mean percentage of time spent in planning at the .05 level but not at the .01 level. The alternate hypothesis of a significant difference between the ideal and actual situations can be accepted at the .05 level but must be rejected at the .01 level.

The results of an analysis of function three--planning--indicated that non-community school principals would ideally like to spend more time planning.

TABLE 26

Analysis of Variance: Function 3--Planning
Comparing Non-Community School Principals'
Ideal and Actual Percentages of Time Responses

| Type of Role | N | Mean | SD | F | DF |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ideal | 24 | 8.77 | 3.49 | 4.64* | 1,23 |
| Actual | 24 | 7.06 | 4.65 | | |

*p = 0.04

Function number four--surveying. As reported in Table 27, an analysis of function four--surveying--failed to indicate a significant difference at the .01 level in the mean percentage of time spent in surveying. The alternate hypothesis of a significant difference between the ideal time percentage and actual time percentage must be rejected. However, the probability of 0.057 is quite low and would be accepted at the .10 level of significance. This indicates a tendency toward a significant difference in the mean percentage of time spent between the ideal and actual roles.

The results of an analysis of function four--surveying--failed to indicate that non-community school principals differ significantly in the percentage of time spent in

their ideal and actual roles. However, there would seem to be a tendency for non-community school principals to ideally spend a larger percentage of time in the surveying function.

TABLE 27

Analysis of Variance: Function 4--Surveying Comparing Non-Community School Principals' Ideal and Actual Percentages of Time Responses

| Type of Role | N | Mean | SD | F | DF |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ideal | 24 | 2.96 | 2.56 | 4.02* | 1,23 |
| Actual | 24 | 2.13 | 1.60 | | |

*p = 0.06

Function number five--stimulating. An analysis of function five--stimulating--as reported in Table 28,

TABLE 28

Analysis of Variance: Function 5--Stimulating Comparing Non-Community School Principals' Ideal and Actual Percentages of Time Responses

| Type of Role | N | Mean | SD | F | DF |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ideal | 24 | 5.44 | 2.93 | 2.76* | 1,23 |
| Actual | 24 | 4.38 | 2.55 | | |

*p = 0.11

failed to indicate a significant difference at the .01 level in the mean percentage of time spent in stimulating. The alternate hypothesis of a significant difference between

the ideal time percentage and actual time percentage must be rejected.

Thus, the results of an analysis of function five--stimulating--indicated that the non-community school principals studied did not differ significantly in the percentage of time spent in their ideal and actual roles in this administrative function.

Function number six--controlling. As reported in Table 29, an analysis of function six--controlling--indicated a significant difference in the mean percentage of time spent in controlling at the .01 level. The null hypothesis of no significant difference between the ideal time percentage and actual time percentage must be rejected in favor of the alternate hypothesis.

TABLE 29

Analysis of Variance: Function 6--Controlling Comparing Non-Community School Principals' Ideal and Actual Percentages of Time Responses

| Type of Role | N | Mean | SD | F | DF |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ideal | 24 | 2.90 | 2.01 | 12.33* | 1,23 |
| Actual | 24 | 8.10 | 7.03 | | |

*p = 0.00

Thus, the results of an analysis of function six--controlling--indicated that the non-community school principals studied differed significantly in the percentage of

time spent in their ideal and actual roles. The non-community school principals ideally would like to spend less time in the controlling function.

Function number seven--decision-making. An analysis of function seven--decision-making--as reported in Table 30, failed to indicate a significant difference at the .01 level in the mean percentage of time spent in decision-making. The alternate hypothesis of a significant difference between the ideal time percentage and actual time percentage must be rejected.

TABLE 30

Analysis of Variance: Function 7--Decision-making Comparing Non-Community School Principals' Ideal and Actual Percentages of Time Responses

| Type of Role | N | Mean | SD | F | DF |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ideal | 24 | 9.42 | 5.25 | 1.34* | 1,23 |
| Actual | 24 | 8.33 | 3.76 | | |

*p = 0.26

Thus, the results of an analysis of function seven--decision-making--failed to indicate that the non-community school principals studied differ significantly in the percentage of time spent in their ideal and actual roles in this administrative function.

Function number eight--training. As reported in Table 31, an analysis of function eight--training--failed to indicate a significant difference at the .01 level in the mean percentage of time spent in training. The alternate hypothesis of a significant difference between the ideal time percentage and actual time percentage must be rejected.

TABLE 31

Analysis of Variance: Function 8--Training Comparing Non-Community School Principals' Ideal and Actual Percentages of Time Responses

| Type of Role | N | Mean | SD | F | DF |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ideal | 24 | 4.17 | 2.06 | 2.13* | 1,23 |
| Actual | 24 | 3.25 | 3.00 | | |

*p = 0.16

Thus, the results of an analysis of function eight--training--failed to indicate that the non-community school principals studied differ significantly in the percentage of time spent in their ideal and actual roles in this administrative function.

Function number nine--programming. An analysis of function nine--programming--as reported in Table 32, failed to indicate a significant difference at the .01 level in the mean percentage of time spent in programming. The alternate hypothesis of a significant difference between

the ideal time percentage and actual time percentage must be rejected.

TABLE 32

Analysis of Variance: Function 9--Programming Comparing Non-Community School Principals' Ideal and Actual Percentages of Time Responses

| Type of Role | N | Mean | SD | F | DF |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ideal | 24 | 4.04 | 2.76 | 0.13* | 1,23 |
| Actual | 24 | 3.92 | 2.55 | | |

*p = 0.73

Thus, the results of an analysis of function nine--programming--failed to indicate that the non-community school principals studied differ significantly in the percentage of time spent in their ideal and actual roles in this administrative function.

Function number ten--communicating. As reported in Table 33, an analysis of function ten--communicating--failed to indicate a significant difference at the .01 level in the mean percentage of time spent in communicating. The alternate hypothesis of a significant difference between the ideal time percentage and actual time percentage must be rejected.

Thus, the results of an analysis of function ten--communicating--failed to indicate that the non-community school principals studied differ significantly in the

percentage of time spent in their ideal and actual roles in this administrative function.

TABLE 33

Analysis of Variance: Function 10--Communicating Comparing Non-Community School Principals' Ideal and Actual Percentages of Time Responses

| Type of Role | N | Mean | SD | F | DF |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ideal | 24 | 8.73 | 5.41 | 2.18* | 1,23 |
| Actual | 24 | 9.71 | 5.98 | | |

*p = 0.15

Function number 11--innovating. An Analysis of function 11--innovating--as reported in Table 34,

TABLE 34

Analysis of Variance: Function 11--Innovating Comparing Non-Community School Principals' Ideal and Actual Percentages of Time Responses

| Type of Role | N | Mean | SD | F | DF |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ideal | 24 | 6.02 | 4.47 | 5.57* | 1,23 |
| Actual | 24 | 4.40 | 3.08 | | |

*p = 0.03

indicated a significant difference in the mean percentage of time spent in innovating at the .05 level but not at the .01 level. The alternate hypothesis of a significant difference between the ideal and actual situations can be accepted at the .05 level but must be rejected at the

.01 level.

The results of an analysis of function 11--innovating--indicated that non-community school principals would like to spend a larger percentage of time innovating.

Function number 12--directing. As reported in Table 35, an analysis of function 12--directing--failed to indicate a significant difference at the .01 level in the mean percentage of time spent in directing. The alternate hypothesis of a significant difference between the ideal and actual roles must be rejected at the .01 level.

TABLE 35

Analysis of Variance: Function 12--Directing Comparing Non-Community School Principals' Ideal and Actual Percentages of Time Responses

| Type of Role | N | Mean | SD | F | DF |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ideal | 24 | 4.56 | 4.26 | 0.54* | 1,23 |
| Actual | 24 | 5.06 | 5.12 | | |

*p = 0.47

The results of an analysis of function 12--directing--failed to indicate that non-community school principals studied differ significantly in the percentage of time spent in their ideal and actual roles in this administrative function.

Function number 13--budgeting. An analysis of

function 13--budgeting--as reported in Table 36, failed to indicate a significant difference at the .01 level in the mean percentage of time spent in budgeting. The alternate hypothesis of a significant difference between the ideal time percentage and actual time percentage must be rejected.

TABLE 36

Analysis of Variance: Function 13--Budgeting Comparing Non-Community School Principals' Ideal and Actual Percentages of Time Responses

| Type of Role | N | Mean | SD | F | DF |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ideal | 24 | 3.13 | .195 | 2.30* | 1,23 |
| Actual | 24 | 4.17 | 3.40 | | |

*p = 0.14

Thus, the results of an analysis of function 13--budgeting--failed to indicate that the non-community school principals studied differ significantly in the percentage of time spent in their ideal and actual roles in this administrative function.

Function number 14--leading groups. As reported in Table 37, an analysis of function 14--leading groups--failed to indicate a significant difference at the .01 level in the mean percentage of time spent in leading groups. The alternate hypothesis of a significant difference between the ideal time percentage and actual time

percentage must be rejected.

TABLE 37

Analysis of Variance: Function 14--Leading Groups Comparing Non-Community School Principals' Ideal and Actual Percentages of Time Responses

| Type of Role | N | Mean | SD | F | DF |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ideal | 24 | 3.56 | 2.32 | 0.06* | 1,23 |
| Actual | 24 | 3.67 | 2.36 | | |

*p = 0.81

Thus, the results of an analysis of function 14--leading groups--failed to indicate that the non-community school principals studied differ significantly in the percentage of time spent in their ideal and actual situations in this administrative function.

Function number 15--organizing. An analysis of function 15--organizing--as reported in Table 38, failed to

TABLE 38

Analysis of Variance: Function 15--Organizing Comparing Non-Community School Principals' Ideal and Actual Percentages of Time Responses

| Type of Role | N | Mean | SD | F | DF |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ideal | 24 | 5.58 | 3.02 | 1.17* | 1,23 |
| Actual | 24 | 6.58 | 4.29 | | |

*p = 0.29

indicate a significant difference at the .01 level in the mean percentage of time spent in organizing. The alternate hypothesis of a significant difference between the ideal time percentage and actual time percentage must be rejected.

Thus, the results of an analysis of function 15--organizing--failed to indicate that the non-community school principals studied differ significantly in the percentage of time spent in their ideal and actual roles in this administrative function.

Function number 16--staffing. As reported in Table 39, an analysis of function 16--staffing--failed to indicate a significant difference at the .01 level in the mean percentage of time spent in staffing. The alternate hypothesis of a significant difference between the ideal time percentage and actual time percentage must be rejected.

TABLE 39

Analysis of Variance: Function 16--Staffing Comparing Non-Community School Principals' Ideal and Actual Percentages of Time Responses

| Type of Role | N | Mean | SD | F | DF |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ideal | 24 | 2.50 | .189 | 0.04* | 1,23 |
| Actual | 24 | 2.58 | 2.19 | | |

*p = 0.85

Thus, the results of an analysis of function 16--staffing--failed to indicate that the non-community school principals studied differ significantly in the percentage of time spent in their ideal and actual roles in this administrative function.

Function number 17--involving community. An analysis of function 17--involving community--as reported in Table 40, indicated a significant difference at the .01 level in the mean percentage of time spent in involving the community. The null hypothesis of no significant difference between the ideal time percentage and actual time percentage must be rejected in favor of the alternate hypothesis.

TABLE 40

Analysis of Variance: Function 17--Involving Community Comparing Non-Community School Principals' Ideal and Actual Percentages of Time Responses

| Type of Role | N | Mean | SD | F | DF |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ideal | 24 | 5.92 | 3.37 | 7.99* | 1,23 |
| Actual | 24 | 4.00 | 3.38 | | |

*p - 0.01

Thus, the results of an analysis of function 17--involving community--indicated that the non-community school principals studied differed significantly in the percentage of time spent in their ideal and actual roles.

The non-community school principals ideally would like to spend a larger percentage of time in involving the community.

Function number 18--coordinating. As reported in Table 41, an analysis of function 18--coordinating--failed to indicate a significant difference at the .01 level in the mean percentage of time spent in coordinating. The alternate hypothesis of a significant difference between the ideal and actual mean percentages must be rejected.

TABLE 41

Analysis of Variance: Function 18--Coordinating Comparing Non-Community School Principals' Ideal and Actual Percentages of Time Responses

| Type of Role | N | Mean | SD | F | DF |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ideal | 24 | 5.17 | 4.12 | 0.65* | 1,23 |
| Actual | 24 | 5.67 | 4.17 | | |

*p = 0.43

The results of an analysis of function 18--coordinating--failed to indicate that non-community school principals studied differ significantly in the percentage of time spent in their ideal and actual roles in this administrative function.

Summary (Non-Community School Principals)

The comparison of the non-community school principals' ideal and actual percentage of time responses revealed a significant difference at the .01 level for three functions--evaluating, controlling and involving the community. In addition, a significant difference was found at the .05 level for two functions--planning and innovating. The alternate hypothesis of a difference between the mean percentage of time had to be rejected in all other functions in favor of the null hypothesis. Next, the same comparisons were made for the community school principals with their ideal and actual percentage of time responses.

Function number one--evaluating. An analysis of function one--evaluating--as reported in Table 42,

TABLE 42

Analysis of Variance: Function 1--Evaluating Comparing Community School Principals' Ideal and Actual Percentages of Time Responses

| Type of Role | N | Mean | SD | F | DF |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ideal | 38 | 10.13 | 6.51 | 9.58* | 1,37 |
| Actual | 38 | 6.94 | 4.79 | | |

*p = 0.00

indicated a significant difference in the mean percentage

of time spent in evaluating at the .01 level. The null hypothesis of no significant difference between the ideal time percentage and actual time percentage must be rejected in favor of the alternate hypothesis.

Thus, the results of an analysis of function one--evaluating--indicated that community school principals studied differed significantly in the percentage of time spent in their ideal and actual roles. The community school principals ideally would like to spend a greater percentage of time in evaluating.

Function number two--listening. As reported in Table 43, an analysis of function two--listening--failed to indicate a significant difference at the .01 level in the mean percentage of time spent in listening. The alternate hypothesis of a significant difference between the ideal time percentage and actual time percentage must be rejected.

TABLE 43

Analysis of Variance: Function 2--Listening Comparing Community School Principals' Ideal and Actual Percentages of Time Responses

| Type of Role | N | Mean | SD | F | DF |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ideal | 38 | 7.76 | 4.03 | 1.27 | 1,37 |
| Actual | 38 | 8.65 | 5.72 | | |

*p = 0.27

Thus, the results of an analysis of function two--listening--failed to indicate that community school principals studied differ significantly in the percentage of time spent in their ideal and actual roles in this administrative function.

Function number three--planning. An analysis of function three--planning--as reported in Table 44, failed to indicate a significant difference at the .01 level in the mean percentage of time spent in planning. The alternate hypothesis of a significant difference between the ideal time percentage and actual time percentage must be rejected.

TABLE 44

Analysis of Variance: Function 3--Planning
Comparing Community School Principals'
Ideal and Actual Percentages of Time Responses

| Type of Role | N | Mean | SD | F | DF |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ideal | 38 | 7.91 | 4.64 | 0.40* | 1,37 |
| Actual | 38 | 7.40 | 3.89 | | |

*p = 0.53

Thus, the results of an analysis of function three--planning--failed to indicate that community school principals studied differ significantly in the percentage of time spent in their ideal and actual roles in this administrative function.

Function number four--surveying. As reported in Table 45, an analysis of function four--surveying--failed to indicate a significant difference at the .01 level in the mean percentage of time spent in surveying. The alternate hypothesis of a significant difference between the ideal time percentage and actual time percentage must be rejected.

TABLE 45

Analysis of Variance: Function 4--Surveying Comparing Community School Principals' Ideal and Actual Percentages of Time Responses

| Type of Role | N | Mean | SD | F | DF |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ideal | 38 | 3.20 | 2.81 | 0.08* | 1,37 |
| Actual | 38 | 3.33 | 2.38 | | |

*p = 0.77

Thus, the results of an analysis of function four--surveying--failed to indicate that community school principals studied differ significantly in the percentage of time spent in their ideal and actual roles in this administrative function.

Function number five--stimulating. An analysis of function five--stimulating--as reported in Table 46, failed to indicate a significant difference at the .01 level in the mean percentage of time spent in stimulating. The alternate hypothesis of a significant difference

between the ideal time percentage and actual time percentage must be rejected.

TABLE 46

Analysis of Variance: Function 5--Stimulating Comparing Community School Principals' Ideal and Actual Percentages of Time Responses

| Type of Role | N | Mean | SD | F | DF |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ideal | 38 | 5.62 | 3.60 | 2.81* | 1,37 |
| Actual | 38 | 4.80 | 3.01 | | |

*p = 0.10

Thus, the results of an analysis of function five--stimulating--failed to indicate that community school principals studied differ significantly in the percentage of time spent in their ideal and actual roles in this administrative function.

Function number six--controlling. As reported in Table 47, an analysis of function six--controlling--indicated a significant difference at the .01 level in the mean percentage of time spent in controlling. The null hypothesis of no significant difference between the ideal time percentage and actual time percentage must be rejected in favor of the alternate hypothesis.

Thus, the results of an analysis of function six--controlling--indicated that community school principals studied differed significantly in the percentage of time

spent in their ideal and actual roles. The community school principals ideally would like to spend a lesser proportion of their time in the controlling function.

TABLE 47

Analysis of Variance: Function 6--Controlling Comparing Community School Principals' Ideal and Actual Percentages of Time Responses

| Type of Role | N | Mean | SD | F | DF |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ideal | 38 | 3.68 | 3.56 | 7.98* | 1,37 |
| Actual | 38 | 5.87 | 4.81 | | |

*p = 0.01

Function number seven--decision-making. An analysis of function seven--decision-making--as reported in Table 48, failed to indicate a significant difference

TABLE 48

Analysis of Variance: Function 7--Decision-making Comparing Community School Principals' Ideal and Actual Percentages of Time Responses

| Type of Role | N | Mean | SD | F | DF |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ideal | 38 | 6.18 | 3.95 | 2.28* | 1,37 |
| Actual | 38 | 7.56 | 6.63 | | |

*p = 0.14

at the .01 level in the mean percentage of time spent in decision-making. The alternate hypothesis of a significant difference between the ideal time percentage and actual

time percentage must be rejected.

Thus, the results of an analysis of function seven--decision-making--failed to indicate that community school principals studied differ significantly in the percentage of time spent in their ideal and actual roles in this administrative function.

Function number eight--training. As reported in Table 49, an analysis of function eight--training--failed to indicate a significant difference at the .01 level in the mean percentage of time spent in training. The alternate hypothesis of a significant difference between the ideal time percentage and actual time percentage must be rejected.

TABLE 49

Analysis of Variance: Function 8--Training
Comparing Community School Principals'
Ideal and Actual Percentages of Time Responses

| Type of Role | N | Mean | SD | F | DF |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ideal | 38 | 3.27 | 2.78 | 0.18* | 1,37 |
| Actual | 38 | 3.10 | 2.46 | | |

*p = 0.67

Thus, the results of an analysis of function eight--training--failed to indicate that community school principals studied differ significantly in the percentage of

time spent in their ideal and actual roles in this administrative function.

Function number nine--programming. An analysis of function nine--programming--as reported in Table 50,

TABLE 50

Analysis of Variance: Function 9--Programming Comparing Community School Principals' Ideal and Actual Percentages of Time Responses

| Type of Role | N | Mean | SD | F | DF |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ideal | 38 | 2.82 | .189 | 1.80* | 1,37 |
| Actual | 38 | 3.50 | 3.17 | | |

*p = 0.19

failed to indicate a significant difference at the .01 level in the mean percentage of time spent in programming. The alternate hypothesis of a significant difference between the ideal time percentage and actual time percentage must be rejected.

Thus, the results of an analysis of function nine--programming--failed to indicate that community school principals studied differ significantly in the percentage of time spent in their ideal and actual roles in this administrative function.

Function number ten--communicating. As reported in Table 51, an analysis of function ten--communicating--

failed to indicate a significant difference at the .01 level in the mean percentage of time spent in communicating. The alternate hypothesis of a significant difference between the ideal time percentage and actual time percentage must be rejected.

TABLE 51

Analysis of Variance: Function 10--Communicating Comparing Community School Principals' Ideal and Actual Percentages of Time Responses

| Type of Role | N | Mean | SD | F | DF |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ideal | 38 | 8.46 | 4.41 | 0.05* | 1,37 |
| Actual | 38 | 8.60 | 4.94 | | |

*p = 0.83

Thus, the results of an analysis of function ten--communicating--failed to indicate that community school principals studied differ significantly in the percentage of time spent in their ideal and actual roles in this administrative function.

Function number 11--innovating. An analysis of function 11--innovating--as reported in Table 52, indicated a significant difference in the mean percentage of time spent in innovating at the .01 level. The null hypothesis of no significant difference between the ideal time percentage and actual time percentage must be rejected in favor of the alternate hypothesis.

Thus, the results of an analysis of function 11--Innovating--indicated that community school principals studied differed significantly in the percentage of time spent in their ideal and actual roles. The community school principals ideally would like to spend a greater percentage of time in the innovating function.

TABLE 52

Analysis of Variance: Function 11--Innovating
Comparing Community School Principals'
Ideal and Actual Percentages of Time Responses

| Type of Role | N | Mean | SD | F | DF |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ideal | 38 | 6.03 | 3.35 | 22.81* | 1,37 |
| Actual | 38 | 3.86 | 2.61 | | |

*p = 0.00

Function number 12--directing. As reported in Table 53, an analysis of function 12--directing--failed to

TABLE 53

Analysis of Variance: Function 12--Directing
Comparing Community School Principals'
Ideal and Actual Percentages of Time Responses

| Type of Role | N | Mean | SD | F | DF |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ideal | 38 | 4.30 | 2.93 | 2.70* | 1,37 |
| Actual | 38 | 5.18 | 3.63 | | |

*p = 0.11

Indicate a significant difference at the .01 level in the

mean percentage of time spent in directing. The alternate hypothesis of a significant difference between the ideal time percentage and actual time percentage must be rejected.

Thus, the results of an analysis of function 12--directing--failed to indicate that community school principals studied differ significantly in the percentage of time spent in their ideal and actual roles in this administrative function.

Function number 13--budgeting. An analysis of function 13--budgeting--as reported in Table 54, failed to indicate a significant difference at the .01 level in the mean percentage of time spent in budgeting. The alternate hypothesis of a significant difference between the ideal time percentage and actual time percentage must be rejected.

TABLE 54

Analysis of Variance: Function 13--Budgeting Comparing Community School Principals' Ideal and Actual Percentages of Time Responses

| Type of Role | N | Mean | SD | F | DF |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ideal | 38 | 2.39 | 2.20 | 0.10* | 1,37 |
| Actual | 38 | 2.35 | 1.81 | | |

*p = 0.92

Thus, the results of an analysis of function 13--

budgeting--indicated that community school principals studied did not differ significantly in the percentage of time spent in their ideal and actual roles in this administrative function.

Function number 14--leading groups. As reported in Table 55, an analysis of function 14--leading groups--indicated a significant difference in the mean percentage of time spent in leading groups at the .05 level but not at the .01 level. The alternate hypothesis of a significant difference between the ideal and actual roles can be accepted at the .05 level but must be rejected at the .01 level.

TABLE 55

Analysis of Variance: Function 14--Leading Groups Comparing Community School Principals' Ideal and Actual Percentages of Time Responses

| Type of Role | N | Mean | SD | F | DF |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ideal | 38 | 3.69 | 2.33 | 4.13* | 1,37 |
| Actual | 38 | 4.65 | 2.99 | | |

*p = 0.05

The results of an analysis of function 14--leading groups--indicated that community school principals would ideally prefer to spend a lesser percentage of time leading groups.

Function number 15--organizing. An analysis of function 15--organizing--as reported in Table 56, failed to indicate a significant difference at the .01 level in the mean percentage of time spent in organizing. The alternate hypothesis of a significant difference between the ideal time percentage and actual time percentage must be rejected.

TABLE 56

Analysis of Variance: Function 15--Organizing Comparing Community School Principals' Ideal and Actual Percentages of Time Responses

| Type of Role | N | Mean | SD | F | DF |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ideal | 38 | 5.72 | 2.73 | 0.21* | 1,37 |
| Actual | 38 | 5.52 | 2.71 | | |

*p = 0.65

Thus, the results of an analysis of function 15--organizing--failed to indicate that community school principals studied differ significantly in the percentage of time spent in their ideal and actual roles in this administrative function.

Function number 16--staffing. As reported in Table 57, an analysis of function 16--staffing--failed to indicate a significant difference at the .01 level in the mean percentage of time spent in staffing. The alternate hypothesis of a significant difference between the ideal

time percentage and actual time percentage must be rejected.

TABLE 57

Analysis of Variance: Function 16--Staffing
Comparing Community School Principals'
Ideal and Actual Percentages of Time Responses

| Type of Role | N | Mean | SD | F | DF |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ideal | 38 | 3.72 | 2.86 | 0.13* | 1,37 |
| Actual | 38 | 3.91 | 3.51 | | |

*p = 0.72

Thus, the results of an analysis of function 16--staffing--failed to indicate that community school principals studied differ significantly in the percentage of time spent in their ideal and actual roles in this administrative function.

Function number 17--involving community. An analysis of function 17--involving community--as reported in Table 58, failed to indicate a significant difference at the .01 level in the mean percentage of time spent in involving the community. The alternate hypothesis of a significant difference between the ideal time percentage and actual time percentage must be rejected.

Thus, the results of an analysis of function 17--involving community--failed to indicate that community school principals studied differ significantly in

the percentage of time spent in their ideal and actual roles in this administrative function

TABLE 58

Analysis of Variance: Function 17--Involving Community Comparing Community School Principals' Ideal and Actual Percentages of Time Responses

| Type of Role | N | Mean | SD | F | DF |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ideal | 38 | 9.39 | 4.81 | 1.03* | 1,37 |
| Actual | 38 | 8.53 | 5.23 | | |

*p = 0.32

Function number 18--coordinating. As reported in Table 59, an analysis of function 18--coordinating--failed to indicate a significant difference at the .01 level in

TABLE 59

Analysis of Variance: Function 18--Coordinating Comparing Community School Principals' Ideal and Actual Percentages of Time Responses

| Type of Role | N | Mean | SD | F | DF |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ideal | 38 | 5.69 | 4.01 | 1.54* | 1,37 |
| Actual | 38 | 6.61 | 4.19 | | |

*p = 0.22

the mean percentage of time spent in coordinating. The alternate hypothesis of a significant difference between the ideal time percentage and actual time percentage must be

rejected.

Thus, the results of an analysis of function 18--coordinating--indicated that community school principals studied did not differ significantly in the percentage of time spent in their ideal and actual roles in this administrative function.

Summary (Community School Principals)

The comparison of community school principals' ideal and actual percentage of time responses revealed a significant difference at the .01 level for three functions--evaluating, controlling and innovating. In addition, a significant difference was found at the .05 level for leading groups. The alternate hypothesis of a difference between the mean percentage of time had to be rejected in all other functions. The third and final question investigated was the next subject covered.

Comparison of non-community school principals' and community school principals' responses to the percentage of time spent in given administrative functions for technical, human and conceptual skill areas in ideal and actual roles

The third and final question examined was whether a difference in skill mix (human, technical and conceptual) existed between non-community school principals and community school principals in either their ideal or

actual roles. Again, it was the researcher's belief that a difference existed between the two groups of principals. Below are the results of six one way analyses of variance (three each for ideal and actual) comparing non-community school principals and community school principals in the human, technical and conceptual skill areas.

Technical skill area--ideal. An analysis of the technical skill area as reported in Table 60 failed to indicate a significant difference in the mean percentage of time spent in functions 1, 4, 6, 8, 9, 12, 13 and 16 between the non-community school principals' and community school principals' ideal percentages of time responses at the .01 level. The alternate hypothesis of a significant difference between the two groups of principals at this level must be rejected.

TABLE 60

Analysis of Variance: Technical Skills Comparing Non-Community School Principals' and Community School Principals' Ideal Percentages of Time Responses

| Type of Principal | N | Mean | SD | F | DF |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Non-Community School | 24 | 32.65 | 9.29 | 0.13* | 1,60 |
| Community School | 38 | 33.51 | 8.93 | | |

*p = 0.72

Thus, the results of an analysis of the technical skill area failed to indicate that non-community school principals and community school principals differ significantly in the percentage of time spent in the technical skill area in their ideal roles.

Human skill area--ideal. As reported in Table 61, an analysis of the human skill area failed to indicate a significant difference in the mean percentage of time spent in functions 2, 5, 10, 14 and 17 between the non-community school principals' and community school principals' ideal percentage of time responses at the .01 level. The alternate hypothesis of a significant difference between the two groups of principals at this level of significance must be rejected.

TABLE 61

Analysis of Variance: Human Skills Comparing Non-Community School Principals' and Community School Principals' Ideal Percentages of Time Responses

| Type of Principal | N | Mean | SD | F | DF |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Non-Community School | 24 | 31.96 | 10.00 | 1.73* | 1,60 |
| Community School | 38 | 34.92 | 7.66 | | |

*p = 0.19

Thus, the results of an analysis of the human

skill area failed to indicate that non-community school principals and community school principals differ significantly in the percentage of time spent in the human skill area in their ideal roles.

Conceptual skill area--ideal. An analysis of the conceptual skill area, as reported in Table 62, failed to indicate a significant difference in the mean percentage

TABLE 62

Analysis of Variance: Conceptual Skills Comparing Non-Community School Principals' and Community School Principals' Ideal Percentages of Time Responses

| Type of Principal | N | Mean | SD | F | DF |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Non-Community School | 24 | 34.96 | 10.27 | 2.45* | 1,60 |
| Community School | 38 | 31.52 | 7.05 | | |

*p = 0.12

of time spent in functions 3, 7, 11, 15 and 18 between the non-community school principals' and community school principals' ideal percentage of time responses at the .01 level. The alternate hypothesis of a significant difference between the two groups of principals at this level must be rejected.

Thus, the results of an analysis of the conceptual skill area failed to indicate that non-community school

principals and community school principals differ significantly in the percentage of time spent in the conceptual skill area in their ideal roles.

Technical skill area--actual. As reported in Table 63, an analysis of the technical skill area failed to indicate a significant difference in the mean percentage of time spent in functions 1, 4, 6, 8, 9, 12, and 16 between the non-community school principals' and community school principals' actual percentage of time responses at the .01 level. The alternate hypothesis of a significant difference between the two groups of principals at this level must be rejected.

TABLE 63

Analysis of Variance: Technical Skills Comparing Non-Community School Principals' and Community School Principals' Actual Percentages of Time Responses

| Type of Principal | N | Mean | SD | F | DF |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Non-Community School | 24 | 34.17 | 8.77 | 0.00* | 1,60 |
| Community School | 38 | 34.17 | 8.96 | | |

*p = 1.00

Thus, the results of an analysis of the technical skill area failed to indicate that non-community school principals and community school principals differ signifi-

cantly in the percentage of time spent in the technical skill area in their actual roles.

Human skill area--actual. An analysis of the human skill area, as reported in Table 64, failed to indicate a significant difference in the mean percentage of time spent in functions 2, 5, 10, 14 and 17 between the non-community school principals' and community school principals' actual percentage of time responses at the .01 level. The alternate hypothesis of a significant difference between the two groups of principals at this level must be rejected.

TABLE 64

Analysis of Variance: Human Skills Comparing Non-Community School Principals' and Community School Principals' Actual Percentages of Time Responses

| Type of Principal | N | Mean | SD | F | DF |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Non-Community School | 24 | 32.29 | 9.64 | 1.42* | 1,60 |
| Community School | 38 | 35.21 | 9.26 | | |

*p = 0.24

Thus, the results of an analysis of the human skill area failed to indicate that non-community school principals and community school principals differ significantly in the percentage of time spent in the human skill

area in their actual roles.

Conceptual skill area--actual. As reported in Table 65, an analysis of the conceptual skill area failed to indicate a significant difference in the mean percentage of time spent in functions 3, 7, 11, 15 and 18 between the non-community school principals' and community school principals' actual percentage of time responses at the .01 level. The alternate hypothesis of a significant difference between the two groups of principals at this level must be rejected.

TABLE 65

Analysis of Variance: Conceptual Skills Comparing Non-Community School Principals' and Community School Principals' Actual Percentages of Time Responses

| Type of Principal | N | Mean | SD | F | DF |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Non-Community School | 24 | 32.04 | 10.53 | 0.25* | 1,60 |
| Community School | 38 | 30.95 | 6.72 | | |

*p = 0.62

Thus, the results of an analysis of the conceptual skill area failed to indicate that non-community school principals and community school principals differ significantly in the percentage of time spent in the conceptual skill areas in their actual roles.

## Summary

A significant difference was not found at the .01 level between the community school principals and the non-community school principals in the percentage of time spent in the technical, human or conceptual skill areas. The alternate hypothesis of a difference in the skill mix between the two groups of principals had to be rejected in favor of the null hypothesis. However, emphasis must be made that where the null hypothesis is not rejected in favor of the alternate hypothesis all that can be stated is that the data did not support a difference between the two groups.

The preceding sections presented a report of the findings for the three basic questions raised in Chapter I which were (1) whether a difference existed between the percentage of time actually spent by community school principals and non-community school principals in given functions, (2) whether a difference existed between the percentage of time actually spent by each group of principals and what they would ideally like to spend in performing given functions and (3) whether there was a difference in the skill mix (human, technical and conceptual) between the community school principals and non-community school principals in either their ideal or actual roles. A summary of the findings and conclusions and implications based on the study is the subject of Chapter V.

# CHAPTER V

## SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

### Introduction

A summary of the findings for the three original questions opens this chapter. Following the summary of these findings are conclusions drawn from the data obtained. The chapter concludes with implications for the use of the study.

### Summary of Findings

Among the 18 administrative functions drawn from writers in business administration (Fayol, Simon, Brown and others), educational administration (Sears, Gregg, Griffiths, Campbell and others) and studies of community school directors or other educators including principals (NEA, McCloud, Melton, Snyder, Becker, Johnson, Kliminski and others), only three--surveying, budgeting and involving the community--were significantly different at the .05 level when comparing the non-community school principals' and community school principals' mean percentage of time actual responses. In fifteen of 18 functions significant differences were not found in mean percentages of time actually spent between the two groups of

principals.

In addition, when comparing the mean percentage of time spent in the ideal and actual roles of the non-community school principals, only 5 out of 18 functions were significantly different. In two functions--planning and innovating--there were significant differences at the .05 level while there were significant differences at the .01 level in three functions--evaluating, controlling and involving the community. However, community school principals were significantly different in only 4 out of 18 functions when comparing their ideal and actual time percentage responses. In one function--leading groups--there was significant difference at the .05 level while differences in evaluating, controlling and innovating were significant at the .01 level.

Finally, when comparing the two groups of principals' mean time percentage responses in the ideal and actual roles for technical, human and conceptual skill areas, there was no significant difference at the .05 or .01 level for any skill area.

## Conclusions

It can be concluded that based upon the present study there is little evidence to support any major differences in the percentage of time non-community school principals and community school principals spend in given

administrative functions. This seems to contradict what many writers in community education (Keidel, 1969; Minzey & Olson, 1969; Totten, 1970; Kerensky & Melby, 1971; Minzey & LeTarte, 1972; and Clark, 1974) have maintained about a difference between the two groups of principals. In deference to the community school principals studied, it should be noted that only within the past two years have they been given the responsibility for community education. Hence, one would not expect a change in patterns of behavior during that short time period. Future studies of the same sample groups might reveal a wider difference between the two groups of principals as the community school principals further activate the community education process.

Three areas of difference did appear when comparing the non-community school principals' and community school principals' responses to the percentage of time actually spent in three functions--surveying, budgeting and involving the community. Community school principals were found to spend a larger percentage of time in surveying and involving the community while the non-community school principals spent a larger percentage of time budgeting.

Community school principals appear to be attempting to meet the needs of the community by surveying to determine those needs. This task is congruent with the

purposes of community education as stated by Minzey and LeTarte (1972), Seay (1974) and Berridge (1973) reported in Chapter I. It is not surprising that community school principals spend more time in these areas and that both functions are significantly different from the non-community school principals inasmuch as considerable emphasis is placed upon surveying and involving the community in most of the community education literature.

The non-community school principals were found to spend more time in the function of budgeting or financing and allocating monies. Money does not seem to be a concern for the community school principals. A number of factors might account for this difference in budgeting between the two groups of principals. First, the tax base for the two school districts is different. Also, it is likely that budgeting and finance in the district representing the community school principals is delegated to personnel other than the principal which may account for less concern for this function by community school principals. Further, in the district in which the community school principals function, funds are provided directly to support community education programs; consequently, principals need not concern themselves with raising funds for community education.

When comparing the ideal percentage time responses with the actual percentage time responses of the two groups

of principals, again few major differences were discovered in the 18 functions. Earlier studies of ideal and actual role perceptions (NEA, 1959; Melton, 1958; Hemphill, 1964; Snyder, 1968; McCloud, 1969) have revealed a greater disparity between the two roles. Usually participants in the studies reveal they are practicing at one level (actual) while aspiring to another level (ideal) of performance. Basically, this does not appear to be true of the two groups of principals studied.

Five functions--evaluating, planning, controlling, innovating and involving the community--of the non-community school principals were discovered to have a difference when comparing actual and ideal roles at the established .05 level of significance. Community school principals had differences in only four functions--evaluating, controlling, innovating and leading groups--at the same level of significance. However, three functions--evaluating, controlling and innovating--were found common to both groups of principals. The conclusion is that both the non-community school principals and the community school principals would ideally spend a larger percentage of time evaluating and innovating while ideally spending a smaller portion of time in controlling. In the context of today's school malaise, controlling as a function is essential to the daily maintenance of the school, whereas, evaluation and innovating,

while important, can be postponed. The evidence indicates though, that both groups desired to do more evaluating and innovating while being restrained with a disproportionate amount of controlling. This would support Ovard's (1966) claim that "There is often a conflict between how they (principals) spend their time and how they think they should spend their time (p. 531)."

Another conclusion reached from comparing the ideal and actual roles of the non-community school principals is that they would ideally like to spend a greater percentage of time planning and involving the community while ideally spending a lesser portion of time in the controlling function. Again, it was evidenced that this group of principals was practicing at one level while aspiring to another level. Non-community school principals would like to spend a larger percentage of time planning and involving the community in various ways than they were currently experiencing. Should non-community school principals reach their ideal level of involving the community, there might not exist the significant difference found when their actual mean percentage responses were compared with those of the community school principals in the same area. If time could be freed from controlling, then perhaps, evaluating, planning, innovating and involving the community might come closer to the ideal roles indicated by the non-community school principals.

The data indicated that community school principals were actually spending more time leading groups than they would prefer. Ideally, they would like to spend a smaller percentage of time in this function. If time could be freed from controlling and leading groups, then, perhaps, the community school principal would have more time to spend evaluating and innovating, functions upon which both community school and non-community school principals would perfer to spend more time.

The conclusion when comparing the ideal and actual roles of the two groups of principals is that each group is practicing close to its idealized role. It would appear that the principals surveyed would not prefer to make changes in current time allocations to fit ideal roles across the functions examined.

One would expect the two groups of principals to be different in the technical, human and conceptual skill areas based on the studies of Becker (1972), Johnson (1972), Weaver (1972) and Kliminski (1974). However, the two groups of principals studied did not indicate differences in skill mix. Neither group of principals spends a greater proportion of time in any of the three skill areas nor do they seemingly desire to have a difference in skill mix. Such a similarity in function and idealized role expectation may well be the result of similar professional training for both groups of principals.

Also, it is possible that the similarity in skill mix between the two groups accounts, in part, for the similarity in preferred time spent in administrative functions.

## Implications

It is reasonable to deduce a number of implications from this study of community school principals and non-community school principals. First, there is a need for a greater portion of the principal's time to be spent in evaluating and innovating. These principals want to be the instructional leaders of their schools but are hindered in their attempts by the very system they seek to serve. Further, there appears to be a need to free principals from the controlling function. This function or a portion of it might be delegated to free the principal to become the instructional leader and perform the functions deemed important.

Avenues must also be found which will allow the non-community school principals time to spend in planning, coordinating and involving the community if they are to approach their ideal roles in these functions.

However, the real need and implication from the study seems to be for a different emphasis in the training of future principals. There appears to be a need for more courses or experiences in group process, affecting change and communications for future principals and especially

for the community school principals. It is possible that through a change in training emphases principals may aspire to serve the community in areas not traditionally served by the school in which case one might expect to find a greater disparity between the functions of community school principals and non-community school principals.

# APPENDIXES

# APPENDIX A

# QUESTIONNAIRE

## FUNCTIONS OF THE PRINCIPAL QUESTIONNAIRE

Please indicate below in column one (1) the percentage of time you would like to spend ideally in each of the administrative functions listed and in column two (2) the percentage of time you actually spend in each of the administrative functions listed. Keep in mind that each of the columns (1 and 2) should equal one hundred percent (100%) for all the functions listed.

| ADMINISTRATIVE FUNCTION | % IDEAL | % ACTUAL |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Evaluating | | |
| 2. Listening | | |
| 3. Planning | | |
| 4. Surveying | | |
| 5. Stimulating | | |
| 6. Controlling | | |
| 7. Decision-making | | |
| 8. Training | | |
| 9. Programming | | |
| 10. Communicating | | |
| 11. Innovating | | |
| 12. Directing | | |
| 13. Budgeting | | |
| 14. Leading groups | | |
| 15. Organizing | | |
| 16. Staffing | | |
| 17. Involving community | | |
| 18. Coordinating | | |
| Column totals | 100% | 100% |

APPENDIX B

| NAME OF SCHOOL | Quest. mailed | Quest. returned | Follow-up letter | Phone call | Personal visit |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

APPENDIX C

Principal's Name
Name of School
Address of School
City, State

Dear

I am currently gathering data for my doctoral dissertation being completed through Western Michigan University. With the consent and cooperation of _____, Director of Testing and Evaluation, _____Schools have been selected as a part of my data base.

Enclosed is a one page instrument covering various administrative functions taken from business and educational literature. Would you please complete the questionnaire according to the instructions. Please note that the percentage of time in the ideal situation (how it should be) is called for in column one (1) and your actual percentage of time (how it is) is called for in column two (2). These column totals should each equal 100%.

Your name is not needed on the questionnaire but the name of your school is already included should a need arise to follow-up on the return of the questionnaires. Schools and districts will remain anonymous throughout the study.

Also, enclosed is a stamped, self-addressed envelope for your convenience and an early return of the questionnaire. Thank you for your assistance with this project.

Cordially,

Lawrence R. Wilder

LRW:sdw
Enc.

## APPENDIX D

Principal's Name
Name of School
Address of School
City, State

Dear

According to my records a questionnaire mailed earlier to you concerning the functions performed by principals has not been returned. As a former principal I know how busy the principal's schedule can become, however, I would appreciate the return of the questionnaire at your earliest convenience.

Should our letters have crossed in the mail and you have already returned the questionnaire your job is complete and I thank you very much.

In case you might have misplaced the earlier questionnaire I am enclosing another one with a stamped, self-addressed envelope so that you can return the questionnaire right away.

Thank you again for your cooperation in this matter.

Cordially,

Lawrence R. Wilder

LRW:sdw
Enc.

## REFERENCES


American Association of School Administrators Staff relations in school administration. Washington: AASA, 1955.

Becker, W. E. A study of the leadership effectiveness of the community school director. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan) Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1972.

Berridge, R. I. The community education handbook. Midland, Mich.: Pendell Publishing Company, 1973.

Bobroff, J. L., Howard, J. G. & Howard, A. W. The principalship: junior high and middle school. National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, April, 1974.

Boles, H. W. Leaders, leading and leadership--a theory. Kalamazoo: Western Michigan University, 1970.

Brown, D. S. Understanding the management function. D. S. Brown (Ed.), Leadership resources management library. Washington, D.C.: Leadership Resources, Inc., 1972.

Callahan, R. E. & Button, H.W. Historical change of the role of the man in the organization: 1865-1950. In Griffiths (Ed.), Behavioral science and educational administration, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964.

Campbell, M. The administration of community schools. In H. W. Hickey, C. Van Voorhees & associates (Ed.), The role of the school in community education. Midland, Mich.: Pendell Publishing Company, 1969.

Campbell, R. F., Bridges, E. M., Corbally, J. E. Jr., Nystrand, R. O., & Ramseyer, J. A. Introduction to educational administration (4th ed.), Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1971.

Clark, P. A. Can basic community education principles be included in the k-12 program? Community Education Journal, 1974, 4(1), 33-34.

Costanzo, M. W. Perceptions of the roles and functions of Philadelphia public high school principals as expressed by the principals and other members of the school community. (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University) Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1972, No. 59-297.

Farquhar, R. H. & Piele, P. K. Preparing educational leaders. Columbus, Ohio: University Council for Educational Administration, 1972.

Fayol, H. Administration industrielle et generale. Translated by Starrs, London: Pitman and Sons, 1949.

Getzels, J. W. Administration as a social process. In Halpin (Ed.), Administrative theory in education. Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, 1958.

Glass, G. V. & Stanley, J.C. Statistical methods in education and psychology. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1970.

Gregg, R. T. The administrative process. In R. F. Campbell & R. T. Gregg (Ed.), Administrative behavior in education. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957.

Grieder, C., Pierce, T. M., & Jordan, K. F. Public school administration. (3rd ed.) New York: Ronald Press, 1969.

Griffiths, D. E. Administration as decision-making. In A. W. Halpin (Ed.), Administrative theory in education. Chicago: Midwest Administration Center, The University of Chicago, 1958.

Griffiths, D. E. Administrative theory, New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1959.

Griffiths, D. E., Hemphill, J. K. et al. Administrative performance and personality. New York: Columbia University Press, 1961.

Griffiths, D. E. Research and theory in educational administration. In Kitchel (Ed.) Perspective on educational administration and behavioral sciences. Eugene: University of Oregon Press, 1965.

Griffiths, D. E. & Lutz, F. W. Synthesis and conclusions. In D. E. Griffiths (Ed.), Developing taxonomies

of organizational behavior in educational administration. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1969.

Gross, B. M. The scientific approach to administration. In Griffiths (Ed.), Behavioral science and educational administration. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964.

Gulick, L. & Urwick, L. (Ed.) Papers on the science of administration. New York: Institute of Public Administration, 1937.

Halpin, A. W. A paradigm for research on administrative behavior. In R. F. Campbell and R. T. Gregg (Ed.), Administrative behavior in education. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1957.

Harris, H. B. Community education and community councils: the perspectives of the president of the Flint board of education. Community Education Journal, 1974, 4(3), 16-19.

Helweg, A. H. Innovative--traditional. The Minnesota Elementary School Principal, 1974, 12, 6-8.

Hemphill, J. K. Progress report: A study of the secondary school principalship. Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1964, 98(4), 217-230.

Jacobson, P. B., Reavis, W. C. & Logsdon, J. D. The effective school principal. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963.

Johnson, W. D. Leadership training model for community school directors. (Doctoral dissertation, Western Michigan University) Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1973.

Katz, R. Skills of an effective administrator. Harvard Business Review, 1955, 33. 33-42.

Keidel, G. E. Jr. Staffing and training. In H. W. Hickey, C. Van Voorhees, and associates (Ed.) The role of the school in community education. Midland, Mich.: Pendell Publishing Company, 1968.

Kerensky, V. M. & Melby, E. O. Education II--the social imperative. Midland, Mich.: Pendell Publishing Company, 1971.

Klimnski, G. C. A study of the skills of successful directors of community education in Michigan. (Doctoral dissertation, Western Michigan University Microfilms, 1974.

Lesick, M. D. The principal: His accountability and evaluation through a job description. The Principal, 1974, 5, 47-50.

Likert, R. The nature of highly effective groups. In Carver and Sergiovanni (Ed.), Organizations and human behavior. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1969.

Lindquist, T. H. Critical tasks for the secondary school principalship of the future. Oregon School Study Council Bulletin, 1974, 17(8), 1-20.

Litchfield, E. H. Notes on a general theory of administration. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1956, 1(1), 3-29.

McCloud, P. I. Time analysis study of Tulsa principals. Tulsa, Okla.: Tulsa Public Schools, 1969.

Melby, E. O. Needed: A new concept of educational administration. The community school and its administration, 1965, 4(11).

Melton, J. Perceptions of the ideal and actual role of the elementary school principalship. (Doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University) Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1958.

Minzey, J. D. & Olsen, C. R. An overview. In H. W. Hickey, C. Van Voorhees, and associates (Ed.), The role of the school in community education. Midland, Mich.: Pendell Publishing Company, 1969.

Minzey, J. D. & LeTarte, C. Community education: From program to process. Midland, Mich.: Pendell Publishing Company, 1972.

National Education Association, Department of Elementary School Principals The elementary school principalship--a research study. (37th yearbook) N.E.A. 1958.

Ovard, G. F. Administration of the changing secondary school. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1966.

Ramseyer, J. A., Harris, L. E., Pond, M.Z., & Wakefield, H. Factors affecting educational administration. Columbus: Ohio State University, 1955.

Sears, J. B. The nature of the administrative process. New York: McGraw Hill, 1950.

Seay, M. F. Two distinctive emphases. Forty-fourth yearbook, part I. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1945, 209-228.

Seay, M. F. & Associates Community education: A developing concept. Midland, Mich.: Pendell Publishing Company, 1974.

Simon, H. A. Administrative behavior. (2nd ed.) New York: The Macmillan Co., 1957.

Snyder, W. S. The elementary school principal's perceptions of his ideal and actual role. (Doctoral dissertation, United States International University San Diego) Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1968.

Starrs, C. General and industrial management. Translation of H. Fayol, Administration industrielle et generale, London: Pitman and Sons, 1949.

Sumption, M. R. & Engstrom, Y. School-community relations. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.

Totten, W. F. The power of community education. Midland, Mich.: Pendell Publishing Company, 1970.

Weaver, D. C. Definitions. Kalamazoo: Western Michigan University, 1968.

Weaver, D. C. The emerging community education model. Kalamazoo: Western Michigan University, 1972.

Whitt, R., & Burden, L. The community school principal. Midland, Mich.: Pendell Publishing Company, 1973.