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The purpose of this study was to investigate the effect that increased responsibilities had on the assistant principal's role. Because of increased responsibilities, it was believed that the assistant principal had been forced to become more task and less person oriented as a result of inadequate time to deal with both tasks and people. The study was designed to ascertain whether there had been growth in task responsibilities and, if so, whether the growth had caused the role to become more task than person oriented.

The sample consisted of 400 Michigan assistant principals. From this sample, 67% of the administrators responded. Personal and job related data were gathered via an Assistant Principal Questionnaire. The Leadership Opinion Questionnaire (Fleishman, 1969) provided measures of two dimensions of supervisory leadership, consideration and structure.

The following conclusions are based on the analysis of data findings. First, assistant principals had to face an increase in duties and responsibilities but did not have adequate time to deal with the increases. Second, administrators who reported task oriented duties as causes for an increase in job responsibilities did not structure their role or those of subordinates toward task
attainment. This was paralleled by assistant principals who reported increased person oriented responsibilities, but who were not necessarily personal in relations with group members. Third, respondents perceived themselves as person oriented and preferred the majority of their work to be person oriented in nature. Fourth, assistant principals preferred to do person oriented type duties but in their actual role did task ones. Fifth, when reviewing the relationship of orientations to years of experience, evidence was found to support the fact that assistant principals with lesser experience were more personal in their administrative approach but were not less structured in their goal completion approach than assistant principals with more experience. Finally, orientations of female and male administrators did not show a difference between the way they dealt with subordinates and duties.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Problem

Throughout the past quarter of a century, secondary school administration has undergone apparent changes concerning the role of the administrators and specialization of administration. Public schools were confronted with various kinds of problems as larger enrollments forced schools to improve methods of and facilities for handling personnel, materials, and public relations. The larger enrollments also led to expansion of programs and of offerings for the pupils. As secondary education grew in magnitude and importance, so did the principalship. Every new administrative duty moved the principal further away from being the instructional leader of the secondary school and further away from attaining improvement of the instructional programs.

Increased pressures on those in the position of principal were a direct result of growth in: (a) numbers of schools, (b) numbers of pupils, (c) size of school districts, (d) expanded curriculum, and (e) added responsibilities in the areas of social service. These pressures caused the principal to seek administrative assistance. This urgent need for administrative assistance led to creation and development of the position of assistant principal.
Austin and Brown (1970) stated in their "Report of the Assistant Principal" that comprehensive and carefully spelled-out job descriptions covering the assistant principal's duties were practically nonexistent. The work the assistant principal does, or is expected to do, seems in some cases to have been decided on by the principal as he developed his working relationships with his new assistant principal. In other schools the duties assigned the assistant principal evolved out of the total school situation as the principal, the assistant principal, the staff, and the students hammered out, in a sense, the assistant principal's job through the impact of the incidents of day-to-day school life. The variations in the position were the results of the personalities, philosophies, and interests of the administrators involved and of the changing needs of particular schools.

Statement of the Problem

The problem investigated in this study was the effect that increased responsibilities had on the role of the assistant principal. Because of increased responsibilities surrounding the position, it was believed that the assistant principal had been forced to become more task oriented and less person oriented as the result of a lack of adequate time to deal effectively with both tasks and people.

The study looked at the historical changes in the role of the assistant principal and the reasons behind the changes. It also considered under what circumstances the assistant principal was working at the time of this investigation.
Many assistant principals perceived their roles as becoming progressively complicated. This study was designed to ascertain whether there had been growth in task responsibilities and, if so, whether that growth had caused the role of the assistant principal to become more task oriented that person oriented.

Need for and Significance of the Study

The role of the assistant principal had not, to that time, been studied in detail, as stated by Davis and Moore in 1965. Later Austin and Brown (1970) reported that, in spite of the acknowledged importance of the assistant principal as a chief support of the administrative structure in all but the smallest schools, the position had been a forgotten stepchild so far as administrative study and research were concerned. In addition, Coppedge (1968) had pointed to the need for greater research when he found that the literature relating to the assistant principal of a secondary school revealed a number of significant points, most of which directed attention to the lack of development of the position.

Black (1980) reported that the role of the assistant principalship evolved in a haphazard manner, with job descriptions that were ambiguous and lacked role clarity. Consequently, she believed that the secondary assistant principal lacked a niche in the school administrative organization.

Garawski (1977) believed that, since the assistant principalship was a key administrative post, the position could no longer be relegated to a subordinate place in educational research. He believed
the position must be thoroughly investigated so that a more complete understanding and greater appreciation of the position and those who occupy it can be gained.

The present investigation may be valuable to those who aspire to be assistant principals and those who presently are in such positions. The study findings may have implications for educational administrators who desire additional information on the role of the assistant principal and the effects of changing responsibilities on the role.

With mounting administrative work loads, the problem of reorganizing the administrative functions of the school to cope with increased responsibilities may be crucial. One specific role that may be affected by the mounting work loads is that of the assistant principal. Increased responsibilities have made it difficult for the assistant principal to deal effectively with both tasks and people.

The intent of the study was to determine whether assistant principals were more task oriented than person oriented. With increased understanding it may be possible for the position to be made professionally attractive. Therefore, the study of the role of the assistant principal was considered necessary.

Definitions of Terms

The following terms are defined in respect to their usage in the present study in order to help furnish a common basis of understanding and interpretation.
**Principal:** The term principal refers to the chief executive officer or head of an educational institution (Jarrett, 1958; Weldy, 1979).

**Assistant principal:** Assistant principal refers to a person ranking next to a principal in command and authority (Jarrett, 1958). Other terms used herein and interchangeably with assistant principal are vice principal, associate principal, dean, administrative assistant, and assistant to the principal (Coppedge, 1968).

**Responsibilities:** Responsibilities are defined as tasks, activities, or duties rightfully assumed or expected of the assistant principal (Paus, 1970; Sigler, 1978).

**Tasks:** For use in this study, task refers to a specific piece of work assigned as the responsibility of an assistant principal (Sigler, 1978).

**Role:** The term role refers to the expected pattern of behavior for the occupant of a position (Cullers, 1976).

**Task oriented behavior:** Task oriented behavior refers to behavior which tends to indicate a concern for tasks and goals.

**Person oriented behavior:** Person oriented behavior refers to behavior which tends to indicate a concern for persons and relationships.

**Organization of the Study**

The problem has been stated and justification for undertaking the investigation has been given in the introductory chapter. Pertinent definitions relating to the study were also included.
Chapter II contains a review of studies which have made contributions to the topics covered in the present study. Chapter II also contains a presentation of the research hypotheses and supporting rationale for them.

The design and methodology used to conduct the study are presented in Chapter III. The discussion includes a description of the sample used, discussion of the instruments chosen, discussion of the design and procedures used in collecting the data, and the method of analysis used in analyzing those data is explained.

Presented in Chapter IV is the analysis of data gathered by means of using the Assistant Principal Questionnaire and the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire along with the findings.

The investigation is summarized in Chapter V and some conclusions, practical implications, and recommendations are presented.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This writer's purpose in this chapter was to review selected literature pertaining to the position and role of the secondary school assistant principal. The review of literature is divided into two sections. The first section deals with the position and its historical evolution, as well as the responsibilities, concerns, and time constraints surrounding the discharge of those responsibilities. Eleven hypotheses and literature to support them are presented in the second section.

The Position of the Secondary School Assistant Principal

The position of the secondary school assistant principal is relatively new in the public school systems of the United States. It developed, as did the position of the principal, because of a need for persons to assume added administrative responsibilities. That the position of the assistant principal had not been well defined or described was a common belief among many concerned educators. Typical of them was Gillespie (1961), who stated that the position of the assistant principal in American secondary school had evolved without an adequate sense of direction or underlying philosophy. The belief was held by many that the position evolved out of expediency rather than out of sound educational planning.
A preliminary search of the literature relating to the assistant principal revealed a scarcity of professional writings on the role of the assistant principal and his responsibilities (Davis & Moore, 1965). Kindsvatter and Tosi (1971) substantiated the lack of role definition in relating that, while there was a supersaturation of writing on most educational topics, very little related to the assistant principalship. Joly stated that in 1973 information on the role of the assistant principal was so scarce in research that a list of ERIC resumes published that year contained only two references specifically addressed to that topic.

In order to study the assistant principalship as a professional position, it was necessary to examine its historical evolution in order to trace the factors that have affected the role.

In the 20th century the American public began to value extended schooling for their children and for themselves. According to Butts (1955), in 1900 there were approximately 6,000 public secondary schools, employing 20,000 secondary school teachers and enrolling a half million secondary school students. By 1936, the numbers had risen to almost 26,000 schools, 270,000 teachers, and 6,000,000 students. By 1940 there were between 6,500,000 and 7,000,000 students enrolled in 35,000 public schools. This was nothing short of phenomenal growth.

Pfeffer (cited in Jarrett, 1958) stated that as secondary education grew in magnitude and importance, so did the principalship of high schools of ever-increasing size. Secondary education grew not only in numbers of pupils and schools, in organization and in scope,
but also in programs and purposes. This growth meant a burden of responsibilities for the principal. As his duties and responsibilities multiplied, it became necessary to add an assistant principal and sometimes more than one to aid him in his growing tasks.

The position of principal became a full time job and some of the jobs were so large as to require assistants, as stated by Sullivan (cited in Jarrett, 1958). The principal remained legally and administratively responsible for the total program of his school, but many of his varied duties were delegated by him to others.

As educational programs continued to grow more complex, schools grew continually larger. An ever-increasing number of assistant principalships was established to fill the growing need for persons to perform the myriad administrative tasks, as stated by Kindsvatter and Tosi (1971).

According to Gillespie (1961), the position of the assistant principal grew out of a need to assist principals with the ever-increasing work loads of expanding schools and programs. The development of the duties and responsibilities of the assistant principal have been influenced more by expediency than by careful planning of what the position should be.

In many of today's schools, the building principal and the assistant principal complement each other by sharing duties and responsibilities in every major phase of school administration. While there is general agreement as to the responsibilities of the building principal, the assistant principal's responsibilities often have been delegated with no clear-cut specification of duties and no
specific authority. Although the position of assistant principal came about because of a direct need, clarification of the role has been lacking because of the increasing number of tasks the position holder often has faced.

Social and educational conditions have resulted in increased demands and pressures on the principal and assistant principal of the 1970s and 1980s, reported Gorton and McIntyre (1978) in "The Senior High School Principalship" and Holloway (1981) in "Training the Assistant Principal."

Parent and community expectations have changed dramatically. Today's citizens are more outcome oriented and they want observable results. Parents are demanding more and more of the principal's time to resolve conflicts of all types in the school program stated Sigler (1978). Because of increased demands on the principal's time, Holloway (1981) believed the responsibilities of the assistant principal had increased, while the principal's time commitments left little opportunity for helping an assistant.

An even more contemporary group of problems involves enrollment declines and court precedents, as pointed out by Hecker and Ignatovich (1980). As enrollments decline, there is an increasing demand to cut staff. The cut in staff is not only at the teacher and support personnel level but also at the administrative level. Fowler (1980) made the statement that schools faced with fewer students, more space, and less money do not necessarily lose teachers and administrators at a corresponding or balanced rate. Sheffield (1978) further reported that the public's most obvious way of cutting costs...
was by decreasing the professional staff members and that "open war"
had been declared on assistant principals and other supportive per­
sonnel which was not only unjustifiable, but also detrimental to
quality education.

Principals in many districts are now assigned to more than one
building or, as Hicks (1981) reported, are responsible for more
grades added to their buildings. Marsh (1981) stated that because of
budget crunches some assistant principals were "excessed" or trans­
ferred to larger schools with more classes and staff.

Dissatisfaction seems to be common among those filling or de­
scribing the assistant principalship. Austin and Brown (1970), in
their study of 1,200 assistant principals, found that most of the
respondents reported much less satisfaction from their tenures as
assistant principals than from their years spent in other assign­
ments. When asked to describe the assistant principal's job, school
administrators and assistant principals commonly describe the job as
a necessary but unrewarding step on the career ladder related Bates
and Shank (1983).

Mazzei (1976) stated that an assistant principal's professional
training was aimed at making him an instructional leader of the
secondary school and an agent for improving the quality of teaching
and learning. However, too often the assistant principal was unable
to put the professional training to use because he had to instead
cope with attendance records, disciplinary problems, corridor duties,
equipment problems, and the many other day-to-day trivia encountered
in any school system. Potter (1980) further reported that assistant
principals were no longer content to be "bottom-line" administrators. They expressed the desire to become involved in their schools' total education programs. Administrators wanted to participate in planning, evaluation, decision making, and supervision.

Mazzel (1976) also stated that an assistant principal's role was viewed differently by individuals within the school setting than by those outside the school setting. This diversity reflected not only background and experience, but also the individual's relationship to the school community.

While there is general agreement among writers as to the responsibilities of the building principal, the assistant principal's responsibilities are those delegated by the individual principal, and thus vary greatly. In too many cases, the assistant principal has become little more than the "chief of police" of the school (Corbally, 1961), but the other extreme may also be found. His or her generally unwritten duties, vestiges of an earlier time, may include virtually all facets of building administration. Jarrett (1958) pointed out that the assistant principal shared with the principal the responsibility for all major phases of school organization, supervision, and management. However, without clear-cut delineation and délegation of responsibilities, these duties can only be delegated in an informal manner and cannot be based upon clearly understood and authoritative bases. This belief supports the need for more clearly defined tasks and responsibilities of the role in order for good administrative practices to develop.
In the view of Bevan (1973), the specific duties of the assistant principal, along with responsibility he or she was given and the amount of authority he or she was allowed to exercise, were in most cases spelled out by the principal. The principal's view of the assistant principalship determined what the assistant principal did and, to a degree, how he or she did it.

Of the many concerns assistant principals had regarding their role, none seemed to concern them more than the work load or time involved in discharging their responsibilities (Bordinger, 1973). In most school systems, the tasks assigned required far more time than reasonable for their completion. No other person, whether principal, assistant superintendent, or superintendent, seemed to have a work load as great as that of most concerned assistant principals.

Furthermore, in the National Association of Secondary School Principal's "Report of the Assistant Principalship," Austin and Brown (1970) listed some 59 different activities involving the assistant principal under six major classifications. Those major classifications were: school management, staff personnel duties, community relations, student activities, curriculum and instruction, and pupil personnel. Each was important enough to warrant a large expenditure of administrative time.

In light of the above information, the present investigation regarding the assistant principalship appeared to be well justified because of: (a) a dearth of adequate research on the topic; (b) a need for further information concerning the assistant principal's duties and tasks and the best method of delegating them; and (c)
expressed interest, by educational administrators, in a study of the position, the role, and the problem.

Statement of the Hypotheses

The preceding review of literature constituted the theoretical foundation of this study. There were important questions to be addressed and answered in order to evaluate the effect of task responsibilities on assistant principals’ roles. The study sought to answer the following questions:

1. As duties and responsibilities have increased, have assistant principals become: (a) more or less person oriented? and (b) more or less task oriented?

2. Do assistant principals perceive that they have adequate time to deal with duties assigned them?

3. Do assistant principals perceive that their job responsibilities have increased over the past 3 years?

4. Do assistant principals who perceive increased job responsibilities perceive task oriented duties or person oriented duties as the cause?

5. Do assistant principals who report increased task oriented duties tend to be structure oriented types?

6. Do assistant principals who report increased person oriented duties tend to be consideration oriented types?

7. Do assistant principals perceive themselves as being more person oriented or more task oriented?
8. Do assistant principals prefer to be more person oriented or more task oriented?

9. Do assistant principals' styles correspond to their reported preferences regarding types of tasks?

10. Do assistant principals with less than 3 years experience in that position tend to be differently oriented than do assistant principals with more than 3 years experience?

11. Are female assistant principals differently oriented than are male assistant principals?

Eleven hypotheses were constructed to try to answer these questions. The development of each hypothesis was based on the review of literature.

Hypothesis 1—The Effect of Increased Tasks on Assistant Principals' Orientations

Kindsvatter and Tosi (1971) found that as schools became larger assistant principals were employed to perform a multiplicity of administrative tasks. Austin and Brown (1970), in their "Report of the Assistant Principal," narrowed an inventory of activities involving the assistant principal to the following six categories: (a) school management, a classification encompassing the day-to-day practical tasks related to running the school and providing for the physical necessities of the educational program; (b) staff personnel, duties that relate directly to teachers, to their professional improvement and status; (c) community relations, a classification that encompasses those activities that involve adults in the community in
their various relations to school; (d) student activities, duties that relate to the nonclassroom activities of students; (e) curriculum and instruction, activities relating directly to the course of study and instruction offered by the school, the improvement of instruction, revision of curricula, and improvement of services designed to facilitate instruction; and (f) pupil personnel items, duties associated with students' problems and concerns, with their welfare in school and within the community, with their control and guidance within the school, and with the improvement of their health, social, and school life. Though these six categories contain both person and task oriented duties, assistant principals who were qualified for the position found little professional satisfaction in spending a large block of their time doing clerical and disciplinary chores contained in two of the categories (Bordinger, 1973).

Garawski (1977) reported that the duties of the assistant principal frequently included discipline and attendance functions but were less likely to include tasks of staff supervision and curriculum improvement.

Kindsvatter and Tosi (1971) found that the greatest amount of role stress among assistant principals arose from the lack of opportunity to be involved in staff leadership and curriculum development.

Therefore, it was hypothesized that as duties and responsibilities have increased, the percentage of assistant principals who have become more task oriented will be greater than the percentage of assistant principals who have become more person oriented.
Hypothesis 2—Perception of Time for Dealing With Assigned Duties

Of the many concerns assistant principals have had regarding their position, none seems to have concerned them more than the workload or time involved in discharging their responsibilities. In most school systems, the tasks assigned far exceeded a reasonable time allotment for their completion, according to Bordinger (1973).

On this basis it was hypothesized that the percentage of assistant principals who perceived that they did not have adequate time to deal with duties assigned them will be greater than the percentage of assistant principals who perceived that they did have adequate time to deal with duties.

Hypothesis 3—Perception of Increased Job Responsibilities

The literature reviewed supports the idea that administrative duties and job responsibilities of the assistant principal have become wider in scope and increasingly numerous in recent years. Gillespie (1961) clearly stated that the position of the assistant principal in American secondary schools evolved as secondary schools grew in size and complexity. The scope of duties of the assistant principal had changed from a narrow range of clerical and routine activities to a broad range of administrative and supervisory functions.

Furthermore, Coppedge (1968) concurred with Gillespie's finding stating that it was apparent that the clerical and disciplinary responsibilities of the assistant principal position were being
replaced with more significant administrative and supervisory duties.

Therefore, the review of literature supported the hypothesis that the percentage of assistant principals who perceived that their job responsibilities had increased over the past 3 years will be greater than the percentage of assistant principals who perceived that their job responsibilities had not increased.

**Hypothesis 4—Perception of Nature of Increased Job Responsibilities**

Literature by Bevan (1973); Paus (1970); Burdick (cited in Kindsvatter & Tosi, 1971); Wells, Nelson, and Johnson (1965); Bordinger (1973); and The School Principal (1977), a California State Legislature report, supported the belief that duties and responsibilities have increased in the past several years because of such matters as inadequate staffing, increased responsibilities delegated by the principal, inadequate numbers of assistant principals, increased clerical duties, and increased state and federal program demands.

Consequently, it was hypothesized that assistant principals who perceived increased job responsibilities will report task oriented duties such as inadequate staffing, increased responsibilities delegated by the principal, inadequate number of assistant principals, increased clerical duties, increased state and federal program demands, or increased student enrollment as causes rather than person oriented duties such as increased community communication, increased committee involvement, increased student counseling, increased classroom visitation, increased assistance to teachers, increased
encouragement of student leadership, or increased planning of staff professional growth.

**Hypothesis 5—Task Oriented Duties and Structure Behavior**

Fleishman's Leadership Opinion Questionnaire (LOQ) supplied measurement of two dimensions of supervisory leadership, consideration and structure. Fleishman (1969) stated that structure reflected the extent to which the individual was likely to define and structure his own role and those of his subordinates toward goal attainment.

One of the most difficult problems of a school system with declining enrollment regarded personnel. Fowler (1980) discussed staff reduction and the fact that staff and administrative losses were not always at a balanced rate. Marsh (1981) further related that often staffs were cut and assistant principals were transferred to larger schools. These schools contained more classes and staff.

Johnson (1981) discussed the fact that principals manage programs mandated by legislation regarding special education, federal requirements for school breakfast and lunch, labor contracts, and busing services, as well as due process and affirmative action. With all of these responsibilities, more and more duties are delegated to the assistant principal in order to allow the principal time to attend to such programs as those mentioned.

This researcher hypothesized that assistant principals who reported task oriented duty choices such as inadequate staffing, increased student enrollment, increased responsibilities delegated by
the principal, inadequate number of assistant principals, increased clerical duties, or increased state and federal program demands as causes for an increase in their duties will score above the median for structure on the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire, as compared to assistant principals who reported person oriented duty choices such as increased community communication, increased committee involvement, increased student counseling, increased classroom visitation, increased assistance to teachers, increased encouragement of student leadership, or increased planning of staff professional growth.

**Hypothesis 6—Person Oriented Duties and Consideration Behavior**

Fleishman (1969) also stated, in his Leadership Opinion Questionnaire, that consideration reflected the extent to which an individual was likely to have job relationships with his or her subordinates. Such relationships were characterized by mutual trust, respect for others' ideas, consideration of their feelings, and a certain warmth between himself or herself and them.

Kindsvatter and Tosi (1971) revealed that the greatest amount of role stress reported by assistant principals arose from the lack of opportunity to be involved in staff leadership and curriculum. This role component included evaluating teacher effectiveness, improving curriculum, coordinating staff efforts and resolving staff differences, conducting research, and implementing innovations.

Mazzei (1976) believed the assistant principal should be a catalyst in the teaching and learning process, not merely a hatchet
man and part-time record keeper. All administrators, he believed, should help to improve the quality of education; they should concentrate on teacher evaluation and program evaluation; they should help teachers with problems of how to teach better.

Austin and Brown (1970) reported in their "Report of the Assistant Principalship" that the work of the assistant principal having to do with community relations and student activities was unbalanced and they recommended that the imbalance should be redressed promptly or that individual schools at least should examine their own practices and values regarding the two areas.

Therefore, it was hypothesized that assistant principals who reported person oriented duty choices such as increased community communication, increased committee involvement, increased student counseling, increased classroom visitation, increased assistance to teachers, increased encouragement of student leadership, or increased planning of staff professional growth as causes for an increase in their duties will score above the median for consideration on the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire as compared to assistant principals who reported task oriented duty choices such as inadequate staffing, increased student enrollment, increased responsibilities delegated by the principal, inadequate number of assistant principals, increased clerical duties, or increased state and federal program demands.

Hypothesis 7—Perceptions of Orientations

Among the major conclusions generated by Garawski's (1977) research study, "A Normative Study of the Secondary School Assistant
Principalship in Selected Pennsylvania School Districts With an Emphasis Upon Job Satisfaction," was that secondary school assistant principals desired greater involvement in supervision of teachers, teacher selection, teacher evaluation, curriculum development, school policies, innovations, experiments, and research. Garawski also found that tasks reported as generating the highest degree of job satisfaction for the largest percentage of secondary school assistant principals included teacher evaluation, teacher supervision, and master schedule preparation. Iannacone and Podorf (1984) found that assistant principals are able to contain stress best when they can keep an even, healthy relationship with other administrators. They also found that the need to meet with other assistant principals and share experiences, solutions, or just to interact are critical experiences for the well-adjusted assistant principal.

Dissatisfaction with conditions on the part of the assistant principals, Garawski (1977) reported, was influenced by a work day of 10 hours or more, traditional organizational structures, lack of sufficient secretarial assistance, lack of assistance from immediate superiors, student rights and responsibilities documents, recent court decisions about due process and discipline, and usurpation by others of credit for work done by the assistant principal.

Thus, it was hypothesized that more assistant principals perceived themselves as person oriented than as task oriented.
Hypothesis 8—Preference Regarding Types of Duties

Bordinger (1973) related that assistant principals who were qualified for their positions found little professional satisfaction in spending a large block of their time doing clerical and disciplinary chores.

Assistant principals have expressed a desire to be involved in duties which go beyond mere mechanical or administrative detail. Hurley (1965) believed that assistant principals wanted the opportunity to become involved in the improvement of instruction and curriculum, in public relations, and in other areas which required educational leadership.

Therefore, it was hypothesized that more assistant principals will prefer to be person oriented than will prefer to be task oriented.

Hypothesis 9—Selection of Duties and Results

The above rationale for Hypothesis 7, provided from the literature by Garawski (1977), is also support for the following hypothesis.

Furthermore, Sigler (1978), in his *Secondary School Management Problems in the 1970's* paper, discussed the many changes which have occurred during the past decade that have so drastically influenced the administrative position. The changes, he reported, have taken place so rapidly that the management system has become extremely obsolescent. Administrators reported experiencing a serious
management overload which had an adverse effect on the manner in which administrators performed their jobs. Sigler believed that the most significant change was in major task requirements for an administrator today as compared with the administrator of a decade ago.

In dealing with student discipline problems, *The School Principal* (1977), a California State Legislature report stated that every decision must be documented with factual information and put in writing so that each party had access to the information which led to the decision. Sheffield (1978) stated that because of due process laws many hours have been added to the work load of administrators by requiring written records of all action and appeal procedures. He further stated that the average discipline case now takes 30% longer to process.

Because of the increase in the complexity of the average high school operation, administrators have been required to double or triple the amount of paper work performed in the form of reports, requests, and proposals of all types declared Sigler (1978).

Hence, it was hypothesized that an assistant principal will choose duties which were designated as consideration oriented as his preference, but will show structure according to his actual role as assistant principal.

**Hypothesis 10—Relationship of Orientation to Years of Experience**

The next body of research considered the contemporary findings that related to job satisfaction.
One finding discussed by Ivancevich and Donnelly (1968) indicated that people began working with a high level of satisfaction, and then became increasingly dissatisfied through the next few years.

The finding was clearly supported in the education field, reported Hendrickson (1979), as across the nation high school principals in growing numbers were deciding that the personal and financial rewards of their careers were far outweighed by the huge sacrifices of time and energy they had to make.

Gorton and McIntyre (1978) found in studying the personal and professional outlook of principals that though they expressed the feeling that the job offers good opportunity for leadership and service, one-half planned not to stay indefinitely in their present position. McCleary and Thomson (1979) found that 82% of the principals surveyed indicated the principalship as fulfilling their capabilities. Yet many were considering other positions. Only one-third were committed to the principalship as a career position.

Kindsvatter and Tosi (1971) reported that the assistant principalship, because it operated largely within the shadow of the principalship, had been assumed to be basically similar to the principalship. Most information that has had implications for the assistant principal has been based on inferences derived from literature focused upon the principal.

Therefore, the following the hypothesis was formed: An assistant principal with less than 3 years experience will tend to score lower on structure according to the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire than will an assistant principal with more than 3 years
experience, while an assistant principal with less than 3 years experience will tend to score higher on consideration according to the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire than will an assistant principal with more than 3 years experience.

**Hypothesis 11—Female Assistant Principal Orientations**

Hennig and Jardim (1976), in *The Managerial Woman*, stated that men viewed a job as a pattern in which a task was to be completed, a set of responsibilities was to be met, and an assignment or set of assignments was to be fulfilled. Women saw a career as personal growth, as self-fulfillment, as satisfaction, as making a contribution to others. While men indubitably wanted these things too, they visualized a career as a series of jobs.

In a Pennsylvania study, Smith (cited in Lovelady-Dawson, 1980) found that a large majority of the state's school superintendents rated the behavior of women principals as good or excellent in the areas of building climate, problem solving, human relations, and leadership characteristics.

Therefore, the researcher hypothesized that female assistant principals will score differently on the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire than will male assistant principals.

**Summary**

As schools have grown and become more complex in their organizational framework, the position of the secondary school assistant principal has increased in importance. This growth and
organizational complexity has also nurtured a definite position development for the assistant principalship. Such evolution has brought the position to a point where tasks previously performed by principals are now under the assistant principal's domain. A need to consider this administrative position in a new research light is necessary because of the changing, evolving situation with the contemporary assistant principalship. A second need has also come about because of the assistant principals' increased influence upon the school setting and organization.

The major considerations of this research study were to establish the information surrounding the position and its historical evolution as well as the responsibilities, concerns, and time constraints that affect the discharging of those responsibilities. Furthermore, 11 hypotheses based on literature support were offered. By investigating these areas, this study was able to provide additional understanding about the position and its relatively perplexed state.
CHAPTER III

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes research design and methodology implemented. Included are descriptions of the sample, the instruments, the design and procedures, and the methods of analysis.

Description of Sample

The sample group for this study was selected from the population of 1,134 assistant principals in the state of Michigan. Four hundred and twenty secondary school assistant principals comprised the sample group. Of the 420 assistant principals, 20 comprised a pilot group which was not included in the final sample.

Description of Instruments

Two instruments were used for data collection. The first instrument, Part A, was researcher-designed and entitled Assistant Principal Questionnaire (APQ). The second instrument was copyrighted by Science Research Associates of Chicago, Illinois. It was entitled Leadership Opinion Questionnaire (LOQ) and was authored by Fleishman (1969).

The Assistant Principal Questionnaire was researcher-designed for the purpose of collecting personal data and to ascertain whether there had been a growth in task responsibilities and, if so, whether the growth had caused the role of the assistant principal to become
more task oriented or more person oriented. Part A contained the following types of questions: (a) informational questions used to describe the subjects, (b) questions relating to the increase or decrease of duties and responsibilities of assistant principals, and (c) questions designed to indicate whether the assistant principal believed his actual and perceived role to be task or person oriented (see Appendix A).

Informational questions concerning the years held in the position were established in order to compare the experiences of relatively new assistant principals (less than 3 years) to those who had occupied the position for a longer period of time (more than 3 years). Gender was determined in order to examine the response differences between male and female assistant principals.

Questions relating to the increase or decrease of duties and responsibilities were included for support or nonsupport of the basic study of task and person oriented responsibilities and their effect on assistant principals' roles.

The major steps in selection of items were (a) intensive search of related studies, (b) perusal of literature, and (c) utilization of the investigator's previous internship in the field.

While collecting all possible items pertaining to the problem, the individual duties and responsibilities were listed. Preliminary examination of the list indicated that various activities fell into 14 basic areas. Even though all the listed duties and responsibilities did not fall completely within the listed areas, it was established that the main areas had been covered.
Questions designed to indicate whether the assistant principal believed his actual and perceived role to be task or person oriented were developed in much the same manner as the steps above. The questions were designed for written answers rather than a checklist type response, and the number of items was limited to three actual role duties and three preferred role duties. These listed responses were then categorized as task or person oriented in nature.

The pilot test was administered to a group of 20 secondary school assistant principals from the state of Michigan. These 20 assistant principals were subsequently eliminated from consideration in the analysis of the study's final data. A further discussion of the pilot and its purpose are discussed later in the chapter.

The APQ was designed to provide data to test the relationship between certain variables and the constructed hypotheses. A summary of the APQ design follows.

Item 1, Years in Present Position, relates to Hypothesis 10 which was constructed to test a relationship between years of experience and two dimensions of leadership, structure and consideration. Item 2, Sex of Respondent, provides data for the testing of Hypothesis 11, Female Assistant Principal Orientations, as they related to a preferred leadership style from their male counterparts. Item 3, Adequate Time for Duties, supplies data for Hypothesis 2, which tested whether a significant difference existed between the observed and expected responses toward Perception of Time for Dealing With Assigned Duties. Item 4, Increased Job Responsibilities, relates to Hypotheses 1 and 3 which tested the effect of increased tasks on
assistant principals' orientations and the perception of increased job responsibilities. Item 5, Reasons for Increased Duties and Responsibilities, furnishes data for Hypotheses 1, 4, 5, and 6. These hypotheses respectively dealt with the effect of increased tasks on assistant principals' orientations, perception of the nature of increased job responsibilities, task oriented duties and structure behavior, and person oriented duties and consideration behavior.

Item 6, Duties Occupying Majority of Workday, provides data for Hypothesis 9 which identified the selection of duties, and tested the results as they relate to assistant principals' styles, corresponding to their reported preferences regarding types of tasks. Item 7, Preference Duties, identifies the preferred styles and preferences concerning types of tasks which Hypotheses 8 and 9 utilized for Preference Regarding Types of Tasks and Selection of Duties and Results.

The Leadership Opinion Questionnaire (LOQ) comprised Part B and provided measures of two important dimensions of supervisory leadership, consideration and structure (see Appendix B). These two patterns have been shown to be meaningful in a wide variety of supervisory-subordinate situations as identified in the Ohio State University Leadership Studies (Fleishman; Halpin & Winer; Hemphill; Shartle, cited in Stogdill & Coons, 1957).

The purpose of the LOQ was to obtain a leadership dimension score for the subjects in the study population. The items in the LOQ have been designed to reflect style scores under the two categories of consideration and structure. Consideration reflects the extent to
which an individual is personal or person oriented in relations with group members. **Structure** reflects the extent to which an individual is likely to structure his or her own role and those of subordinates toward goal or task attainment. The LOQ provides a measure of leadership attitudes regarding these basic dimensions. Individuals respond in terms of how frequently they feel they should engage in the behavior described in each item.

The LOQ was developed to maximize construct validity. The two dimensions measured by the questionnaire were developed by factor-analysis procedures, and item analysis was carried out to provide homogeneous measures of **consideration** and **structure**.

Each item was scored 0, 1, 2, 3, or 4. This was done automatically by the self-scoring format of the answer sheet. There were 20 items in each scale and the maximum possible score was 80 on each scale. The LOQ scoring mechanisms were used to formulate the **consideration** and **structure** dimensions of the assistant principals in order to test Hypotheses 5, 6, 7, 10, and 11. This questionnaire was pretested using a sample of 20 of the intended population.

The instrument was the product of more than 18 years of research. The LOQ has been utilized in a wide variety of organizations. These include industrial and business organizations, educational institutions, hospitals and nursing schools, research and development laboratories, military organizations, and various governmental institutions.

According to Kirchner (1965) in his review of the LOQ, the two dimensions of supervisory behavior were identified in the well-known
Ohio State Leadership Studies and were derived through factor analytic techniques.

Statistically, Kirchner (1965) continued that the instrument appears quite reliable. Reliability coefficients were cited for both the split-half and test-retest methods. Reliability coefficients ranged from .62 to .89 for the two scales. Kirchner therefore supported the statement that the instrument was reasonably reliable.

Kirchner (1965) further discussed in his review of the LOQ several validity studies cited. He reported that there was good evidence that consideration scores, for example, correlate with successful ratings of supervisory performance in a variety of different activities. He also reported that the questionnaire has some validity in determining leadership style or supervisory behavior.

Gibb (1972) reported that many estimates of reliability and validity are given from a variety of sources derived from exhaustive consideration of the literature on the instrument. The independence of LOQ scales from intelligence measures is explored, as are the correlations of LOQ scales with personality measures.

Doppelt (1965) claimed that the evidence is fairly clear that scores on these scales are not dependent on intelligence and such correlations as there are with personality measures do not contradict the meanings given the two constructs but do confirm that these attitudes may be held independently of personality traits.

Because of the extensive usage of the LOQ with varied groups of supervisors, the researcher has concluded that the LOQ is both valid and reliable.
The LOQ was also part of the pilot study. Twenty subjects from the defined population were randomly selected to complete the LOQ. All respondents appeared to have no difficulty with completing the instrument as instructed. Therefore, no changes were made concerning the use or construction of the instrument. Since scoring of the pilot group was completed with no problems, this researcher decided to utilize the LOQ in the study.

Design and Procedure

This study was designed to answer research questions concerning whether there had been growth in task responsibilities and, if so, whether that growth had caused the role of the assistant principal to become more task than person oriented. This researcher has relied on self-reported personal data and leadership dimension data to test earlier specified hypotheses.

The first step in implementing this study was the request for endorsement of the study by the Michigan Association of Secondary School Principals, Jack D. Bittle, Executive Director, Ann Arbor, Michigan. Mr. Bittle's endorsement was included in the cover letter which accompanied the questionnaire packets mailed to each assistant principal (see Appendix C). It was believed that an endorsement by the association would enhance the return of questionnaires. The endorsement was granted and was used in the form of a letter which was mailed to all subjects. The letter contained information concerning the study and its relevance.
Upon endorsement of the study, the LOQ was purchased from Science Research Associates, Inc., for use in this study. The instrument had to be purchased since Science Research Associates, Inc., had the copyrights to the instrument.

A cover letter, using the letterhead of Western Michigan University's Educational Leadership Department, accompanied the packets. The cover letter explained the need for the study and stressed the confidentiality of information obtained. It also requested the cooperation and participation of the assistant principals. The cover letter was signed by this researcher and Dr. Harold W. Boles, Advisor (see Appendix D).

The sample group of assistant principals from Michigan were identified from teacher certification lists available at the Michigan Department of Education Certification Office, which contained codes identifying assistant principals.

A random sample consisting of 20 assistant principals was selected for the pilot study. The sample administrators received one cover letter, the APQ and LOQ questionnaires, and a self-addressed stamped envelope. Within 3 weeks 14 questionnaires were returned and scored. Analysis of the pilot study resulted in no changes in the testing instrument or mailing procedures. Questionnaires were then mailed to a random sample of 400 participants in the project once academic approval was received. Within 2 weeks, 234 questionnaires were returned. Postcards were sent to subjects who had not responded approximately 2 weeks after the initial mailing, reminding them to return their questionnaires (see Appendix E). As a result of the
During the specified response period and the 2-week extension, 267 questionnaires were received. At that point, scoring of personal data and the charting of consideration and structure scores were begun. Directions were followed in the LOQ scoring manual. Raw scores were utilized resulting in actual dimension scores. The consideration and structure dimension scores were plotted for all participants on summary charts. The APQ responses were also tallied and recorded on the same charts. Data were analyzed using suitable statistical formulas for analysis which are found in the following section.

Methods of Analysis

In this section, the questions used to gather data for testing each hypothesis are identified. An appropriate statistical test for data analysis is suggested and the chosen level of significance is stated.

Hypothesis 1 maintained that as duties and responsibilities have increased, the percentage of assistant principals who have become more task oriented will be greater than the percentage of assistant principals who have become more person oriented. The hypothesis was tested using the chi-square one-sample test. It utilized the responses to Questions 4 and 5 on the APQ. Assistant principals indicated whether their job responsibilities had increased over a 3-year period in Question 4. The responses of the participants who
indicated an increase were then examined in Question 5 and the indicated increased duties and responsibilities were sorted into two mutually exclusive classes of task or person oriented responsibilities. The responses were then categorized into whether the majority responses for each assistant principal fell into the task or person oriented category. Equal responses to both by administrators were not utilized in either category. The observed respondent scores and the expected scores were represented by frequencies in these two discrete categories. The expected frequencies for each cell reflected the operation of chance under the null hypothesis. The null hypothesis stated that the population did not differ with respect to frequency of occurrence and, therefore, 50% of the assistant principals were expected to become task oriented and 50% were expected to become person oriented as duties and responsibilities increase.

Hypothesis 2 stated that the percentage of assistant principals who perceived that they did not have adequate time to deal with duties assigned them would be greater than the percentage of assistant principals who perceived that they did have adequate time to deal with duties. This hypothesis was tested by comparing the responses to Question 3 on the APQ. This question dealt with whether the assistant principals had adequate time to deal with duties assigned them. The administrators responded by indicating a "yes" or "no" response. The responses were dicotomized and the chi-square one-sample test was used for analysis. This technique was used to test whether a significant difference existed between the observed number of responses falling into each category, adequate time or inadequate
time and the expected number of responses based on the null hypothesis, which stated that 50% of the assistant principals perceive that they have adequate time to deal with duties assigned them.

Hypothesis 3 indicated that the percentage of assistant principals who perceived increased job responsibilities over a 3-year period would be greater than the percentage who perceived no increase. This hypothesis was tested by comparing the responses to Question 4 on the APQ, which asked for a "yes" or "no" indication toward increased job responsibilities over a period of 3 years. The chi-square one-sample test was chosen because the hypothesis under test concerned a comparison of observed and expected frequencies in discrete categories dealing with the perception of increased or nonincreased job responsibilities. The null hypothesis determined the expected frequencies; and since it stated equal proportions for assistant principals whose responsibilities have or have not increased, the expected frequency was 50% for each category.

Hypothesis 4 addressed the nature of increased job responsibilities and whether they were task oriented or person oriented. The responses to Question 5 on the APQ were utilized. Question 5 contained 13 duties and responsibilities that were involved with the role of the assistant principal. The 14th item was left to be filled in by the respondent for any responsibility not covered by the list. The responses by each participant were reviewed and categorized according to whether the majority of their responses were task or person oriented. If the responses were an equal number for both task or person oriented, then the responses were not utilized. These
totals were then placed in the observed cells under the categories of task oriented and person oriented duties. The expected frequencies were then determined for each of the cells. Since the null hypothesis maintained that assistant principals would perceive increased job responsibilities according to random causes and the causes were separated into two categories of task or person oriented duties, the expected frequency was determined to be 50% in each category. The chi-square test for the one-sample case was used to analyze the data.

Hypothesis 5 dealt with the premise that assistant principals who reported task oriented duties as causes for increases in their responsibilities would score above the median on structure. Responses to Question 5 on the APQ and responses on the LOQ were employed. Question 5 was used to determine whether the respondent chose predominantly task or person oriented duties. The steps in determining this were the same as in the preceding hypothesis. The structure scores on the LOQ were arranged and the median score was achieved. The participants were then categorized into task oriented duty choice people who scored above or below the median on structure or person oriented duty choice people who scored above or below the median on structure. These charted scores were placed in a 2 x 2 contingency table. The chi-square test for two independent samples was used to analyze the data.

Hypothesis 6 maintained that assistant principals who reported person oriented duties would score above the median on consideration. Hypothesis 6 was tested in the same manner as Hypothesis 5 except the LOQ consideration scores were used. The administrators were again
categorized into task or person oriented duty choice people who scored above or below the median on consideration. These charted scores were again placed in a 2 x 2 contingency table and the chi-square test of two independent samples was used to analyze the data.

Hypothesis 7 inferred that more assistant principals perceived themselves as person oriented rather than task oriented. The LOQ responses were analyzed. The LOQ contained 20 structure questions and 20 consideration questions. The administrator could score 0, 1, 2, 3, or 4 on each question. The total raw scores of each respondent were computed for structure and consideration. These observed totals were used to compute whether administrators had a majority of consideration or structure responses. Then the null hypothesis was examined; and since it stated that assistant principals would not perceive themselves as more person or task oriented, the expected frequency was set at an equal 50% for each category. The expected and observed scores were placed in cells and the chi-square one-sample test was used to analyze the research data.

Hypothesis 8 addressed the belief that assistant principals, if given a choice, would prefer to be person oriented rather than task oriented. This hypothesis was tested using the responses to Question 7 on the APQ. Question 7 asked the respondents to list three duties that they would prefer to have occupy the majority of their workday. The responses were then categorized as to whether they were person or task oriented in nature. The categorizations were numerically recorded as 0-1 or 2-3 task or person oriented preferred duties. Then since the scores for person oriented categories of 0-1 and 2-3 were
simply a reversal of the task oriented scores the person oriented scores were utilized. Person oriented type people were categorized as ones who responded to 2 or 3 person oriented duties. The observed scores were totaled and an expected frequency was computed. The null hypothesis determined the expected frequencies by stating that assistant principals have no preference between being person and task oriented; therefore, the two categories should show no difference. The total number of responding administrators (258) was divided by 2 and 129 was determined for each expected frequency. The chi-square one-sample test was applied.

Hypothesis 9 maintained that assistant principals, if given a choice, would choose duties which were designated as consideration oriented as a preference but would show structure according to their actual role. Questions 6 and 7 on the APQ were used to test the hypothesis. Question 6 dealt with listing, in terms of the assistant principal's actual role, the duties that occupied the majority of the workday. The respondents listed three duties that were categorized as task or person oriented. Task oriented behavior was considered synonymous to structure and person oriented behavior with consideration. Structure type people were categorized as ones who responded with 2 or 3 task oriented duties on Question 6. The same participants were then reexamined in Question 7. Question 7 dealt with their preference duties. The preference duties were divided into two observed categories of 0-1 and 2-3 task duties. The expected frequency was computed in the same manner as Hypothesis 8 and from the 237 responses an expected frequency of 118.5 for each category was
obtained. The chi-square one-sample test was then used for analysis.

Hypothesis 10 presented the theory that assistant principals with less than 3 years experience would score lower on structure and higher on consideration according to the LOQ than an assistant principal with more than 3 years experience. Question 1 on the APQ and responses on the LOQ were employed. Question 1 on the APQ determined which administrators had held the position for less or more than 3 years. The LOQ consideration scores for each administrator were columnized and tabulated. From this total tabulation the mean score was computed for assistant principals with less or more than 3 years experience. Then each administrator's LOQ consideration score was subtracted from the mean resulting in a deviation score for each assistant principal. These were then squared and totaled and the t test for independent samples (Gay, 1976) was applied using the mean score and the squared deviation score for each group. The same process was followed for administrators with less than 3 years experience and more than 3 years experience and the LOQ structure scores.

Hypothesis 11 dealt with female assistant principals and whether they would score differently on the LOQ versus their male counterparts. The responses to Question 2 on the APQ and responses to the LOQ were used in the analysis. Question 2 on the APQ dealt with the gender of each assistant principal. Once this was established the male and female LOQ individual scores for consideration were listed and again the mean score was computed for each group. Then each male and female administrator's LOQ consideration score was subtracted from the mean in order to achieve a deviation score. The deviation...
scores were squared and totaled and then along with the mean score for each group were applied to the \( t \) test for independent samples. The same was done for male and female responses to LOQ structure scores.

The probability of committing a Type I error in testing each hypothesis was set at .05.

Summary

This chapter presented a description of the population sample, type of instruments utilized in the study, design and procedures used to collect data, and methods of analysis. The next chapter will address the results of the specified data collection procedures.
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND ANALYSES

Introduction

This chapter reports the findings of the study. The first section of the chapter will report general biographical data. The second section will discuss the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire and the leadership structure and consideration dimension scores. The third section presents the results of the testing of the 11 hypotheses proposed in this study. An analysis of data concerning each of the null hypotheses will be presented. The procedures used to arrive at each conclusion will also be discussed, and each conclusion presented.

General Characteristics of the Population

The population consisted of 400 Michigan assistant principals. Two hundred and sixty-seven administrators responded to the request for information. Personal and job related data were gathered via the Assistant Principal Questionnaire (see Appendix A). The following data will be presented: years in present position, respondent's gender, self-evaluation of the administrator's time to deal with assigned duties, job responsibility increases, self-evaluation of reasons for duty and responsibility increases, identification of the three duties which most often occupy the majority of the
administrator's workday, and identification of the three duties preferred by administrators to occupy the majority of the workday.

**Years in Present Position**

The data in Table 1 indicate that 16.4% of the assistant principals have been in their positions for less than 3 years. When compared with the data that 83.6% of the assistant principals have been in their positions for more than 3 years, the data strongly suggest a high permanence rate among this branch of administrators. The data also suggest that the opportunities for upper administrative job mobility are limited.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Years in Present Position</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 3 years</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 3 years</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>83.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** Missing data = 5.

**Respondent's Gender**

The data reported in Table 2 indicate that of the respondents, 87.6% were male and 12.4% were female. The data indicate the position of assistant principal is overwhelmingly held by men. If these
percentages represent all that equal employment opportunity can pro-
vide, they are obviously disappointing for female administrators or
those females who aspire to the position.

Table 2
Respondent's Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>87.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Missing data = 8.

Assessment of Time

The APQ asked the administrators a question which would allow
the individual to indicate whether there was adequate time to deal
with assigned duties. Table 3 reports that 59.2% of the assistant
principals believed that they did not have adequate time in which to
execute their duties and 40.8% of the administrators indicated that
they did have adequate time. The fact that 157 administrators felt
they did not have enough time supports the premise in this study that
a majority of assistant principals are concerned with inadequate time
restrictions.
Table 3
Assessment of Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do you have adequate time to deal with duties assigned you?</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>59.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Missing data = 2.

Job Responsibility Increases

Table 4 reports the data collected on the APQ regarding the respondent's opinion on whether job responsibilities have increased over the previous 3 years. The results were staggering. Ninety-seven percent of the assistant principals indicated that their job responsibilities had increased. The net result of this study clearly supports job responsibility increases. Only 8 of the 267 respondents reported they had no responsibility increases.

Self-Assessment of Reasons for Increased Responsibilities

Fourteen reasons for increased duties and responsibilities were listed on the APQ for response by 259 administrators. Eight administrators checked "No" to increased responsibilities and therefore did not react to the reasons for increased responsibilities. The reason checked most frequently was increased clerical duties;
Table 4

Job Responsibility Increases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have job responsibilities increased over the past 3 years?</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>97.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>267</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

i.e., attendance procedures, student referral documentation, reports, and teacher evaluation reports (82.6%). The principal delegating increased responsibilities (59.4%) ranked second and increased state and federal program demands (53.2%) came in third in the ranking of reasons for increased duties and responsibilities. When analyzed the top ranked reasons all center around task oriented types of duties in accord with one of the original hypotheses in this study. Table 5 illustrates the frequency of response to each reason for increased duties and responsibilities, listed on the Assistant Principal Questionnaire, and the percentage of the 259 assistant principals who reported that reason. The remaining responses included a range of issues. Low in ranking was staff professional growth at 19.3% of 259 responses. Student enrollment having increased was the lowest reason (11.5%) checked by the administrators though understandable when it is remembered that schools are facing a continual decline in enrollment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>% of assistant principals reporting reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased clerical duties; i.e., attendance procedures, student referral documentation, reports, teacher evaluation reports</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>82.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The principal delegating increased responsibilities to the assistant principal</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>59.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased state and federal program demands; i.e., gifted programs, special education programs, Title IX programs,</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>53.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased student counseling and conferences</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The assistant principal not having adequate staff to whom to delegate duties</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased committee involvement</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased classroom visitation</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased involvement in community communication</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>33.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not having enough assistant principals to handle the number of responsibilities in the building</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing increased assistance to teachers in establishing and evaluating meaningful goals, objectives, and concepts</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>29.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased encouragement of student leadership activities such as class government and student council</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased planning of the staff's professional growth program and encouragement of participation in in-service education programs</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student enrollment having increased</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1,388</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Identification of Actual Duties

Table 6 reports the data collected on the APQ regarding the respondent's listing of the three duties which most often occupied the majority of the workday. While 91.8% of the responses by assistant principals indicated the majority of their day was occupied by task oriented duties, only 8.2% indicated the same concerning person oriented duties. The data strongly suggest that task oriented duties are a major concern for the assistant principal each day. The low level of person oriented duties is an indication of the minimal importance placed upon person oriented duties by both the administrator's superiors and possibly by the assistant principals themselves.

Table 6
Duties Which Occupy Majority of Workday

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of duties</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No. of duties</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>task oriented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>person oriented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>57.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>34.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Missing data = 9.
Identification of Preference Duties

The APQ asked the administrators a question which would allow the individual to indicate the three duties he or she would prefer to occupy the majority of the workday. Table 7 reports that 85.7% of the administrators preferred person oriented duties as supported by the 2/3 choices under that category. Only 14.3% of assistant principals preferred to have tasks occupy the majority of their workday as measured by the 2/3 task oriented duty choices. This data support the review of literature that assistant principals have expressed a desire to be involved in duties which go beyond mere mechanical or administrative detail. These administrators want involvement in areas which require educational leadership.

Table 7
Preferred Duties to Occupy Majority of Workday

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of preferred duties (task oriented)</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>No. of preferred duties (person oriented)</th>
<th>Freq.</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>258</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Missing data = 9.
Leadership Dimension

The supervisory leadership dimension scores for the administrators were obtained from the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire. The LOQ has 20 items, scored 0–4, for each scale and the maximum score is 80. Style scores fell under the two categories of consideration and structure. According to the previously mentioned Ohio State University Leadership Studies (Fleishman; Halpin & Winer; Hemphill; Shartle, cited in Stogdill & Coons, 1957), consideration reflects the extent to which an individual is personal or person oriented in relations with group members. Structure reflects the extent to which an individual is likely to structure his or her own role and those of subordinates toward goal or task attainment.

Data were collected from 267 assistant principals. Five administrators did not respond to the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire. Thirty-six assistant principals had equal scores on Item 5 (APQ) which affected Hypotheses 5 and 6. Therefore, their LOQ scores were not utilized. Three respondents chose not to respond to a question from the Assistant Principal Questionnaire that was related to the LOQ information for Hypotheses 5, 6, and 11.

Discussion of how the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire scores were utilized is found in the following "Testing of the Hypotheses" section and addressed.
Testing of the Hypotheses

The hypotheses that follow offer an analysis of variables which are of interest to this researcher when evaluating the role of the assistant principal in relationship to increased responsibilities and the effect these responsibilities have on the effective dealing of the administrator with both tasks and people. The hypotheses have resulted from the review of literature and expectancies formed from the review. The stated hypotheses rationale was offered in the review of literature.

Each of the 11 hypotheses and related information including a statement of the item(s) from which the data are derived will be presented. Results and conclusions will follow the given hypotheses where appropriate. The probability used for committing a Type I error is .05.

**Hypothesis 1—The Effect of Increased Tasks on Assistant Principals' Orientations**

It is hypothesized that as duties and responsibilities have increased, the percentage of assistant principals who have become more task oriented will be greater than the percentage of assistant principals who have become more person oriented.

In operational terms, as duties and responsibilities have increased, the percentage of assistant principals who have become task oriented will be greater than 50%.

The null hypothesis is that assistant principals become no more than 50% task or 50% person oriented when tasks increase.
The percentages revealed that 70% of the 223 observations had indicated a majority of duty and responsibility increases as task oriented while 30% of the observations showed a majority of duty and responsibility increases as person oriented.

It would appear, as reported by assistant principals, that they did become less person oriented and more task oriented as duties and responsibilities increased.

A chi-square one-sample test (Siegel, 1956) was applied to the data. The scores used to compute the chi-square value came from the application of the Assistant Principal Questionnaire (Appendix A), Items 4 and 5. The number of assistant principal responses were divided into task or person oriented responsibilities. The responses were then categorized into whether the majority of responses for each administrator fell into the task or person oriented category. Thirty-six administrators who had equal responses to both were not included in the total frequencies. These compiled frequencies are listed in Table 8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Task oriented</th>
<th>Person oriented</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expected (E)</td>
<td>111.5</td>
<td>111.5</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed (O)</td>
<td>156.0</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 223. Chi-square value = 35.5 with 1 degree of freedom.
The chi-square one-sample test was applied to the data and the findings concluded that the chi square equaled 35.5 with 1 degree of freedom. This result yielded a significant difference from the critical value of chi square, 3.84 at the alpha level of .05 (Siegel, 1956, Table C).

**Hypothesis 2—Perception of Time for Dealing With Assigned Duties**

It is hypothesized that the percentage of assistant principals who perceived that they did not have adequate time to deal with duties assigned them will be greater than the percentage of assistant principals who perceived that they did have adequate time to deal with duties.

Stated operationally, the percentage of assistant principals who perceived that they did not have adequate time to deal with duties assigned them will be greater than 50%.

The null hypothesis states that 50% of the assistant principals perceive that they have adequate time to deal with duties assigned them.

The frequencies used to compute this chi-square value came from Item 3 on the APQ. Participants were asked to indicate whether they had adequate time to deal with duties assigned them. Those responses were used to calculate the chi-square value that follows in Table 9. Two administrators chose not to respond to Item 3.

The chi-square one-sample test was applied to the data and the findings concluded that the chi square equaled 9.06 with 1 degree of freedom.
freedom. The result yielded a significant difference from the critical value of chi square, 3.84 at the alpha level of .05.

Table 9
Perception of Time for Dealing With Assigned Duties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adequate time</th>
<th>Inadequate time</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&quot;yes&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;no&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>132.5</td>
<td>132.5</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>108.0</td>
<td>157.0</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 265. Missing data = 2. Chi-square value = 9.06 with 1 degree of freedom.

Examination of the responses indicates that a larger percentage (59.2%) of the 265 assistant principals hold the perception that they have inadequate time for dealing with assigned duties than did those indicating adequate time (40.8%). These percentages, along with the rejection of the null hypothesis, necessitated the acceptance of Research Hypothesis 2.

Hypothesis 3—Increased Job Responsibility Perception

It is hypothesized that the percentage of assistant principals who perceive that their job responsibilities have increased over the past 3 years will be greater than the percentage of assistant principals who perceived that their job responsibilities have not increased.
It was therefore surmised that the percentage of assistant principals who perceive that their job responsibilities have increased over the past 3 years will be greater than 50%.

The proportion of assistant principals whose responsibilities have increased is equal to the proportion of assistant principals whose responsibilities have not increased makes up the null hypothesis.

Item 4 on the APQ (Appendix A) asked participants to indicate whether their job responsibilities increased over the past 3 years. Those responses (100%) were used to calculate the chi-square value that follows in Table 10 by use of the chi-square one-sample test statistic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception of Increased Job Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected (E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed (O)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 267. Chi-square value = 235.95 with 1 degree of freedom.

Calculation of chi square equaled 235.95 which was greater than the critical value of 3.84 at the .05 alpha level indicating a definite support for acceptance of Research Hypothesis 3. Furthermore, inspection of the responses indicates that an overwhelming percentage
(97%) of the assistant principals responded to increased responsibilities over the past 3 years than did assistant principals responding to no increased responsibilities (3%). This also lends support for acceptance of the hypothesis.

Hypothesis 4—Nature of Increased Job Responsibility Perception

It is hypothesized that assistant principals who perceived increased job responsibilities will report task oriented duties such as inadequate staffing, increased responsibilities delegated by the principal, inadequate number of assistant principals, increased clerical duties, increased state and federal program demands, or increased student enrollment as causes rather than person oriented duties such as increased community communication, increased committee involvement, increased student counseling, increased classroom visitation, increased assistance to teachers, increased encouragement of student leadership, or increased planning of staff professional growth.

Operationally speaking the percentage of assistant principals who perceive increased job responsibilities as task oriented in nature will be greater than 50%.

The null hypothesis maintains that the percentage of assistant principals who perceive increased job responsibilities as task oriented in nature will be 50%.

In assessing assistant principal perceptions of the nature of increased job responsibilities, participants were asked to respond to the list of duties in Item 5 of the APQ. These duties were task and
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person oriented in nature. Two hundred and fifty-nine participants indicated an increase in duties and their answers were analyzed. Eight marked "No" and therefore did not respond to Item 5. Each "Yes" participant's answers were then studied as to whether the majority of their responses were task or person oriented. Those that had tied responses (36) were not included in the total frequencies.

The chi-square one-sample test statistic was used to test the hypothesis. Table 11 presents this data in the form of a contingency table.

Table 11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Task oriented duties</th>
<th>Person oriented duties</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expected (E)</td>
<td>111.5</td>
<td>111.5</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed (O)</td>
<td>156.0</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 223. Chi-square value = 35.5 with 1 degree of freedom.

For the .05 alpha level, the chi-square value with 1 degree of freedom is 3.84. Since the calculated chi square is 35.5 and, therefore larger than the table value, the null hypothesis is rejected and the research hypothesis accepted. The obtained frequencies do differ enough from the frequencies expected by chance to indicate that actual population differences exist as to assistant principal perceptions of the nature of increased job responsibilities.
Assistant principals chose task oriented duties (156), more than two to one, over person oriented duties (67). In terms of percentages it was 70% task oriented chosen duties versus 30% person oriented chosen duties, clearly resulting in support that most of their jobs and duties centered around tasks.

**Hypothesis 5—Task Oriented Duties and Structure Behavior**

It is hypothesized that assistant principals who reported task oriented duty choices such as inadequate staffing, increased student enrollment, increased responsibilities delegated by the principal, inadequate number of assistant principals, increased clerical duties, or increased state and federal program demands as causes for an increase in their duties will score above the **median for structure** on the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire, as compared to assistant principals who reported person oriented duty choices such as increased community communication, increased committee involvement, increased student counseling, increased classroom visitation, increased assistance to teachers, increased encouragement of student leadership, or increased planning of staff professional growth.

Operationally, the percentage of assistant principals who report task oriented duty choices and who score above the **median on structure** on the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire will be greater than 50%.

The null hypothesis states that the percentage of assistant principals who report task oriented duty choices and who score above the **median on structure** on the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire will
be 50%.

The frequencies used to compute the chi-square value used to test this null hypothesis came from Item 5 on the APQ and the application of the LOQ structure responses. Item 5 on the APQ was used to determine predominant task or person oriented duties chosen by the respondent. The responses by each administrator were categorized according to whether the majority of their responses were task or person oriented. Those who had an equal number of responses to task or person oriented duties were not included in the total frequencies. The structure scores on the LOQ were listed and a median score of 45 was achieved. The administrators were categorized into task oriented duty choice people who scored above or below the median on structure or person oriented duty choice people who scored above or below the median on structure. These frequencies were placed in a 2 x 2 contingency table. Two hundred and fifty-nine administrators responded to the APQ Item 5 and the LOQ. Eight assistant principals did not respond to Item 5 and therefore their LOQ scores were not examined for this hypothesis. Thirty-six administrators had tied results and were not included in the total frequencies.

The chi-square test of two independent samples (Siegel, 1956) was the test statistic used to analyze the data. The results of the calculations are presented in Table 12.

The chi-square value of 1.12 was obtained for 1 degree of freedom. The significance (.30) of the observed chi-square value was determined by reference to the Table of Critical Values of Chi-Square (Siegel, 1956). For a one-tailed test, the significance was halved.
Since the probability given was greater than the .05 alpha level, the decision was not to reject the null hypothesis.

Table 12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Above median structure (LOQ)</th>
<th>Below median structure (LOQ)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Majority task oriented duty choices</td>
<td>83.2 (E)</td>
<td>68.8 (E)</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>79.0 (0)</td>
<td>73.0 (0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority person oriented duty choices</td>
<td>38.8 (E)</td>
<td>32.2 (E)</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>43.0 (0)</td>
<td>28.0 (0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>122.0</td>
<td>101.0</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 223. Missing data = 8, Chi-square value = 1.12 with 1 degree of freedom.

Inspection of the frequencies and the chi-square value indicates that there is no statistically significant difference in administrator's task and person oriented duty choices and their structure scores. When examining the relationship between the two above median percentages it is apparent that there is little significant difference between task oriented duty choices at 52% and people oriented duty choices at 61%. Furthermore, if the individuals above and below the median percentages are examined, it is found that the above median frequencies on structure for task oriented duties result in 35.4% of the total frequencies. This is well below the 50% mark and
clearly in support of the null hypothesis. Also, if the expected frequencies are examined next to the observed frequencies in Table 12, it is determined that they are in close agreement and, consequently, the value of chi square is small. Siegel (1956) stated that with a small value of chi square the null hypothesis may not be rejected. Assistant principals who reported task oriented duties as causes for an increase in their duties did not score above the median for structure on the LOQ.

Hypothesis 6—Person Oriented Duties and Consideration Behavior

It is hypothesized that assistant principals who reported person oriented duty choices such as increased community communication, increased committee involvement, increased student counseling, increased classroom visitation, increased assistance to teachers, increased encouragement of student leadership, or increased planning of staff professional growth as causes for an increase in their duties will score above the median for consideration on the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire as compared to assistant principals who reported task oriented duty choices such as inadequate staffing, increased student enrollment, increased responsibilities delegated by the principal, inadequate number of assistant principals, increased clerical duties, or increased state and federal program demands.

Stated operationally, the percentage of assistant principals who report person oriented duty choices and who score above the median on consideration on the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire will be greater than 50%.
The null hypothesis states that the percentage of assistant principals who report person oriented duty choices and who score above the median for consideration on the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire will be 50%.

The APQ Item 5 and the LOQ consideration responses were used to obtain the frequencies necessary to compute the chi-square value for this hypothesis. As with Hypothesis 5, Item 5 on the APQ was used to determine predominant task or person oriented duties chosen by the administrator. Again the responses by each participant were categorized according to whether the majority of their responses were task or person oriented. Equal number of responses were not included. The consideration scores on the LOQ were listed and a median score of 56 was achieved. The administrator's Item 5 APQ majority result of task or person oriented choice was then compared to their LOQ score on consideration and whether it fell above or below the median for consideration. The frequencies that were charted were then put in a 2 x 2 contingency table. APQ Item 5 and the LOQ were responded to by 223 administrators. Missing data centered around 8 assistant principals who did not respond to Item 5 and, therefore, their LOQ scores were not used. Thirty-six administrators had equal responses and were not included in the total frequencies.

A chi-square test of two independent samples was performed on the frequencies of assistant principals which fell above or below the median of consideration scores as they related to their task and person oriented duty choices. The results of that calculation are presented in Table 13.
### Table 13
Person Oriented Duties and Consideration Behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Above median consideration (LOQ)</th>
<th>Below median consideration (LOQ)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Majority task oriented duty choices (APQ)</td>
<td>79.1 (E) 68.1 (E)</td>
<td>82.0 (0) 70.0 (0)</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority person oriented duty choices (APQ)</td>
<td>52.8 (E) 31.8 (E)</td>
<td>34.0 (0) 37.0 (0)</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** N = 223. Missing data = 8. Chi-square value = .489 with 1 degree of freedom.

The chi-square value (.489) indicates no statistical significance between the **consideration** scores and the duty choices at the .05 alpha level. The null hypothesis was not rejected. Again as with the last hypothesis the indication is that there is no significant difference in administrator’s task and person oriented duty choices and their **consideration** scores. When examining the relationship between the two above median percentages it is clear that there is little significant difference between task oriented duty choices at 53.9% and people oriented duty choices at 47.9%. Furthermore, if the individual above and below median percentages are examined it is found that the above median frequencies for person oriented duties result in only 15.2% of the total frequencies. This is below the 50%
level and further supports the null hypothesis. Also, as with the last hypothesis, if the frequencies in Table 13 are studied it becomes evident that the expected and observed values are in close agreement therefore making the chi-square value small. The premise of the hypothesis is not supported. Assistant principals who reported person oriented duties as causes for increase in their duties did not score above the median for consideration on the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire.

**Hypothesis 7—Orientation Perceptions**

It is hypothesized that more assistant principals perceive themselves as person oriented than task oriented.

In operational terms, the percentage of assistant principals who perceive themselves as person oriented rather than task oriented will be greater than 50%.

The percentage of assistant principals who perceive themselves as person oriented rather than task oriented will be 50% is the null hypothesis.

Assistant principals were asked to respond to the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire. From the LOQ the consideration and structure scores for each administrator were obtained. The scores were then examined and administrators were designated as having a majority of consideration or structure responses. From these data frequencies were totaled for both categories and are found in Table 14. Two hundred and twenty-six assistant principals responded to the LOQ while 5 administrators did not respond.
Table 14
Perceptions of Orientations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Majority consideration scores</th>
<th>Majority structure scores</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expected (E)</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed (O)</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>262</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 226. Missing data = 5. Chi-square value = 134.9 with 1 degree of freedom.

The chi-square one-sample test was used to test the null hypothesis. The chi-square value obtained was 134.9. This is greater than the critical value of 3.84 (Siegel, 1956) at the .05 alpha level indicating support for acceptance of the hypothesis.

Majority consideration scores amounted to 85.9% of the total sum, while 14.1% of the majority scores were structure. It is apparent that these LOQ percentages support the belief that over 50% of the assistant principals perceive themselves as person oriented.

Hypothesis 8—Types of Duty Preferences

It is hypothesized that more assistant principals will prefer to be person oriented than will prefer to be task oriented.

Operationally speaking, the percentage of assistant principals who prefer to be person oriented rather than task oriented will be greater than 50%.
The null hypothesis states that the percentage of assistant principals who prefer to be person oriented will be 50% and assistant principals who prefer to be task oriented will be 50%.

Item 7 on the APQ asked participants to indicate their three preferences regarding the types of duties they would prefer to have occupy the majority of their workday. Those responses were categorized according to whether they were task or person oriented in nature. Person oriented type people were categorized as ones who responded to 2 or 3 person oriented duties. Since the scores for person oriented categories are a reversal of the task oriented categories, the person oriented scores were utilized. These scores are listed in Table 15.

Table 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preference Regarding Types of Duties</th>
<th>Person oriented duties</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>2-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected (E)</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed (O)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. $N = 258$. Missing data = 9. Chi-square value = 131.2 with 1 degree of freedom.

The statistic used to test the null hypothesis was the chi-square one-sample test. The results in Table 15 were used to compute the chi-square value.
For the .05 alpha level the chi-square critical value with 1 degree of freedom is 3.84 (Siegel, 1956). This value must be equaled or exceeded before the null hypothesis can be rejected. Since the calculated chi-square value is 131.2 and therefore larger than the critical value, the null hypothesis was easily rejected.

Item 7 showed a high proportion of participants (85.7%) who preferred 2 or 3 person oriented duties to occupy the majority of their workday. These observations clearly support the fact that assistant principals do not want to spend the majority of their workday with task oriented duties, but as the accepted research hypothesis states would prefer to be person oriented as shown by their preference duties.

Hypothesis 9—Selection of Duties and Results

It is hypothesized that an assistant principal will choose duties which are designated as consideration oriented as his preference, but will show high structure according to his actual role as assistant principal.

From this research hypothesis an alternative hypothesis was formed surmising that the percentage of assistant principals who choose duties which are designated as consideration oriented as a preference but show high structure according to their actual role will be greater than 50%.

The null hypothesis states that the percentage of assistant principals who choose duties which are designated as consideration oriented as a preference but show high structure according to their
actual role will be 50%.

Item 6 on the APQ asked assistant principals to indicate the three actual duties which most often occupy the majority of their workday. The 237 administrators who responded to 2 or 3 task type duty answers made up the population. Their answers on Item 6 were then compared with the answers they gave on Item 7. Item 7 dealt with their preferred duty choices. Nine administrators left Item 7 blank and 21 indicated 0 or 1 task on Item 6; therefore, their responses were excluded. Table 16 lists the frequencies.

Table 16
Selection of Duties and Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task oriented duties</th>
<th>0-1</th>
<th>2-3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expected (E)</td>
<td>118.5</td>
<td>118.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observed (O)</td>
<td>205.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 237. Missing data = 9. Chi-square value = 126.2 with 1 degree of freedom.

The chi-square one-sample test was the statistic used to test the null hypothesis. Table 16 frequencies were used to compute the chi-square value.

The null hypothesis was rejected and the research hypothesis accepted based on attaining a chi-square value of 126.2. The critical value of chi square for one degree of freedom is 3.84.
(Siegel, 1956) at the alpha level of .05. Since the calculated chi square of 126.2 exceeds this value extensively, there is support to reject the null hypothesis.

Two hundred and thirty-seven assistant principals responded to 2 or 3 task oriented duties occupying the majority of their workday. When compared with their listed preference duties it was discovered that 86.5% of the administrators chose only 0 or 1 task duty. Conversely, 86.5% chose 2 or 3 person oriented duties to occupy the majority of the workday. Assistant principals overwhelmingly prefer to do person oriented type duties but in their actual role end up doing task oriented type ones.

Hypothesis 10—Relationship of Orientation to Years of Experience

It is hypothesized that an assistant principal with less than 3 years experience will tend to score lower on structure according to the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire than will an assistant principal with more than 3 years experience, while an assistant principal with less than 3 years experience will tend to score higher on consideration according to the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire than will an assistant principal with more than 3 years experience.

Operationally, an assistant principal with less than 3 years experience will score below the mean on structure and above the mean on consideration according to the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire than an assistant principal with more than 3 years experience.

The null hypothesis states that assistant principals with less than 3 years experience mean scores on structure and consideration
according to the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire will be equal to assistant principals with more than 3 years experience.

The scores used to compute the $t$ test for independent samples in order to test the null hypothesis came from Item 1 on the APQ and application of the LOQ structure responses. Item 1 was used to determine whether the administrator had held the position for less or more than 3 years. The LOQ structure scores for each administrator were listed and totaled. From this total the mean score of 45.8 was obtained for assistant principals with less than 3 years experience and 44.8 for assistant principals with more than 3 years experience. Then the structure score for each administrator was subtracted from the mean resulting in a deviation score for each respondent. These were then squared and totaled. The same process was accomplished for administrators with less or more than 3 years experience and their LOQ consideration scores. Then the standard deviation was calculated for each group and was compared to each group mean. Forty-three administrators fell into the less than 3 years experience category and 219 the more than 3 years experience category. Five did not respond to the LOQ.

The $t$ test for independent samples (Gay, 1976) was the test statistic used to analyze the data. The mean calculations and standard deviations for the groups are presented in Table 17.

The $t$-test value of 0.79 was obtained for a degree of freedom of 260. The significance of the observed $t$-test value was determined by reference to the Table of Critical Values of $t$ (Gay, 1976).
Table 17
Years of Experience Compared to Leadership Opinion Questionnaire Structure Mean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assistant principal experience</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>LOQ structure mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 3 years</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 3 years</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 262. Missing data = 5. The t-test value = 0.79 with 260 degree of freedom.

The t value required for the rejection of the null hypothesis with an alpha level of .05 and a 260 degree of freedom is 1.960. Since 0.79 is less this would suggest that the null hypothesis cannot be rejected.

The result of the t-test value indicates that there is no statistically significant difference between assistant principals with less or more than 3 years experience and their LOQ structure scores. Furthermore, if the mean and standard deviation scores are examined, the assistant principals with less than 3 years experience had an overall mean of 45.8 on structure question responses and a standard deviation score of 7.1 which is extremely close in relationship to assistant principals with more than 3 years experience whose mean was 44.8 and standard deviation was 7.6.

The same conclusion was not true of the LOQ consideration questions involving assistant principals with less or more than 3 years.
experience. The mean calculations and standard deviations for the groups are presented in Table 18.

Table 18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assistant principal experience</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>LOQ consideration mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 3 years</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 3 years</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. N = 262. Missing data = 5. The t-test value = 2.18 with 260 degree of freedom.

The t-test value was 2.18 and because this is greater than 1.960 at the .05 alpha level for a 260 degree of freedom, the null hypothesis is rejected. The mean was once more computed from the raw consideration scores on the LOQ. Assistant principals with less than 3 years experience scored a mean of 56.8 and a standard deviation of 5.3, while administrators with more than 3 years had a mean of 54.5 and a standard deviation of 6.5. It appears that there is a difference between years of experience and administrators’ consideration scores on the LOQ and therefore necessitates acceptance of the research hypothesis.
Hypothesis II—Orientations of Female Assistant Principals

It is hypothesized that female assistant principals will score differently on the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire than will male assistant principals.

In operational terms the mean consideration scores will be higher for female assistant principals than male assistant principals, while the mean structure scores will be lower for female assistant principals than male assistant principals.

The null hypothesis states that there will be no difference in mean consideration or structure scores between female and male assistant principals.

Responses from Item 2 on the APQ were used to determine male and female gender. Then the male and female LOQ individual consideration scores were listed and the mean score was computed for each group. From this total the mean score of 56.8 for female assistant principals and 55.0 for male assistant principals was obtained. Then the LOQ consideration score for each male and female was subtracted from the mean in order to achieve a deviation score. The deviation scores were then squared and totaled. These totals along with the mean score for each group were applied to the t test for independent samples. The same process was followed for male and female administrators and their LOQ structure scores. Then the standard deviation for each group was calculated and compared to the mean. There were 227 male participants and 32 female. Five respondents did not answer the LOQ and 3 gave no response to whether they were male or female.
The t-test for independent samples was used to test the null hypothesis. The mean and standard deviation calculations for the groups are presented in Table 19.

**Table 19**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>LOQ consideration</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant principal gender</td>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 259. Missing data = 8. The t-test value = 1.5 with a 257 degree of freedom.*

The t-test value of 1.5 was obtained for a degree of freedom of 257. The significance of the observed t-test value was determined by reference to the Table of Critical Values of t (Gay, 1976).

The t value required for rejection of the null hypothesis with an alpha level of .05 is 1.960. Since 1.5 is less than 1.960, the null hypothesis cannot be rejected.

The result of the t-test value indicates that there is no significant difference between male and female consideration scores on the LOQ. Also, if the mean scores are examined for each group, the close relationship is again evident. The male assistant principals had an overall mean of 55.0 on consideration question responses and a standard deviation of 6.0, while female administrators had a mean of
56.8 and a standard deviation of 7.9. Though there is a wider spread in the standard deviation results it still appears that there is not a major difference between male and female assistant principals and their consideration responses.

A similar conclusion was true of LOQ structure responses involving male and female administrators. The mean and standard deviation calculations are presented in Table 20.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender Compared to Leadership Opinion Questionnaire Structure Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant principal gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. N = 259. Missing data = 8. The t-test value = 0.48 with a 260 degree of freedom.*

The t-test value was 0.48. Again because this is less than 1.960 at the .05 alpha level for a 260 degree of freedom, the null hypothesis cannot be rejected. The mean was again computed from the raw structure scores on the LOQ. Male assistant principals scored a mean of 45.1 and a standard deviation of 7.4, while female administrators had a mean of 44.1 and a standard deviation of 8.4. It appears there is little difference between male and female administrators and their structure responses.
Summary

Results have been offered which support the purposes of the study. The first section described the general background characteristics of the assistant principal. Characteristics of interest were years in present position, self-evaluation of the administrator's time to deal with assigned duties, job responsibility increases, self-evaluation of reasons for duty and responsibility increases, identification of the three duties which most often occupy the majority of the administrator's workday, and identification of the three duties preferred by administrators to occupy the majority of the workday. Data were presented in this chapter which offered a better understanding of how these variables relate to assistant principals.

The second section of the chapter presented a discussion on leadership dimensions.

The third section of the chapter presented the results of the testing of the 11 hypotheses. Research Hypotheses 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, and 9 dealt respectively with the effect of increased tasks on assistant principals' orientations, perception of time for dealing with assigned duties, perception of increased job responsibilities, perception of the nature of increased job responsibilities, perceptions of orientations, preference regarding types of tasks, and selection of duties and results. These seven hypotheses were accepted. Research Hypotheses 5 and 6, concerned with task oriented duties and structure behavior and person oriented duties and
consideration behavior, were not accepted. Research Hypothesis 10 concerned with the relationship of orientation to years of experience was accepted, while Hypothesis 11 concerned with female assistant principal orientations was not accepted.

Chapter V offers a discussion concerning the conclusions that can be drawn from the data analysis offered in this chapter. Also, practical implications are discussed and recommendations are offered for future research.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS,
AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

As earlier detailed, this study has been conducted to investigate the effect that increased responsibilities have on the role of the assistant principal. Because of increased responsibilities surrounding the position, it was believed that the assistant principal had been forced to become more task oriented and less person oriented as a result of a lack of adequate time to effectively deal with both tasks and people. This study was designed to ascertain whether there had been growth in task responsibilities and, if so, whether the growth had caused the role to become more task oriented than person oriented. This chapter discusses a summary of the study and its design, conclusions relative to each hypothesis, practical implication of the findings, and recommendations for future studies.

Summary

Chapter IV presented all the personal and professional data collected from the study population of Michigan assistant principals. Two questionnaires were used to achieve the previous objectives. The first entitled Assistant Principal Questionnaire (APQ) comprised items relative to informational questions regarding the description of subjects, questions relating to the increase or decrease of duties
and responsibilities of assistant principals, and questions intended to indicate whether the administrator believed his actual and perceived role to be task oriented or person oriented. The Leadership Opinion Questionnaire (LOQ) provided measures of supervisory leadership dimensions, consideration and structure. The questionnaires were sent to the study's sample of 400 secondary school assistant principals in the state of Michigan. Of the 400 assistant principals who received questionnaires, 267, or 67%, returned them for inclusion in the study.

After data were received summary charts were organized. Tables were generated summarizing the following information: number of years in present position; respondent's gender; assessment of time; job responsibility increases; reasons for increased duties and responsibilities; duties which occupy majority of workday; preferred duties to occupy majority of workday; effect of increased tasks on assistant principals' orientations; perception of time for dealing with assigned duties; perception of increased job responsibilities; perception of nature of increased job responsibilities; task oriented duties and structure behavior; person oriented duties and consideration behavior; perceptions of orientations; preference regarding types of duties; selection of duties and results; years of experience compared to Leadership Opinion Questionnaire structure and consideration means and standard deviations; and male, female responses compared to LOQ structure and consideration means and standard deviations.
In arranging the data it was found that much information would be readily understandable through observation of relative percentages. These percentages were reported and certain tests were used to determine significance of the raw frequencies.

The chi-square one-sample test was used extensively to determine when the observed result was or was not significant at the .05 alpha level. This test was useful in analyzing the assistant principal responses to the following: effect of increased tasks on assistant principals' orientations, perception of time for dealing with assigned duties, increased job responsibility perception, nature of increased job responsibility perception, orientation perceptions, types of task preferences, and the selection of duties and results.

The chi-square two-sample test was used for the questions in regard to task oriented duties and structure behavior and person oriented duties and consideration behavior as perceived by the assistant principals.

In addition, the t test for independent samples was used to examine the relationship of orientation to years of experience and the orientations of female assistant principals in respect to their male counterparts.

The tests in each case were chosen for their appropriateness in relationship to the data as well as simplicity of presentation. Conclusions which have been drawn from the collected data are presented in the major categories as presented below.
Conclusions Regarding the Hypotheses

The following conclusions related directly to the listed hypotheses in Chapter IV. Each hypothesis is discussed as well as conclusions based upon literature and the significance of the statistical data.

The Effect of Increased Tasks on Assistant Principals' Orientations

Hypothesis 1 stated that as duties and responsibilities had increased, the percentage of assistant principals who became more task oriented was greater than the percentage of assistant principals who became more person oriented. This hypothesis was supported by the data. First, it can be concluded from the reported data that assistant principals overwhelmingly (97%) hold the belief that job responsibilities have increased. This is clearly understood when examining the varying array of functions and roles that the assistant principal is involved in. Consider, for example, Kindsvatter and Tosi's (1971) finding that as schools became larger assistant principals were employed to perform administrative tasks covering a multiplicity of areas. Austin and Brown (1970) further substantiated the finding by stating that an assistant principal in an American secondary school has his hands in practically everything that goes on in the school. These findings certainly support the increased job responsibility belief. Second, the percentages revealed that 70% of the reported duty and responsibility increases were task oriented showing a clear majority. Third, upon testing the data statistically
it was again found that the hypothesis could be supported. This is not surprising when reviewing the types of duties assistant principals are involved in. According to Garawski (1977), the duties of the assistant principal most frequently center themselves around discipline, attendance functions, and clerical duties rather than staff supervision and curriculum improvement. Mazzei (1976) further stated that too often the assistant principal is unable to put professional training to use because of attendance records, disciplinary problems, corridor duties, equipment problems, and other trivial tasks encountered each day.

These findings would strongly suggest that an investigation should be initiated to ascertain the areas of responsibility increase and whether these areas could be redeployed so as to more effectively use the assistant principal's professional capabilities. It would also appear that there has been great variability and ambiguity in the assistant principal's duties and that these two conditions alone should lead to the continuing study about how the position might ultimately be structured. In this way the role could be developed with a variety of types of duties but within an acceptable parameter of time for successful completion of each responsibility.

Perception of Time for Dealing With Assigned Duties

Literature by Bordinger (1973) has established the point that in most school systems the duties assigned far exceed a reasonable time allotment for their completion. The data analysis supports the hypothesis that the percentage of assistant principals who perceived
inadequate time to deal with duties is greater than assistant principals who perceived that they had adequate time. Furthermore, 59.2% of the administrators indicated that they have inadequate time for dealing with assigned duties, a clear majority over those that believed they had adequate time. This is not surprising when reviewing literature by Garawski (1977) and Black (1980) which concluded that secondary school assistant principals expend a tremendous amount of energy within a given school day, with many days extending into evening activities. In addition, they concluded that as the assistant principal strives to provide effective leadership for the staff on the one hand, and supervise the numerous duties and responsibilities on the other, time becomes a limiting factor.

This researcher concludes that the time factor for execution of assigned duties plays an important role in the ability of the assistant principal to be effective. Garawski (1977) revealed a trend related to increasing hours of work for assistant principals. He found specifically, as the number of hours increased, the percentage of dissatisfaction with hours worked increased and the percentage of job satisfaction decreased. A recent study of the role of the assistant principal by Black (1980) indicated that time management needed to be considered as a way to eliminate stress in the assistant principalship. High levels of frustration were associated with the lack of time provided to complete tasks. When a system overloads its administrator, it is easy to assess why the role may not be an effective or attractive one.
Another conclusion which may be drawn from the above data is that the position lacks a precise and defensible definition. It has already been established that the duties and responsibilities assigned require far more time than reasonable for their completion. Therefore, job descriptions for assistant principals need to be developed keeping in mind the needs of the particular principal and school setting as well as the amount of time necessary to execute the responsibilities.

**Increased Job Responsibility Perception**

Inspection of the data confirmed a definite support that the percentage of assistant principals who perceived their job responsibilities increasing over the past 3 years was greater than the percentage of assistant principals who perceived their job responsibilities not increasing. An overwhelming 97% of the administrators indicated increased responsibilities. The idea that administrative duties and job responsibilities have widened in range and increased in number in recent years is supported by Gillespie (1961) and Coppedge (1968) when they stated that the responsibilities of the assistant principal have changed from a narrow range of activities to a broad range of administrative and supervisory functions. Austin and Brown in their 1970 "Report of the Assistant Principalship" had an inventory of 59 activities involving the assistant principal developed under six broad categories of administrative activity. There was no item among the 59 for which there was a zero response. The literature, large percentage, and the data support should
indicate to school districts that they closely review the duties performed by their assistant principals for the purpose of differentiating between those appropriate to the position and those which would be more appropriately assigned to other staff members.

**Nature of Increased Job Responsibility Perception**

Hypothesis 4 states that assistant principals who perceived increased job responsibilities reported task oriented duties as causes rather than person oriented duties. This hypothesis was supported by the data in this study. The responses to the self-assessment of reasons for increased duties and responsibilities by 259 administrators indicated that of the 14 possible choices, the reason selected by 82.6% of the respondents centered around increased clerical duties; i.e., attendance procedures, student referral documentation, reports, and teacher evaluation reports. The next highest selection concerned the principal delegating increased responsibilities to the assistant principal and was selected by 59.4% of the administrators. The third highest response was concerned with increased state and federal program demands; i.e., gifted programs, special education programs, and Title IX programs, and was indicated by 53.2% of the assistant principals. When analyzed the top three reasons for job responsibility increases centered around task oriented type duties.

One explanation for this occurrence could be the effect of declining enrollment. The most difficult problem, Fowler (1980) stated, that any school suffering declining enrollment must face is
with personnel. Teachers and administrators are not necessarily cut at a corresponding or balanced rate as schools are faced with fewer students, more space, and less money. With these reductions more responsibilities must be assumed and delegated in many cases to the assistant principal. Another explanation centers around the expanding role of the principal and his or her need to delegate duties in order to meet his or her increasingly larger role in school-community relations (Paus, 1970; Weldy, 1979). Again the assistant principal is a key candidate to receive these tasks because of his or her second in command position.

Since literature by Kindsvatter and Tosi (1971) and Garawski (1977) supports the belief that assistant principals want full authority and responsibility for the development of positive student, teacher, and educational programs, this researcher believes that the assignments of the assistant principal must be examined. Development of an administrative team with clear-cut and shared job descriptions is a necessity. Assistant principals should be given equal responsibilities that are both task and person oriented in nature. Systems that operate in this fashion can alleviate the stigma and negative feeling of the assistant principal's role.

**Task Oriented Duties and Structure Behavior**

Assistant principals who report task oriented duties as causes for an increase in their duties will score above the *median* for structure on the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire as compared to assistant principals who report person oriented duties was stated by
Hypothesis 5. It would appear that task oriented duties would be congruent with structure which Fleishman (1969) stated reflects the extent to which an individual is likely to structure his or her role toward goal or task attainment. This fact was not supported by the administrators' LOQ structure scores or their duty choices. No significant difference was established by the data analysis involving administrators' task and person oriented duty choices and their structure scores. The relationship between the two above median percentages when examined showed little difference between task oriented duties at 52% and people oriented duty choices at 61%.

Therefore, this data analysis has not supported the literature suggested by Fowler (1980), Marsh (1981), and Johnson (1981) that as more and more duties are delegated to the assistant principal because of personnel reductions and increased state and federal demands he or she is more structured in his or her goals. An explanation of this phenomenon could be that even though the LOQ instrument is considered a well-developed one (Doppelt, 1965; Gibb, 1972) and well-suited to research and training activities, that as Doppelt (1965) stated, it is probably not the best questionnaire to use as an evaluative instrument of supervisory performance. The researcher, therefore, surmises that perhaps if another appropriate test was used, different results would occur or perhaps its potential lies in training and training evaluation as Gibb (1972) stated rather than as an instrument of supervisory performance evaluation. The area of the instrument is one which definitely needs more research and study.
Person Oriented Duties and Consideration Behavior

Hypothesis 6 surmised that assistant principals who report person oriented duties as causes for an increase in their duties score above the median on consideration as compared to assistant principals who report task oriented duty choices. Fleishman (1969) stated consideration reflected the extent to which an individual was likely to have personal job relationships with his subordinates, therefore being person oriented in nature. Kindsvatter and Tosi (1971) believed their research indicated a need for the assistant principal to be more involved in the functions of staff leadership and curriculum development in order to achieve greater job satisfaction. Garawski (1977) found that six major tasks for which assistant principals sought greater involvement included the following: evaluation of teachers; supervision of teachers; curriculum development; innovations, experiments, and research; school policies; and teacher selection.

Though the literature supported the research hypothesis, the data analysis suggests that person oriented duty choices do not influence the consideration scores of assistant principals. The relationship between the above median scores on consideration by task oriented duty choices (53.9%) and person oriented duty choices (47.9%) clearly shows little difference. This researcher again concludes that the data analysis has not supported the literature and that further investigation and evaluation of the LOQ instrument would be prudent as discussed in the previous section.
Hypothesis 7 stated that more assistant principals perceive themselves as person oriented than task oriented. Among major conclusions generated by Garawski (1977) was that assistant principals desired greater involvement in teacher supervision, selection, and evaluation as well as curriculum development, school policies, innovations, experiments, and research. He also found that two of three duties reported as generating high job satisfaction included teacher evaluation and supervision. Iannacone and Podorf (1984) found that assistant principals were able to contain stress best while holding an even, healthy relationship with other administrators. They also found assistant principals had a need to meet with other administrators to share experiences and interchange ideas.

Garawski (1977) reported dissatisfaction with assistant principal conditions was influenced by a 10-hour or more workday, traditional organizational structures, lack of clerical help, lack of assistance from superiors, documents concerning student rights and responsibilities, recent due process and discipline decisions, and lack of credit for work done.

The hypothesis was supported by the data in the study. Therefore, it was concluded that assistant principals do want to have job relationships with subordinates and do want people-orientation type responsibilities. Assistant principals indicated they want a personal style as supported by the majority consideration scores which
amounted to 85.9% of the total sum, while only 14.1% of the majority scores were structure.

**Types of Duty Preferences**

The literature from the above hypothesis also lends support to the premise that more assistant principals prefer to be person oriented than task oriented. Further support came from Bordinger (1973) when he related that assistant principals found little satisfaction professionally in spending large amounts of their time doing clerical and disciplinary chores. Hurley (1965) believed that assistant principals wanted to become involved in instruction and curriculum improvement, public relations, and other educational leadership areas.

Assistant principals indicated they clearly preferred person oriented duties by pointing out that of the three preference types of tasks they would choose to occupy the majority of their day, 85.7% centered around two or three person oriented duties; and conversely, 85.7% preferred zero or one task oriented duties. From these observations it is evident that the data support the hypothesis.

Further study of the responses to preference duties indicated that a total of 85.7% of the assistant principals preferred two or three person oriented duties, while only 14.3% preferred to have two or three tasks occupy the majority of their workday. This data further support the review of literature whereby assistant principals have expressed the need to be involved in responsibilities and duties which go beyond mere mechanical or administrative detail.
The above conclusion would lead the researcher to believe that assistant principals desire involvement in areas that center around people such as the following: teacher evaluation, teacher supervision, curriculum development, innovations, experiments and research, school policies, and teacher selection. This could be effectively brought about if the secondary assistant principals' job descriptions included a substantial role in these areas. Yet, as will be discussed in the next section, this is not true of the actual role.

Selection of Duties and Results

The literature used as rationale in Hypothesis 7 by Garawski (1977) also supported the hypothesis that assistant principals choose duties which are designated as consideration oriented as preference, but show high structure according to the actual role. Further support came from Sigler (1978) when he discussed the many changes that have caused administrators a serious management overload which adversely affects how they perform their jobs. He believed the most significant change was in major task requirements for an assistant principal today versus a decade ago. Sheffield (1978) addressed the increased work load of administrators because of recent due process laws and required documentation. Sigler (1978) stated that paperwork has doubled or tripled for administrators.

Inspection of the data confirmed support for the hypothesis. Upon comparing preference duties with actual duties it was concluded that 86.5% of the administrators chose only zero or one task duty.
while 86.5% chose two or three person oriented duties to occupy the majority of their time. Overwhelmingly, assistant principals prefer to do person or consideration oriented type duties but their actual role forces them to do task or structure oriented responsibilities. The results would strongly indicate that task oriented duties are a major concern for the assistant principal each day. Yet, from literature (Garawski, 1977) the administrators have staunchly indicated a desire to become more involved in the total education program of their schools. Assistant principals want to be more than "paper pushers" or "policemen" stated Mazzei (1976). They desire an active participation in planning, evaluation, decision making, and supervision. This would indicate that the position needs to be re-evaluated and restructured to offer a variety of responsibilities in both task and person oriented areas.

The above conclusions, which appear to be valid, point the way for revision in philosophical and structural changes within the current role of the assistant principal. The changes will undoubtedly alter the perspective of an effective principal as well as the assistant. These changes need to include working with a variety of people and tasks to get commitment for educational programs, ideas, and activities. It also should involve solving the human problems concerned with completing tasks and in doing so employing communication skills such as listening, clarifying, and summarizing.
Relationship of Orientation to Years of Experience

Hypothesis 10 stated that an assistant principal with less than 3 years experience scores lower on structure according to the LOQ than one with more than 3 years experience, while an assistant principal with less than 3 years experience scores higher on consideration according to the LOQ than one with more than 3 years experience. The data supported the hypothesis in this study. No significant difference was established by the data analysis involving administrators' years of experience and their structure scores, but there was a significant difference established involving administrators' years of experience and their consideration scores. It was concluded that years of experience do not affect dimension scores related to structured goal attainment but do affect dimension scores related to person orientation.

Therefore, the first section of data analysis has not supported the literature suggested by Ivancevich and Donnelly (1968) that people began working with a high level of satisfaction, but then became increasingly dissatisfied through the next few years or the findings by Hendrickson (1979) which chronicled the exodus of administrators due to huge sacrifices of time and energy expended in job tasks.

An explanation for the occurrence of support in the second section of data analysis could be that administrators have become more aware of their roles; and as Smerka (1980) stated, assistant principals are working to establish continuing solid relationships.
with people while performing the expected daily tasks.

A separate conclusion and one the researcher believes needs addressing resulted from the data from Hypothesis 10 surrounding years in the position. A need seems to exist to establish a means by which assistant principals can utilize the years in their present position as well as their work experiences in order to pave the way for an eventual principalship or some other administrative position. At the time of this study, 83.6% of the assistant principals surveyed had been in their positions for more than 3 years. This percentage would seem to indicate that the "upward mobility" or "professional advancement" opportunities stemming from the position are limited. Of course, further examination of the factors that appear to be related to professional movement upward from the assistant principalship would have to be examined.

Orientations of Female Assistant Principals

The literature by Hennig and Jardim (1976) and Smith (cited in Lovelady-Dawson, 1980) supported the hypothesis that female assistant principals score differently on the Leadership Opinion Questionnaire than male assistant principals. The study, however, did not support this hypothesis and as a result led to the conclusion that the gender of the administrator does not have an influence on consideration or structure behavior in dealing with goals and subordinates.

The above conclusion appears to be valid and reliable; yet because of the small number of women surveyed (32), it would be prudent to examine the results against a larger population. Since
87.6% of the assistant principals were male and only 12.4% were female, it can be concluded that there is a scarcity of women in the position. It is suggested that equal employment opportunities for this school administrative position is poor. This is difficult to comprehend when realizing that women make up 67% of all public school teaching positions (Mertz, Grossnickle, & Tucher, 1980). It can also be concluded that women must be frustrated in their professional efforts and with their under-utilization.

This is a major concern for women aspiring to administration because it leads to the conclusion that women may lack the personal competence and aptitude to administer schools. The observation of Smith (1978) which suggests that superintendents gave their women building administrators very high marks on their administrative performance tends to refute these beliefs but is not supported by the respondents' gender data.

It also seems logical that again philosophical differences concerning women administrators need to be addressed within the current system. The lack of female assistant principals has to be a major concern of female educators who hope to make the transition into administration since the assistant principalship is one major stepping stone.

Summary and Practical Implication

In summary, conclusions have been stated concerning the 11 hypotheses considered in this study. The conclusions were based on the data analysis and the statistical test of significance results.
This study did establish a data base for the personal backgrounds of assistant principals and a basis for obtaining results surrounding the increase or decrease of duties and responsibilities of the role. Also indication of whether the assistant principal believed the actual or perceived role to be task or person oriented was another area established in the data base. The Leadership Opinion Questionnaire supplied the data base with dimension scores of the study population.

Support was given that assistant principals have had to face an increase in duties and responsibilities, yet have not had ample time to deal with the myriad of tasks.

Support was also given that assistant principals who reported task oriented duties as causes for an increase in their job responsibilities did not necessarily structure their role or those of subordinates toward goal or task attainment. This was paralleled by assistant principals who reported person oriented duties as causes for increased responsibilities. They also were not necessarily personal or person oriented in relations with group members.

It appears clear that assistant principals perceive themselves as person oriented and prefer the majority of their work to be person oriented in nature.

Support was readily given to the fact that assistant principals prefer overwhelmingly to do person oriented type duties but in their actual role must resort to doing task oriented natured ones.

When reviewing the relationship of orientations to years experience, evidence was found to support the fact that assistant
principals with lesser experience were more personal or person oriented in their administrative approach but were not less structured in their approach to goal completion than assistant principals with more experience.

Orientations of female assistant principals were not supported and it was evident that there wasn't a difference between the way male and female administrators deal with subordinates and duties. Females were not more personal in their dealing with group members and goals and less structured in their role than males.

The greatest implication and one which this study sought to ascertain is whether there had been growth in task responsibilities and, if so, whether the growth had caused the role of the assistant principal to become more task or person oriented. It was ascertained that there was a definite growth in responsibilities and the majority of the growth centered around task oriented type duties. Yet, as duties and responsibilities increased the assistant principal did not become more task or person oriented in nature.

Recommendations for Future Research

It is hoped that this research study will result in additional analysis and study concerning assistant principals. Documentation about this population is beginning to expand but is still sparse considering the responsibilities and duties charged to this leadership position.

If future research is done, it is recommended by this researcher, that those studies attempt to compare not only the types of
duties and responsibilities of the assistant principals, but also those of the principal under whom the assistant must work. Comparison of these two roles and tasks would allow for study of a possible teamwork approach to the position rather than an individual approach with limited parameters.

It would be interesting to do comparison studies between districts that offer a teamwork approach to the role of the assistant principal and those that do not. These studies might be difficult in that they would necessitate distinguishing the role approach in each district and these approaches may even vary within a district building to building.

Further studies of assistant principals' preference duties may reveal how the role can be restructured to enhance it and the educational setting it surrounds.

Research studies may reveal if and how particular role methods may increase the effectiveness of the position. It may also be interesting to study each of the methods of approach to the position in relationship to its effect on leadership style and motivation as well as productivity.

It would be useful if future research involved personal interviewing of a sample of assistant principals. Interviewing might lead to a more complete analysis of the role and the problems which this particular administrator experiences in the performance of his or her duties. Assurances of confidentiality of responses could be guaranteed verbally and in writing.
Numerous studies could explore possible ways to redistribute duties and responsibilities or delegate them to sources as of yet untapped. Perhaps volunteer groups and parent programs could impact on the role through their input value and as an of yet untouched labor force to help alleviate some aspects of lengthy clerical work that is a major part of the role.

Research should be initiated to study the female assistant principal's role in more depth. Study of their particular leadership style and its effect on the role responsibilities might lead to a necessary and possible positive expansion of their position.

The additional study suggested by these recommendations should aid in developing a broader research base for understanding the assistant principalship. Such insight is needed because the position is such an important force in secondary education.

This chapter has attempted to present summaries, conclusions, practical implication, and recommendations that have emerged from the study of the effect of increased responsibilities on the role of the assistant principalship.

The results have demonstrated that those in the position possess an important role for implementing many of the duties and responsibilities necessary in order to maintain and execute a sound educational climate. However, the effect of these duties and responsibilities on assistant principals' roles must be fully realized. Without this realization the position can be adversely affected, but with it the position can be one of major importance to the goals of the schools' total educational programs.
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Appendix A

Assistant Principal Questionnaire
Assistant Principal Questionnaire

PART A.

Please answer the following questions about yourself and your actual position as Assistant Principal by placing a check next to the desired answer. Select only one answer per question unless otherwise requested. Your answers will remain confidential and all responses will be averaged to obtain a general picture of Assistant Principal opinions.

1. How many years have you held a position as an Assistant Principal?

   ( ) Less than three years.
   ( ) More than three years.

2. What is your sex?

   ( ) Male
   ( ) Female

3. As an Assistant Principal, do you have adequate time to deal with duties assigned to you?

   ( ) Yes
   ( ) No

4. In your opinion, have your job responsibilities increased over the past three years?

   ( ) Yes
   ( ) No (Skip to Question 6)

5. Duties and responsibilities have increased in the past several years because (check as many as apply to your situation) of:

   ( ) Student enrollment having increased.
   ( ) The assistant principal not having adequate staff to whom to delegate duties.
   ( ) The principal delegating increased responsibilities to the assistant principal.
   ( ) Not having enough assistant principals to handle the number of responsibilities in the building.
   ( ) Increased involvement in community communication.
   ( ) Increased committee involvement.
   ( ) Increased clerical duties; i.e., attendance procedures, student referral documentation, reports, teacher evaluation reports.
   ( ) Increased classroom visitation.
   ( ) Increased student counseling and conferences.
6. In your actual role as Assistant Principal, please list the three duties which most often occupy the majority of your workday.

(1) ____________________________

(2) ____________________________

(3) ____________________________

7. List the three duties you would prefer to have occupy the majority of your workday.

(1) ____________________________

(2) ____________________________

(3) ____________________________
Appendix B

Leadership Opinion Questionnaire
PLEASE NOTE:
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Appendix C

Endorsement Letter
January 19, 1981

Mrs. Sandra Sirotti
131 Wendalton
Troy, Michigan 48084

Dear Mrs. Sirotti:

Thank you for your letter of January 14th concerning your dissertation. MASSP will endorse this study if we can have the results in a summary suitable for publication in our journal, SECONDARY EDUCATION TODAY. Please keep us informed as to the completion date and when we can expect the summary.

Good luck in your endeavor.

Sincerely yours,

Jack D. Bittle
Executive Director
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Appendix D

Cover Letter
April 6, 1981

As the role of the Assistant Principal continues to grow, there is a need to explore the effect that increased responsibilities have had on that role. I am, therefore, conducting a study to ascertain whether there has been growth in task responsibilities and, if so, whether that growth has caused the role of the Assistant Principal to become more task oriented or more person oriented. I believe that as an administrator actively involved in the Assistant Principal position, you are most aware of the responsibilities of your role.

The study has been endorsed by the Michigan Association of Secondary School Principals, and they have expressed an interest in publishing the results in their journal, Secondary Education Today.

Since I am seeking information from only one third of the Assistant Principals in the state of Michigan, your participation is essential to the study. I would appreciate it if you would take 15 minutes to complete the enclosed questionnaires. Please return them no later than April 20, 1981, in the stamped, self-addressed envelope. The code number on the questionnaires is for follow-up purposes only. Your responses will be strictly confidential.

If you have any questions concerning the questionnaires, please contact me at (313) 939-8820 or 689-6832.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Sandra B. Sirotti

Sandra B. Sirotti, Doctoral Student

Dr. Harold W. Boles, Advisor

Enclosures (2)
Appendix E

Follow-Up Postcard
I can understand that your position is a busy one and that you may have overlooked the questionnaires you recently received, but I would greatly appreciate it if you would take a few minutes to answer. Both the Assistant Principal questionnaire and the Leadership Opinion questionnaire are essential to completion of the study. Please return them as soon as possible.

Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Sandra B. Sirotti, Doctoral Student
Western Michigan University

Dr. Harold W. Boles, Advisor
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