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The purpose of this study was to examine differences in perceptions between various educators regarding needed competencies for the position of principal in Guam. The study was undertaken because of the relative lack of empirical data in Guam regarding competencies for education administrator positions. In addition, there appeared to be a need to examine the perceptions of others on competencies for the principalship outside of those included by Holder in 1962.

The research population consisted of 1,105 educators of the Guam school system. All the 34 principals, 16 assistant principals, and 14 administrators and 18 consultants of the central office were used for this study. In addition, a random sample of 365 teachers out of a population of 1,023 was also used. One hundred percent of the principals, assistant principals, and central office administrators provided usable responses. Eighty-three percent of the consultants and sixty-seven percent of the teachers sampled provided usable responses.

A 54-item questionnaire was developed and used in this study from the competency listings of Lipham and Hoeh (1974), those found in the literature, and those included in the present job description of the Guam principalship. Twenty-three competencies resulted from
Responses on the ratings of the competencies by the elementary and secondary principals, elementary and secondary assistant principals, elementary and secondary teachers, and central office consultants and administrators, respectively, were compared using the dichotomy of responses above or below the median of the respective combined scores. The null hypotheses were tested by applying appropriately either the Fisher exact or the chi-square test for two and k independent samples with alpha, the probability of committing a Type I error, equal to .05.

Differences were found on the ratings of the competencies by the respective educator groups as follows:

1. The elementary and secondary principals differed in their opinions regarding the need for the competencies of implementing programs and 2 years of administrative and/or supervisory experience for the principalship.

2. The elementary and secondary teachers differed in their ratings on the need for the competencies of staff development, providing school community relations, knowledge of the principles and practices of educational technology with emphasis in curriculum and instructional areas, and ability to maintain records and prepare reports for the principal position.

3. The consultants and administrators differed in regard to how important they perceived the competency of ability to work effectively with the public and employees is to the principalship.
4. The combined responses of principals, assistant principals, teachers, and central office staff showed different responses regarding the need for the competencies of evaluating programs, organizing staff resources, and knowledge of the principles and practices of school administration for the principalship.

However, no difference was found between the perceptions of the elementary and secondary assistant principals in regard to their ratings of the competencies needed for the position of principal in Guam.

The study concluded that certain competencies are perceived quite differently by the various educator groups and may be a basis for specifying principalship competencies for the Guam school system.
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CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND ITS SETTING

This research sought to identify and assess needed competencies for the position of principal in the Guam public schools. This was done by seeking the perceptions of principals, assistant principals, teachers, and central office administrators and consultants.

More specifically, the study sought to assess whether there were differences in perceptions between and among principals, assistant principals, and teachers in the elementary and secondary school levels in regard to needed competencies for the principalship. In addition, the study assessed whether there were differences in perceptions between and among central office consultants and administrators in regard to the same needed competencies.

Identifying and assessing needed competencies stem from a concern to seek out those skills, abilities, and knowledge which will assist the performance of those in positions of educational leadership (Culbertson, Henson, & Morrison, 1974). In this study, the concern was with the position of principal, a position which has been stipulated as being crucial in the teaching-learning environment (Lieberman, 1973; Trump, 1972).

The ways of looking at or defining competencies appear to be varied (Pool, 1974). This study used the approach of looking at the functions of the principal as a means of arriving at competencies. This approach is supported by Lipham and Hoeh (1974) and will be
further addressed in the next chapter. In the assessment of competencies, one seeks the technical, human, and conceptual skills (Katz, 1955; Lipham & Hoeh, 1974) necessary for the effective performance of a principal.

Seeking the perceptions of principals, assistant principals, teachers, administrators, and consultants in regard to competencies is supported by Hemphill, Griffiths, and Frederiksen (1962). They reasoned that there is a need to find out what school districts require of the principal in order that an individual aspiring for the principalship may more precisely see the description of the job and increase one's chances of success when seeking the position. Persons presently holding a principalship should know the competencies expected of them in order that it may assist them in their overall performance.

Finally, the concern of this research is that of looking at some needed competencies for the position of principal. Lipham and Hoeh (1974) suggested that in most instances competencies are exemplary and will not always be inclusive. In another vein, Halpin (1966) called attention to this pervasive problem of theorizing in education as the molar to molecular aspects of looking at educational phenomenon. This was fully recognized and therefore, the competencies examined were delimited to those listed by Lipham and Hoeh (1974) and as supported by those found in the literature. Specifying competencies was an aspect which the study hoped to contribute in resolving.
Background and Need for the Study

The Guam Department of Education is the responsible public agency for the implementation of elementary and secondary education programs. It is both the state and local education agency when compared to mainland United States education organization. The Board of Education is the governing body whose membership is elected on a district basis. The Director of Education is the Chief State School Officer. Associate and assistant superintendents assist the Director in administering and managing the education programs out of the Central Office. In addition, principals in the different area schools are directly responsible for the building programs.

The complexity of administering and leading the educational enterprise in Guam has grown rapidly since its transition to civilian administration in 1950. This was the year the people of Guam were granted U.S. citizenship by Congressional action called the Organic Act of Guam thereby allowing a civilian government to run the affairs of the island territory. Steps are being initiated in order to systematically review the education organization. A component of this review has included preliminary examination of competencies for those in positions of educational leadership.

An examination of competencies for the position of Director of Education was initiated by the Governor's Blue Ribbon Committee (Blue Ribbon Committee Report, 1974). This Committee outlined qualifications which centered on recommending that a person with training in business management assume the top leadership position of education.
in Guam. In addition, an education specialist was suggested to assist in programs, curriculum development, and other educational matters. The recommendations all seemed to center on the need for the top leader to have business and managerial skills but with educational skills taking a subordinate consideration.

More specific to the principal position, a joint committee was formed by the Department of Education and the University of Guam which examined needed qualifications for certification of teachers, consultants, and principals. The resulting committee work centered on specifications for the principalship which was highly dependent on previous teaching experience and academic training. The recommendations of the committee suggested that competencies be based on experience and structured training.

A more systematic approach to the study of competencies for educational leadership is contained in the Guam Comprehensive Plan for Accountability (Guam Department of Education, 1971), a project funded by federal grants. This plan involved the assessment of critical work activities of the principals through frequency counts of activity occurrence. The underlying purpose was to see if some relationship existed between learner achievement and activities of the principal. An initial analysis suggested that significant relationships existed between activities of the principal, organizational climate, and overall learner performance (Guam Department of Education, 1974). The activities which appeared to relate to overall student performance included the amount of time the principal spent in budget preparation, supervision of nonprofessional staff, and other administrative
activities in the schools. No final analysis exists because a change in administration of the Department of Education slowly phased out further implementation of the plan.

Competencies for administrative positions are implied in the job descriptions disseminated by the Guam Civil Service Commission (see Appendix A). When reviewing the position description, one finds four emphases: the nature of the work, examples of work, desirable knowledge, abilities, and skills, and minimum requirements. These four components appear to make up a consideration for competency examination.

Based on discussions with the administrator and staff of the Civil Service Commission and this writer's research, there appears to be no systematic study which assesses the process involved in arriving at the stipulated descriptions or the relationship of the stipulations to enhancing the performance of a principal. A possibility for assessment has existed by means of the annual job reviews which are submitted to the Commission. However, what usually results from these reviews are the perpetuation of the previous year's descriptions in order to minimize consequent administrative actions should changes be indicated. Actions arising may include a salary change, reclassification, and other related changes seen more in their negative rather than positive effects.

All of these past attempts at examining qualifications and requirements for positions of educational leadership in Guam indicated that there was a need to study the problem more closely. The purpose of this research in examining needed competencies for the position of
principal was to continue and further enhance the systematic understanding of needed knowledge, abilities, and skills for the principalship.

An examination of the required competencies for the position of principal is important in a more general way, because the principal, as the educational leader, is in a position to determine educational programs to be implemented. In addition, the principal is in a position to best influence the learning environment of the schools (Annese, 1971; Gross & Herriott, 1965).

The type of training that principals receive and its relationship to success in the field has not been firmly established. Questions of appropriate training continue to be a major concern (Goldhammer, Suttle, Aldridge, & Becker, 1967; McCleary, Brown, & Gale, 1975). Addressing needed competencies for principals have been suggested as a means to formulating the structure and contents of the training of principals (Brandewie, Johnson, & Trump, 1972; Nickerson, 1972).

Finally, Lipham and Hoeh (1974) called attention to the importance of understanding the position of principal through the competency-based approach when they stated:

The competency-based approach to the principalship provides a systematic means for analyzing and synthesizing the conceptual, human, and technical skills required for efficient performance in the principal's role. (p. 351)
Organization of the Study

The study is organized around five chapters in addition to the appendices and bibliography. Chapter I presented the background and need for the study and the importance of the problem.

The rationale for the study is contained in Chapter II where selected literature and research pertinent to the study are presented. Chapter III presents the methods and procedures undertaken, instrumentation, data collection techniques, and the statistical analyses used.

The results of the study are presented in Chapter IV dealing with the data gathered from the principals, assistant principals, teachers, consultants, and central office administrators. Finally, Chapter V presents the conclusions, recommendations, and summary of the study based on the overall results.
CHAPTER II

RATIONALE FOR THE STUDY

This chapter presents a review of the literature related to the purpose of the study: to determine needed competencies for the position of principal. An overview of the theoretical framework of the study is presented as well as other conceptual writings and research concerning important referent group perceptions on competencies. The hypotheses of the study are also presented.

The Theoretical Perspective

Both in the literature of management (Likert, 1969) and educational administration (Campbell, 1965), the perceptions of administrators and those of significant others (Saxe, 1968) are considered important to the understanding of management and administrative processes. Since competencies in educational organizations are usually defined by school districts (Hemphill et al., 1962) to specify performance (McIntyre, 1974), then the perceptions of significant others in regard to competencies are important. Perceptions of those involved with the particular position being assessed have been considered critical by Campbell (1965).

In the field of educational administration, Getzels and Guba (Getzels, 1958; Getzels & Guba, 1955) posited that behavior of an administrator is influenced by what is perceived as demands coming from the personal and institutional dimensions which compose any
social system. The authors termed these influences "idiographic" and "nomothetic." One finds in this theoretical model that the two dimensions are a dynamic process influencing each other. Germane to this investigation, Getzels (1958) stated:

The first level derives from the particular offices or statuses in the social system and is determined by the nature of the roles involved in the interaction. This is, of course, the nomothetic dimension of our model. The second level of interaction derives from the particular people or individuals in the social system and is determined by the personalities involved in the interaction. This is, of course, the idiographic dimension of our model. You will recall that we said that the publicly prescribed nomothetic relationship is enacted in two separate private idiographic situations—one by the subordinate and one by the superordinate. The functioning of the administrative process will, we said, depend on the nature of the overlap—i.e. on the relative congruence or discrepancy—between the separate perceptions of the expectations in the two situations. (p. 159)

The purpose of this study in seeking the perceptions of principals, assistant principals, teachers, central office administrators, and consultants appear to present a situation similar to what is posited by this social systems model. Each of the groups would be operating from their respective nomothetic and idiographic perspectives when defining competencies and would be sharing subordinate and superordinate relationships respectively with the principal.

Heald and Moore (1968) support the subordinate and superordinate relationship in regard to the principalship by stating that the superintendent and his or her attendant staff officers have a superordinate relationship to the principal and the teachers and other staff of the schools have a subordinate one.
A further or more molecular stipulation than Getzels and Guba's model is that of role theory (Lipham & Hoeh, 1974). Role theory zeroes in on a particular aspect of the perceptual scheme, that of role, and further expands on it. The concepts of self-expectations, other's expectations, and one's perceptions of the other's expectations in one's role in a position are considered important. Lipham and Hoeh (1974) called these "self-role expectations, alter's role expectations, and perceptions of alter's expectations" (pp. 126-129).

In regard to role theory and this study, one relates to the fact that there is a personal role expectation that a principal brings to the position. In addition, there are the role expectations of others (teachers, assistants, consultants, etc.) and a principal's perception of these expectations on the principal position. The extent of agreement or disagreement in perceptions is important since it affects the position itself and at times may give rise to conflicts (Lipham, 1962).

Although these theories hold major importance to this study, there is yet another view altogether germane. Lipham and Hoeh (1974) reasoned that if one looks at the functions of the principal, one may define exemplary competencies for the position itself. This view strengthens the relationship of practice and theory. They contend:

To perform effectively in the principalship at least two productive alternative stances may be taken. The first and most current view we have termed the foundations of the principalship. It draws heavily on recent theories, constructs, and models from the basic and applied social, behavioral, and administrative sciences to describe and delineate the antecedents, correlates, or predictors of the behavior of the principal and those with whom he works. The second and most typical view we have termed
the functions of the principalship. It focuses on the tasks, jobs, and activities that occupy the bulk of the principal's time and analyzes them according to the major competencies that must be demonstrated by an effective school principal. (p. 3)

This conceptualization supposes that the foundations and practice of the principalship is on a continuum where "the principal on the job moves back and forth between foundations and functions or between theory and practice in resolving issues and making decisions" (pp. 3-4). These authors specified the functions of the principal as including "the instructional program, staff personnel services, student personnel services, financial-physical resources, and school-community relationships" (p. 203). These functions incorporate considerations for principal competencies along the following:

1. Improvement of instruction
   a. Program assessment
   b. Planning and organizing programs
   c. Implementing programs
   d. Evaluating programs

2. Staff personnel services
   a. Organizing staff resources
   b. Staff development
   c. Evaluating staff performance

3. Student personnel services
   a. Providing student services
   b. Achieving student involvement

4. Financial and physical resources
   a. Providing and managing financial resources
   b. Providing and managing school plant resources

5. School community relations
   a. Providing school community relations

Since these functions and related competencies are the major considerations of this study, Appendix H gives an overview in relation to other authors subsequently discussed in this chapter. For
the most part, the listings above closely resemble the competencies mentioned by Graff and Street (1956), the initiators of the competency approach. McCleary (1973a) pointed to the usefulness of the works of these authors.

Further, Lipham and Hoeh (1974) linked the aforementioned competencies to practice and theory under the following considerations:

1. Where the competencies deal with relevance, planning, and the implementation of programs, attention is called to the concurrent use of the spectacles of the systems approach or systems theory.

2. Where the competencies are listed or deal with staff resources, staff development, and staff evaluation, the authors called attention to the accompanying assistance of role theory and social and general systems theories.

3. Where the competencies deal with student activities and student involvement, these authors espouse the concurrent theoretical understanding of the "eyes" of values theory.

4. Where the competencies delineate school plant resources and financial management activities, these authors call attention to the systems theory in assisting in this instance.

5. And where the principal is to encounter the world of community relations, the assistance of general systems theory, leadership theory, and decision theory are put forward for possible assistance in understanding the foundations of this activity.

The framework of Lipham and Hoeh in lending itself to theory consideration is an aspect which other authors posit to be a modern approach to understanding educational administration (Campbell &
Lipham, 1960; Miller, Madden, & Kincheloe, 1972).

The social systems theory and role theory previously mentioned therefore generate the proposition that personal and organizational demands influence an administrator's behavior. These demands are suggested as perceived demands which define, refine, reinforce, or change behavior. The concept of competency specifying performance allows for the additional conceptual model of the functional approach as indicators of performance needs for the principalship. These conceptual models offer the general framework for this study.

Additional considerations of the principal and competency, persons interacting with the principal or reference groups, and some stipulations found in regard to competency follow. Finally, the hypotheses of this investigation are offered in light of these discussions.

The Principal and Competency

The importance of examining competencies for the position of principal is evidenced by the March 1972 issue of the NASSP Bulletin. The whole issue is devoted to the examination of competencies for the principalship in the secondary schools. Nickerson (1972) and Trump (1972) writing on two separate articles equally decried the status of training for credit hours instead of for competency. They maintained that the emphasis should be in training persons for effective performance in the principalship and not just for gaining credit hours.
McCleary (1973a) mentions that Graff and Street (1956) provided the experiential root to the examination of competencies for educational administration in their book, Improving Competence in Educational Administration. The latter authors offered a competency pattern which included (a) the job of educational administration, (b) the know-how of educational administration, and (c) theory of educational administration (p. 45). These authors also posited two functions of educational administration. One function allowed for all concerned to share in the formulation of policies or programs and the other allowed for all to share in the execution of policies and programs. The competency pattern and these functions are carried forward in some ways by present authors espousing the competency approach (Culbertson et al., 1974; McCleary, 1973a).

Goldman (1966) expressed concern that there is a need to do further research into the responsibilities and duties of elementary school administrators because the role of the principal will change and must be revised with respect to the situation, the community, and the times. Changing roles will affect competencies. Knezevich (1962) elaborated on the changing roles of the principalship as stemming from the fact that each local school district defines administrative expectations which at times are different from each other. The schools in Guam are under the jurisdiction of the Department of Education and therefore its own expectations are defined by its constituent students, administrators, and other community members.

Campbell, Bridges, Corbally, Jr., Nystrand, and Ramseyer (1971) agreed with Knezevich but stated "ascertaining the competence of
teachers or administrators is a very difficult matter. Establishing criteria of competence is essentially a valuing procedure and may vary from district to district" (p. 445).

Boles and Davenport (1975), writing on educational leadership, suggest that competencies are important because they are the "primary basis, or criteria, which potential leaders must satisfy" (p. 414). It appears that present educational leaders must satisfy this basis, too.

McIntyre (1974) stated that competencies need to be examined in order to provide guidelines for skill development. He argued that from an assessment of competencies one may be able to find "the smallest unit of behavior that, if employed at a quality level, will make a discernible difference in the fulfillment of the responsibility" (p. 155) of the principalship.


The principalship holds much that is in common with other administrative roles—particularly insofar as the basic theoretical and conceptual foundations are concerned. The principalship also requires a unique set of competencies—particularly insofar as the basic functions or tasks of the principal are concerned. (p. XI)

The importance of assessing competency for positions of educational administration is a continuing concern (Pool, 1974). As it reflects the principalship, the major reason stems from the need to enhance a principal's ability to positively influence the learning environment of the schools (Greene, 1972; Lieberman, 1973). Campbell, Corbally, Jr., and Ramseyer (1966) summarized these thoughts by
suggesting that "to operate successfully with his or her school the
principal must possess another kind of authority--authority based on
competence" (p. 227). In a later edition of the same text (Campbell
et al., 1971), the authors stated:

Researchers have virtually ignored descriptive data dealing with the relationship between specific administrative competencies and appointment to different types of administrative positions. If some minimal level of performance in any given category of competencies is demanded for appointment to an administrative position, the research literature that we have examined provides no clue as to what the minimal levels might be. (p. 377)

As to the situation in Guam, the Board of Education has just recently reexamined certification requirements for professional positions in the school system. The reexamination appeared to stem from a desire to select and identify competency needs for the school system. In the Board of Education Policy Manual (Guam Board of Education, 1979), Section 812 addresses the position of the principal. The stipulations on the principalship are more specific now and seem to relate competency with minimum requirements in training, education, and experience.

Additionally, the job description of the principal position first approved in 1973 was revised and updated in December 1978 (see Appendix A). The major change still exhorts competencies under the minimum knowledge, abilities, and skills section with concomitant minimum experience and training.

The changing or varied nature of competencies for the principal appear to come from differing values on performance held for the principal. If performance is the aim of competency and performance
is a valuing process (Campbell et al., 1971) then the nature of competencies may be understood through the nature of reference groups or demands of significant others who work with the principal (McCleary, 1973b; Saxe, 1968).

The Principal and Reference Groups

As espoused by the theoretical framework of this study, the perceptions of others in regard to the educational leadership position of principal are deemed necessary to understanding administrative behavior. Saxe (1968) supported this contention in his text *Perspectives on the Changing Role of the Principal* where he presented differing viewpoints in regard to the position of principal. He stated that the view of the principalship from "as many eyes as there are persons interested in the position" (p. XI) are important if one is to better understand the changing role of the principal. In Saxe's view, significant others contribute to the changing role of the principal.

In his article "Dynamics of the Principalship," Lipham (1962) reviewed existing theory and research and stated that a principal's behavior is influenced by the reference group he or she is actively involved with at a specific point in time. Reference groups not only determine the behavior of a principal but also are sources of conflict for the principal when expectations and overt behavior are not congruent. In understanding this phenomenon, Lipham suggested that one finds the sources of conflict to come from "(1) conflict between two or more roles which the principal is fulfilling simultaneously, (2) conflict in expectations between two or more reference groups,
and (3) conflict in expectations within a major reference group" (p. 273).

Hemphill et al. (1962) argued that school district expectations are important for the understanding of the precise descriptions of what an individual might expect within the occupation or position of principal. The authors concluded this after conducting intensive research on performance and personality in elementary school administration. Knezevich (1962) agreed that school district expectations are a result of reference group needs and expectations.

Campbell (1965) affirmed the importance of significant others by noting specific groups which are critical to the principalship. He stated that "teachers, parents, central office--these are the principal's major reference groups" (p. 190). Campbell's statement is supported by Heald and Moore (1968) but contended the immediacy and importance of subordinate and superordinate positions to the principal.

The reference groups of interest to this study are the principals, assistant principals, teachers, and central office administrators and consultants. These positions are subordinate and superordinate positions to the principalship. Principals themselves are important to the principalship because they normally are the ones who define, refine, and determine the professional standards of the position. The rise of the elementary and secondary school principal organizations was a response to a need to set professional standards for their respective positions (Knezevich, 1962). The granting of professional status is highly associated to the granting of competency status (McCleary, 1973b).
In relation to the positions of interest in this study, Foskett (1967) additionally recognized that the principal position is interstitial to all of them. He maintained that this has serious implications to the principalship and postulated

The ambiguity of the nature of the position of elementary school principals suggests that the position is interstitial and that it exists between two other positions, that of teacher and that of central administration. As a consequence, it tends to be associated in part with each of the adjacent positions and not completely with either. (p. 95)

This interstitial phenomenon would appear to affect the consideration of competencies for the principalship. Each of the adjacent positions will have some associated influence and, concurrently, some differing influence on expected competencies for the principalship. Some of these differing expectations are now discussed.

Major Referent Groups and Competency Expectations

The purpose of this study is to assess the needed competencies for the position of principal as perceived by principals, assistant principals, teachers, and central office administrators and consultants. The review of literature up to now has centered on the importance of competencies and the reference groups important to the understanding of effective principal performance. Some of the differences that have been found are now examined as a way of generating the needed competencies for the principalship and at the same time as a prelude to the hypotheses tested by this study.

Campbell (1965) elaborated on some of the expectations that teachers and central office staff have on the principalship. He
mentioned that teachers want to be buffed between parents and students. The central office wants the principal to be essentially a communication agent maintaining the organization through effecting appropriate policies and procedures especially as handed down by the superintendent.

In a study of the behavior of principals toward the superintendent and teachers, Moser (1957) found that these two groups subject the principal to markedly different sets of leadership expectations. In addition the principal's behavior varies according to whether he or she is with superiors or subordinates.

Goal achievement, instructional regulations, and centralized authority were stressed in the principal's relation with superintendents. However, behavior stressing needs and wants, minimum rules, and decentralized authority were observed in the principal's interaction with teachers. In addition to these two major levels of differing expectations, school level considerations have also been explored and shown to affect differences in expectations on the principalship.

Holder (1962) explored perceptions of specific groups across grade levels in regard to perceived competencies for the position of principal. His contention was that perceptions across grade levels will be different.

Using the critical incident technique, Holder asked teachers in the elementary, junior, and senior high schools to record two or more incidents of behavior which they perceived as critical to the fulfillment of the job of principal. Five hundred forty-three elementary,
junior high, and senior high school teachers responded by reporting 1,035 incidents. Seven hundred thirteen of the observed behaviors met the criteria of usability with 241 incidents for the elementary, 334 for the junior high, and 260 for the senior high principals observed. Each behavior was then classified into six areas of interaction involving (a) working with and caring for students, (b) working with and providing leadership for teachers and other personnel, (c) working with individual parents, (d) working with community groups and agencies, (e) organizing and administering the school program, and (f) working with line organization superiors. From these major areas, Holder found that there were 53 requirements observed for the elementary principal, 56 for the junior high school, and 53 for the senior high school principals. The majority of the acts of the principals reported by the teachers related to students, teachers, and parents. Most of the acts reported directly benefited the teacher, and the most critical of the acts were those concerned with student discipline. The least critical of the acts pertained to the principal's relationship with the community and his or her superiors. The extent of behavior considered critical related to those concerned with human relationships.

What is most interesting and germane to this study is that teachers had a wide range of role expectations at each level of the principalship. Some requirements were perceived as different and some the same across school levels. The rank order of criticalness was not the same and those requirements for the principalship perceived as common across the school levels were not rated the same in
criticalness.

Holder (1962) concluded that since requirements are perceived differently across school levels by the teachers, other investigations are needed to find out how other reference groups perceived critical behaviors are for the principalship. This study is an attempt to fill this need.

Differences in school level roles of the principal were the concern of Hinrichs (1972). He examined the roles of the elementary and secondary school principals in Iowa using the questionnaire technique to get at responses from a representative sampling of principals in the respective school levels. He concluded that the elementary school principals perform a wider variety of tasks than do the high school principals. He found that high school principals delegate more and were involved more in schedule making than elementary school principals. Finally, both groups tended to rank order the criticalness of their tasks according to the largest time spent on them. Two such major tasks were classroom visitation and supervision of instruction. This latter finding is similar to Bowman's (1977) later study.

In 1977, Bowman found specific critical tasks performed by principals to be related to school levels. Additionally, she noted that some of the critical tasks were significantly related to one's previous experience as an assistant principal.

Bowman's dissertation study involved 288 principals from various elementary, middle, junior high, and senior high schools in Michigan. The respondents were asked through a 43-item questionnaire to indicate the roles and tasks which occupied the largest portion of their
time and to rate them in importance to creating effective learning environments. Table 1 displays the most demanding roles and the proportion of time spent by school level.

Table 1

Most Demanding Roles of Principals by Proportion of Time Spent and School Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Elementary</th>
<th>Middle/Jr. High</th>
<th>Senior High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School manager</td>
<td>54.2%</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
<td>75.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional leader</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel leader</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community leader</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One observes from the table that secondary principals spent more time in their role as school manager than did the elementary or junior high school principals. Conversely, the elementary principals indicated spending more time in the role of instructional leader than did the junior or senior high school principals. Elementary principals reported spending double the portion of their time in instructional leadership when compared to the senior high school principal and a quarter more time when compared to the junior high principal. Junior high and elementary school principals spent a bit more time in their role of personnel leader than did the high school principals.
spent in the role of community leader was greater for the senior high principals although overall this was the least time spent by the three groups.

In regard to the 43 tasks that made up the four roles, 10 were listed as most demanding of the time of the principals altogether. These were:

1. Developing and enforcing school procedures, rules, regulations, and maintaining routine student discipline.
2. Supervision of the professional and non-professional staff.
3. Meeting with individuals or groups on matters of curriculum improvement or change.
4. Providing direct assistance to the teaching staff through formal and informal evaluation procedures.
5. Formal or informal evaluation of existing programs.
6. Becoming more familiar with the instructional programs or processes now being used in your building.
7. Serving as a resource person to the instructional staff.
8. Gathering information needed for decision-making.
9. Formal or informal measures of promoting good staff morale.
10. Formal or informal meetings with parents of students in the building (school visits, Open House, parent organizations). (Bowman, 1977, pp. 105-106)

All except one of the above 10 most demanding tasks were considered critical to the effective performance of the principalship. The task not considered critical but was time demanding concerned gathering information for decision-making. The task considered critical but not one of the top 10 time demanding tasks related to the
development, with individuals or groups, of performance criteria for the improvement of instruction.

Continuing, nine tasks were found to be related to school level functions. Six of these tasks involved the role of school manager and were:

1. Student discipline.
2. Student government activities.
3. Extra curricular activities.
4. Coordination of special services.
5. Scheduling of classes.

Outside of budget preparation, senior high school principals spent the greatest amount of time in the five listed tasks. The junior high and elementary school principals, respectively, spent the lesser amount of time on these tasks.

The three other tasks that demanded different time allocations of the principals studied included acting as a resource person, an instructional leadership role, and working with noneducational agencies, a community leader role. The elementary principals devoted more time to these tasks than did the junior high or senior high principals. The task of selection and hiring of staff, a personnel leader role, had a descending rank order emphasis between the senior high, junior high, and elementary school principals, respectively.

Finally, Bowman (1977) found that there was a significant relationship between one's prior experience as an assistant principal and the time one spends on an activity now as a principal. Those who
were assistant principals before used larger portions of their time in the preparation of a master schedule, budget preparation, and student government activities. In relation to this study, this finding appears to support further examination of perceptions of assistant principals in regard to the principalship.

In 1974, Smith and Wilson compiled one of the most comprehensive reviews of literature in regard to the functions of the various principalships. Based on eight major studies reported in *ERIC Research in Education* (Smith & Wilson, 1974a, 1974b, 1974c, 1974d; Wilson & Smith, 1974a, 1974b, 1974c, 1974d) they reported many and varied subcategories of functions for the different level principalships.

Using content analysis as the methodology and content variables used by previous investigators, they reviewed periodicals from the *Education Index* of 1970-1973 and books listed in the 1973 edition of *Books in Print*. Table 2 shows the major findings by school level and type of literature where the functions of the principal were appropriately mentioned.

One may observe from the table that two major trends appear in regard to the functions mentioned for the different school level principalships. First, whether a function is mentioned in a periodical or book made a difference on the number specified and at what level. Secondly, there were a lot of content variables that were undetermined or unspecified as to school level. One may find argument that this occurs because it should apply to all levels as some authors put forth in regard to common and specialized competencies for the principalship (Boles & Davenport, 1975; Downey, 1963;
Table 2

Principal Functions by School Level and Literature Reported

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Category</th>
<th>Elementary Periodicals</th>
<th>Middle School Periodicals</th>
<th>Junior School Periodicals</th>
<th>Senior School Periodicals</th>
<th>Undetermined Periodicals</th>
<th>Total Periodicals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and instructional leadership</td>
<td>Periodicals 41</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Books 23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel guidance</td>
<td>Periodicals 43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Books 49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School community relations</td>
<td>Periodicals 14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Books 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative responsibility</td>
<td>Periodicals 7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Books 29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Periodicals 12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Books 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional development</td>
<td>Periodicals 12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Books 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Periodicals 129</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Books 130</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
McNally & Dean, 1963). Although Smith and Wilson did not consider the reference group with which the various writers associated themselves when writing about the respective functions or competency areas, one still finds it plausible that had reference groups been considered it will clarify the competencies or functions where they most apply.

Another determined effort to isolate competencies by school levels using various reference groups was done by Rose in 1971 when he investigated the competencies for the principalship in the junior high school. He found that there are competencies considered specific and unique in importance to the junior high school position.

Using the questionnaire technique, he sought the opinions of superintendents, secondary principals in the North Central Association, and members of the Committee on Junior High School Education of the National Association of Secondary School Principals regarding the importance of competencies for the junior or senior high school principalship. In the questionnaire, a column for the junior high and a column for the senior high was provided for the rating of items with a response range of no importance, designated by a zero (0), and critical in importance, designated by a five (5), for the two level principalships.

Ten competencies had mean ratings higher for the junior high school than for the senior high school principal position. These were:

1. Knowledge of child growth and development.

2. Background of successful experience as an elementary school teacher.
3. Background of successful experience as a junior high school teacher.

4. Background of successful experience as a junior high school administrator.

5. Background of successful experience as an elementary school administrator.

6. Knowledge of the development and function of elementary schools.

7. Knowledge of the development and function of junior high schools.

8. Understanding current issues, problems, and practices of core curriculum.

9. Knowledge and understanding of sound elementary school curriculum practices.

10. Knowledge and understanding of effective block time teaching technique. (Rose, 1971, p. 169)

Using the chi-square test in regard to the distribution of ratings of these 10 competencies, Rose found the responses to all of them to be significant at the .01 probability level.

Although not tested for significance because it was outside of the purview of Rose's study, the following competencies were rated higher for the senior high school than for the junior high school principalship:

1. Background of successful experience as a senior high school teacher.

2. Background of successful experience as a senior high school administrator.


4. Knowledge of development and function of senior high schools.

5. Knowledge of development and function of junior colleges.
6. Understanding the function of adult education.
7. Understanding the role of vocational education.
9. Understanding the role of regional accrediting agencies.
10. Knowledge and understanding of sound secondary school curriculum practices.
11. Understanding the role of out-of-class activities, such as clubs, athletics, etc.
12. Understanding methods and techniques used in supervising out-of-class activities. (pp. 74-78)

All of these competencies were rated an average of 4.25 in importance to the senior high school principalship. One may recall that the highest rating considered critical in importance was 5.0.

Finally, the study did show that the different groups of respondents used by Rose (1971) had differences in opinions in regard to specific competencies. Superintendents, principals, and the jury members did offer differences in perceptions in regard to the rank importance of the competencies.

Differences in principalship competency expectations are not only attributed to school level differences but also to the ideal and actual roles held for the principal position. Cook and Van Otten (1973) studied prime competencies and administrative tasks for secondary school principals as perceived by superintendents, secondary school principals, and secondary school teachers from Utah and Colorado. They compared ideal and actual roles perceived for the principalship.
Using the questionnaire technique to rank the various administrative tasks and competency foundation statements, Cook and Van Otten found that the referent groups had varied perceptions on how the principal was presently performing and ought to be performing his/her administrative tasks when compared along the "is" and "ought" continuum and according to one's present role and residence. There was little agreement between and among the referent groups regarding how much time the principal was presently spending in the performance of administrative tasks; however, there was very significant agreement between and among the referent groups regarding how much time the principal ought to be spending in performing these same tasks.

The respondents felt that the principals were spending most of their time in the functions of (a) student control, (b) school plant and building level organization and control, (c) business affairs, (d) student activities, (e) staff improvement, and (f) personnel staffing. On the other hand, they felt that a principal should rank order his or her time to the functions of (a) staff improvement, (b) program evaluation and planning, (c) personnel staffing, (d) research and development, and (f) pupil personnel services. Cook and Van Otten concluded that the referent groups tended to regard leadership areas as being more important than areas representing organizational management.

In 1961, Thorin sought the accuracy with which selected secondary school principals perceived the ideal and actual role expectations held for them by their staff and superintendent. Teachers, principals, and superintendents were asked to rank order the ideal
and actual roles of secondary principals using a 12-item questionnaire. In addition, the principals were asked to rate how they perceived the teachers and superintendents will rate the ideal and actual roles of the secondary principal.

The roles or functions and the syndromes (tasks under each role) rated by Thorin (1961) were:

A. Curriculum function

1. Assisting teachers in diagnosing difficulties of pupils; assisting teachers to plan effective instruction; orienting new staff and improving staff relations.

2. Stimulating and upgrading departmental activities; stimulating and upgrading the pupil activity program; stimulating and upgrading pupil reporting procedures.

3. Stimulating and upgrading the guidance program; stimulating and upgrading program for exceptional children; stimulating and developing professional staff leadership.

4. Supervising professional staff; giving leadership planning of professional staff meetings; assisting staff in securing effective instructional material.

B. Administrative function

1. Distributing budget equitably among all departments; inventorying supplies and equipment; supervising and auditing internal accounts.

2. Disciplining for classroom behavior; scheduling professional staff assignments; maintaining good condition of building facilities.

3. Preparing staff and administrative bulletins; developing building policies; enforcing Board of Education, Superintendent, and Building policies.

4. Rating the effectiveness of individual staff members; keeping building free from safety hazards--fire drills, tornado drills, etc.; preparing
reports for accrediting agencies, Superintendent, state department, Board of Education, etc.

C. Public relation function

1. Encouraging and fostering P.T.A.; encouraging local citizens to serve as resource persons to the school; encouraging parents to feel a part of total school program.

2. Creating community goodwill toward importance of public education; releasing building information to the press; supporting community activities by attendance.

3. Interpreting school program to community; providing means for personal contacts between home and school; assisting staff in maintaining school-community relations.

4. Developing teacher understanding of impact students have on school-community relations; assisting teachers to understand community backgrounds; protecting teachers from parental attacks. (pp. 139-140)

Thorin (1961) found that the teachers and the superintendents expressed the greatest agreement on the principal's role. However, the principals have a closer agreement with the teachers in regard to the ideal roles than with the superintendents. The superintendents' ideal and actual role perceptions were more in agreement than the teachers' ideal and actual role perceptions on the principalship. The principals themselves did not demonstrate agreement on their perceived ideal and actual roles. Finally, the perceptions of the principals as a whole were not in agreement with the staff and superintendents in regard to the ideal and actual roles of the secondary principal.

All the groups were in agreement in regard to the rank order of ideal role being curriculum function, administrative function, and
public relation function, respectively. The major discrepancies were
in the ideal role held and the actual role perceived.

The syndromes where significant differences existed between the
ranking of the ideal and actual roles perceived involve the first
three curriculum tasks, the latter two administrative tasks, and
public relations task number one.

Melton (1971) reported that differences continued to exist over
time in the way principals actually spent their time and the ideal
time they wished to spend on various tasks. This phenomenon would
appear to complicate the question of competencies.

Table 3 shows the comparison of two studies from which Melton
formed his conclusions. The findings are based on Melton's 1959
dissertation study in which principals in Michigan were asked to
estimate the actual time spent and the ideal time to be spent in
regard to the fulfillment of the role of principal. Snyder (1968)
did a similar study 10 years later in California. Melton (1971) sum­
marized the findings in regard to the principals in the elementary
schools as follows:

I am doing some of the "more important" functions of a
principal; however, there are many "more important" ones
that I am not actually doing.

As for the less important items, sometimes I actu­
ally do what I think should be done; sometimes I don't;
and sometimes I'm not sure. On the other hand, I tend
to feel that more often than not, I spend my time doing
the "less important."

In the area of school-community relations, I am cer­
tainly not doing what I want to do. Also, I question my
judgment about what I should be doing. (p. 42)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and instructional leadership</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Includes philosophical and psychological theories, program supervision, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel guidance (Professional personnel service and student personnel)</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School community relations (Communications, community-school development, curriculum interpretation)</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative responsibility (Relationships with central staff, school plant, routine operations)</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation (Evaluation of objectives, teacher and pupil progress, etc.)</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional improvement (In-service, research, recruitment, etc.)</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gross and Herriott (1965) posited a rationale for the continuous differences in expectations and perceptions on the ideal and actual role expectations of professionals. They hold that most professionals go through a dual socialization process. The first socialization is the preparatory phase in which the training institutions prepare one for some idealized role of the profession to practice thereby providing the initial credential of competence. The second phase involves the phase of organizational reality in which one practices one's profession and further refines or makes real his or her role. These authors proffered:

The norms and values they (the professionals) encounter in the two settings may or may not be the same. The training experiences in the colleges or universities inculcate in them ideal images of their roles. But these conceptions of their roles may be at variance with those held by significant others in the organizations in which they work. (p. 95)

The five major groups of interest to this study in regard to their perceptions of competencies for the principalship would appear to be influenced by the dual socialization process that Gross and Herriott (1965) mention and would contribute to differences in expectations for the principalship. The differences in training background itself have been shown to contribute to differences in perceptions (Hazuda, 1966).

Hazuda sought the perceived competencies of New York School Business Officials from the judgments of business officials certified by the Civil Service Commission and those certified by the state education agencies. This investigation first sought the help of chief school officers of the school districts to identify job competencies.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
From the list of suggestions he derived, Hazuda asked the two groups of business officials to rate the competencies. He found that there were agreements specific to effective performance and that each of the job competencies incorporate one of the following developable skills—technical, human, and conceptual. However, business officials certified by the Civil Service Commission ranked business skills in the technical areas more important than those certified by the education agencies who ranked human and conceptual skills as more important.

The differences in expectations due to subordinate and superordinate relationships operating in an education organization have also been shown to influence role expectations thereby affecting competency expectations. Halpin (1956) called attention to the differences that exist between expectations of leadership held by school superintendents, members of the board, and other staff members of the superintendent. He stated:

Evidence from this inquiry . . . show that the leader's description of his own leadership behavior and his concept of what his behavior should be have little relationship to others' perceptions of his own behavior that others have. Both reference groups, the board and the staff, impose expectations on how he (the superintendent) should behave as a leader. When these expectations are essentially similar he (the superintendent) probably encounters no difficulty in orienting his behavior to them. But to the extent that they are incompatible, he (the superintendent) is placed in a position of potential role conflict. (p. 300)

Firth (1976), continuing in the same vein, suggested that discrepancies in expectations will always exist between the perceptions of leadership by subordinates and superiors. However, he posited that leadership style perceived as effective is that which is
consonant with the nature and expectations of the group to be led. Inference may be drawn from these authors that the same may occur in relation to competency expectations.

Although most of the studies cited so far have mainly called attention to the elementary and secondary school level expectations, it appears that the central office level, as a third level, does influence and present differences in expectations on the principalship. One may recall Campbell's (1965) contention that the function of the principal is mainly a communications agent for the central office.

Knezevich (1962) also posited that the level of administration presents situations requiring differing degrees of information about the substantive problems, nature of learners, and information on learners themselves. The principal, being in the middle of the levels of administration, must fulfill differing information requirements, expertise, and coordination between and among the levels of administration if he or she is to function effectively. These expectations are in addition to the normal requirements of his or her building reference group needs.

There appears to be no study in regard to the perceptions of consultants, other central office administrators, and assistant principals per se outside of those already cited concerning their perceptions of needed competencies for the position of principal. Gross and Herriott (1965) partially support this judgment when they stated "parenthetically, we became aware of how little is known about these functionaires and the apparently ambiguous nature of their functions" (p. 156). The functionaires in this instant were specifically the
assistant principals but other support personnel involved in providing services to the schools were also alluded to.

Differences in expectations and perceptions in regard to the principalship have thus been reviewed and appear to come from varied concerns of different groups working with the principal. Some of the differences stem from the ideal and actual role expectations perceived of the principal. The study of Melton (1971) presented the problem of differences in ideal and actual role expectations as continuing even over time. Other differences in expectations have been offered as coming from school level and administrative level differences. Still others have found that the types of certification or training that one holds have a bearing on what one holds as expected competencies. Some differences have been found to stem from the varied tasks that a principal performs in the respective school levels. All these differences appear to be a function of the reference groups working with the principal who define, change, refine, or reinforce competency expectations for the principalship (Campbell, 1965; Foskett, 1967; Heald & Moore, 1968; Holder, 1962).

The reference groups of interest to this study and their perceptions on needed competencies for the principalship are principals, assistant principals, teachers, and central office administrators and consultants. The relationship of these positions to their perceptions of needed principal competencies are now posited as the hypotheses tested in this study.
The Hypotheses

The hypotheses posited for investigation by this study were that differences in perceptions of needed principalship competencies existed between and among the principals, assistant principals, teachers, and central office administrators and consultants. These differences are suggested as follows:

1. The perceptions of principals in the elementary schools will differ from those in the secondary schools in regard to needed competencies for the position of principal.

2. The perceptions of assistant principals in the elementary schools will differ from those in the secondary schools in regard to needed competencies for the position of principal.

3. The perceptions of teachers in the elementary schools will differ from those in the secondary schools in regard to needed competencies for the position of principal.

4. The perceptions of administrators in the central office will differ from those of consultants in the central office in regard to needed competencies for the position of principal.

5. The principals, assistant principals, teachers, and central office staff, when compared one to the other, will hold differing perceptions on needed competencies for the position of principal in the Guam public schools.

The design of the study to test these hypotheses is now described in Chapter III.
CHAPTER III

THE DESIGN OF THE STUDY

The selection and characteristics of the population studied, the data collection procedures, the instrumentation, and the statistical methods used are now described.

Population and Sample

All principals, assistant principals, and central office administrators and consultants in Guam were used as part of the population of this study. A directory of these personnel was available from the Guam Department of Education and was utilized to identify this population group.

Additionally, teachers were randomly selected from a listing which was also available from the Department of Education in Guam. From a table of random numbers taken from Glass and Stanley (1970), a systematic random procedure was used to get at the needed respondents from the elementary and secondary school teachers. It should be noted that all the respondents used in the study are only those working in the public school system in Guam.

Data available from the Guam Department of Education showed the following population breakdown:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Elementary</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asst. principals</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>413</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

41
Central office: Consultants 18 Administrators 14
The samples used from each subgroup were:

Principals: Elementary 27 Secondary 7
Asst. principals: Elementary 5 Secondary 11
Teachers: Elementary 241 Secondary 203
Central office: Consultants 18 Administrators 4

Data Collection Procedures

Permission had been granted earlier in July 1979 to conduct the study (Appendices B & C), but since there was a change in the directorship (chief state school officer) of the Guam Department of Education, a follow-up permission was approved during the implementation of this study in April 1980 (Appendix D).

Questionnaires were sent via first class mail to the principals, assistant principals, and central office administrators and consultants using their respective Guam school address. Each questionnaire had a letter explaining the study and soliciting assistance for participation (Appendix E) in addition to a stamped self-addressed envelope for the return of the questionnaire.

Those questionnaires involving the teachers were delivered by the spouse of this investigator to the respective schools where the teachers taught. This procedure was done in order to expedite and ensure the delivery of the research packets to the various schools and teacher samples.

Follow-up letters were sent to those not responding from the first mailing. The first follow-up letters (Appendix F) were sent
during the third week after the first mailing. The second follow-up letters were sent on the fifth week from the date of first mailing. Since the questionnaires were coded, follow-up letters were sent to only those who had not yet responded. Finally, all the follow-up letters were coordinated and delivered to the appropriate respondents by the spouse of this investigator. The latter procedure was done under written instructions from this investigator. This was to ensure that responses were kept confidential and on a voluntary basis.

A third and final follow-up was done by this investigator himself upon returning to Guam in June 1980. During this month, those principals, assistant principals, teachers, central office consultants and administrators who had not responded were personally contacted by this investigator. On July 31, 1980, it was decided that those not responding were either not interested or not willing to participate or cooperate in the study.

The Instrument

The instrument used in this study was designed by this investigator using the format of Rose (1971) and the competency listings of Lipham and Hoeh (1974), McIntyre (1974), and those investigators noted in Chapter II. Additionally, the Civil Service Commission job specification for the principal position in Guam was used verbatim in the last section of the questionnaire.

Rationale for this procedure is supported by the works of Thorin (1961) and Smith and Wilson (1974a) in which they based their final instrument on previous works of other investigators and some additions
of their own. The use of the Guam principal job specification was in keeping with a partial purpose of this study in validating through reference groups the said specifications. Lastly, the competency listing from the Commission closely resembled those included by Rose in 1971.

The rating scale used to get at the perceived importance of the competencies was the same as those used by Rose (1971). This scaling appeared to yield better differentiation in getting at perceived competencies compared to those used by Situmorang (1970). The ratings therefore were:

1 = No importance
2 = Very little importance
3 = Slightly less than average importance
4 = Slightly above average importance
5 = Highly important
6 = Critical in importance

Finally, the sources cited support the validity of the contents and design of the instrument.

Section A of the instrument (see Appendix C) permitted the identification of the respective referent groups of the study. Section B permitted the identification and rating of the 23 competencies, 12 identified from the literature and 11 from the principal job description.
Data Analysis Procedures

After the data were received, the first procedure was to transfer the raw data from the questionnaires to optical scanning sheets procured from the Western Michigan University Testing Center. This procedure allowed for the data to be stored in disks for ease in automated data processing. A codebook was devised correlating the transfer of the raw data to the scanning sheets. Basically, what the codebook provided was the identification of each item in the questionnaire to each numerical position in the scan sheets. This allowed the investigator not to lose the positions of the variables with respect to the overall data collected.

After the data were transferred to disks and entered with the Western Michigan University PDP10 Computer, an initial frequency run of the data was done. Based on this initial data processing and the scrutiny of the positions of the variables using the codebook, this investigator gave written instructions on the scoring of the data and the statistical analysis to be performed.

The independent variable categories of the analyses of the data included the respective elementary and secondary principal, assistant principal, and teacher positions in addition to the consultant and administrator positions of the central office. The dependent variables were the 12 competencies identified from the literature and the 11 competencies included in the present Guam principal job description.
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Scoring involved with the dependent variables were derived using two methods. Scoring of the competencies derived from the literature was done by computing the mean response to the four items comprising each respective competency. The remaining 11 job specifications competency scores were the response category checked by the respondents for each item corresponding to the competency. Since missing data were indicated by a response category of 9 in the codebook, all scores were derived by using only the items which had appropriate responses.

After tabulation of the scores, the data were first analyzed by computing the median of the combined sets of scores (Siegel, 1956, p. 111) of the independent variable categories. Secondly, the median derived from the respective computations was used to dichotomize the sets of scores above or below the median. Where a particular score fell at the median itself, such a score was considered and placed at the above the median category (Siegel, 1956, p. 112). Besides noting the frequencies of occurrence of the dichotomized scores, percentages of the score categories were also used in formulating the contingency tables of the sets of scores.

Finally, the Fisher exact probability test (Siegel, 1956, pp. 96-101) and the chi-square test for two independent samples (Median test) and k independent samples (Siegel, 1956, pp. 104-115, 179-184) were the inferential techniques used to test the null hypotheses with alpha, the probability of committing a Type I error, equal to .05.

The Fisher exact technique was used to test the hypotheses that there were differences in ratings of needed competencies for the principalship between elementary and secondary principals, elementary
and secondary assistant principals, and central office consultants and administrators, respectively. The chi-square test for two independent samples (Median test) was used to test the hypothesis that there were differences in ratings of needed competencies for the principalship between elementary and secondary teachers. The chi-square test for k independent samples was used to test the hypothesis that there were differences in ratings of needed competencies for the principalship between principals, assistant principals, teachers, and central office staff.

The results and overall findings of the study are discussed in Chapter IV.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

This study sought to assess needed competencies for the position of principal as perceived by principals, assistant principals, and teachers in the elementary and secondary school levels of the Guam public schools. Perceptions of central office administrators and consultants were also sought.

Generally, it was hypothesized that between and among the principals, assistant principals, teachers, and central office consultants and administrators, differences in perceptions exist regarding the competencies needed for the position of principal in Guam.

What follows now are the results of the study first summarizing the response rates and then the results of the test of the respective hypotheses. Finally, a summary of the overall results conclude the chapter.

Response Rates

Completed questionnaires were received from 332 of the professional educators mentioned above for an overall response of 74%. Out of these 332 responses, 328 were found to be usable. Table 4 displays the frequency distribution of the population, sample, and returns.

It should be noted that originally, the teachers randomly selected included 241 and 203 from the elementary and secondary levels, respectively. However, 32 of the elementary teachers and 47

48
of the secondary teachers had resigned sometime during the school year. This phenomenon occurs frequently in Guam because of the transient status of some teachers. The sample sizes in Table 4 do not include those teachers who resigned. Not considering those who resigned, teachers who did not respond appear to be equally distributed among the respective elementary and secondary schools. One may assume, therefore, that a random occurrence is reflected by the teacher responses.

Table 4

Frequency Distribution of Population, Samples, and Response Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Usable Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Principals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27 (100%)</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7 (100%)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assistant principals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5 (100%)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11 (100%)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Central office</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14 (100%)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultants</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16 (89%)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teachers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>146 (70%)</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>106 (68%)</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1,105</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>332 (74%)</td>
<td>328</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Based on these returns, the data were analyzed to test the respective hypotheses which now follow. The results of the comparison of the perceptions of elementary and secondary principals in regard to competencies for the principalship will be given first. It is followed by those of the elementary and secondary assistant principals, those of the elementary and secondary teachers, those of the central office consultants and administrators, and finally the results of the overall comparison of the groups combined into four distinct sets—principals, assistant principals, teachers, and central office personnel. Each section corresponds to a major hypothesis of this study.

Principals and Needed Competencies

The first perceptions of interest to this study in regard to needed competencies for the principalship in Guam were those of the elementary and secondary principals. It was hypothesized that the elementary and secondary principals will hold differing perceptions in regard to the competencies needed. As noted in Chapter II, 23 competencies were rated by this group of educators. Table 5 shows the results and comparisons of the competency ratings. The responses were dichotomized above or below the median of the combined scores (henceforth, median will be defined this way).

The null hypothesis that the proportion of the ratings on the competencies by the elementary principals above or below the median equaled to the proportion of the ratings of the secondary principals was tested by applying the Fisher exact technique with alpha, the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Level of Competency</th>
<th>Elementary Principals (N = 27)</th>
<th>Secondary Principals (N = 7)</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of program relevance</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>62.96%</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>37.04%</td>
<td>57.14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and organizing programs</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>74.07%</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>25.93%</td>
<td>57.14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing programs</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>70.37%</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td>.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>29.63%</td>
<td>71.43%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating programs</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>70.37%</td>
<td>57.14%</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>29.63%</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing staff resources</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>85.71%</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff development</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>51.85%</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>48.15%</td>
<td>57.14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating staff performance</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>48.15%</td>
<td>85.71%</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>51.85%</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing student services</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>55.56%</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>44.44%</td>
<td>71.43%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competency</td>
<td>Level of Competency</td>
<td>Elementary Principals (N = 27)</td>
<td>Secondary Principals (N = 7)</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieving student involvement</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>70.37%</td>
<td>71.43%</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>29.63%</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing and managing financial resources</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>55.56%</td>
<td>85.71%</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>44.44%</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing and managing school plant resources</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>59.26%</td>
<td>57.14%</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>40.74%</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing school community relations</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>62.96%</td>
<td>57.14%</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>37.04%</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of the principles and practices of school administration</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>74.08%</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>25.92%</td>
<td>57.14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of the board's policies and departmental personnel rules, regulations and procedures</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>70.37%</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>29.63%</td>
<td>57.14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of the principles and practices of educational technology with emphasis in curriculum and instructional areas</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>81.48%</td>
<td>85.71%</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>18.52%</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to administer the program of the school</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>77.78%</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>22.22%</td>
<td>57.14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competency</td>
<td>Level of Competency</td>
<td>Elementary Principals (N = 27)</td>
<td>Secondary Principals (N = 7)</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to maintain school discipline</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>57.14%</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to make decisions in accordance with laws, policies, rules and regulations</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>85.19%</td>
<td>57.14%</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>14.81%</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to work effectively with the public and employees</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>70.37%</td>
<td>71.43%</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>29.63%</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to communicate effectively</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>77.78%</td>
<td>57.14%</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>22.22%</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to maintain records and prepare reports</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>92.59%</td>
<td>57.14%</td>
<td>.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>7.41%</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three (3) years of professional teaching experience in the appropriate grade level</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>77.78%</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>22.22%</td>
<td>57.14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two (2) years of administrative and/or supervisory experience</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>81.48%</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
<td>.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>18.52%</td>
<td>57.14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p ≤ .05
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probability of committing a Type I error, equal to .05. As can be concluded from Table 5, the null hypothesis was rejected in regard to three competencies only. These were (a) implementing programs, (b) ability to maintain records and prepare reports, and (c) 2 years of administrative and/or supervisory experience. The elementary principals saw the need for these competencies to a greater degree than did secondary principals. Therefore, the research hypothesis of differences in perceptions was confirmed in these instances.

Outside of the aforementioned significant results, one may elaborate (Babbie, 1973) in regard to the findings or results. From the same Table 5, the elementary and secondary principals differed in their ratings of some competencies which came close to rejecting the null hypothesis, that is, alpha, the probability of committing a Type I error, equal to .10. The competencies rated along this line included (a) planning and organizing programs, (b) evaluating staff performance, (c) knowledge of the principles and practices of school administration, (d) ability to administer the program of the school, and (e) 3 years of professional teaching experience in the appropriate grade level.

In addition, one may note, however, that both elementary and secondary principals appear to consider the following competencies as important based on their ratings being both above the median. The competencies included:

1. Evaluating programs
2. Organizing staff resources
3. Achieving student involvement
4. Providing and managing financial resources
5. Providing and managing school plant resources
6. Providing school community relations
7. Knowledge of the principles and practices of educational technology with emphasis in curriculum and instructional areas
8. Ability to maintain school discipline
9. Ability to make decisions in accordance with laws, policies, rules, and regulations
10. Ability to work effectively with the public and employees
11. Ability to communicate effectively

A note about a peculiarity on the dichotomies reported in Table 5. One may observe that in some instances there exists a deviation in proportions much greater than normally expected of around 50% above the median on the combined scores. This occurs because there were a number of scores right at the median of the combined scores. Following the suggestion of Siegel (1956, p. 112), these scores were considered as exceeding the median, therefore, they were placed on the above the median category. This peculiarity in dichotomizing sets of scores may be present in subsequent tables discussed. Henceforth, this investigator will assume this explanation of the peculiarity of the scores in instances where it occurs.

Assistant Principals and Needed Competencies

The second perceptions of interest to this study in regard to needed competencies for the principalship were those of assistant principals. It was hypothesized that the elementary and secondary
assistant principals will hold different perceptions in regard to competencies needed for the principalship. The same 23 competencies rated by the principals were rated by the assistant principals. Table 6 displays data on the responses of the assistant principals.

The null hypothesis that the proportion of responses of the elementary assistant principals falling above or below the median with respect to the rating of the competencies equaled the proportion of the responses of the secondary assistant principals on the same dichotomy was tested by using the Fisher exact technique with alpha, the probability of committing a Type I error, equal to .05. As can be concluded from Table 6, the overall responses of the assistant principals failed to show any competency where the null hypothesis was rejected. The research hypothesis of differences in perceptions by elementary and secondary assistant principals regarding needed competencies for the principalship was not confirmed. It appears there is no clear difference in perceptions between these two groups with respect to needed principal competencies. The competency which came closest to supporting the research hypothesis was that of providing and managing school plant resources ($p = .12$). The elementary assistant principals, in this instance, felt the competency as most important for the principalship.

Finally, outside of the competency of staff development, the two groups of assistant principals rated the rest of the competencies as important to the principalship. This is evidenced by their ratings falling mainly above the median.
Table 6
Median of Combined Ratings of Elementary and Secondary Assistant Principals by Competency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Level of Competency</th>
<th>Elementary Assistant Principals (N = 5)</th>
<th>Secondary Assistant Principals (N = 11)</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of program relevance</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>63.64%</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>36.36%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and organizing programs</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>54.55%</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>45.45%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing programs</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>54.55%</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>45.45%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating programs</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
<td>90.91%</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing staff resources</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
<td>72.73%</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>27.27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff development</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
<td>45.45%</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>54.55%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating staff performance</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>72.73%</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>27.27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing student services</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
<td>54.55%</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>45.45%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competency</td>
<td>Level of Competency</td>
<td>Elementary Assistant Principals (N = 5)</td>
<td>Secondary Assistant Principals (N = 11)</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieving student involvement</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>63.64%</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>36.36%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing and managing financial resources</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>63.64%</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>36.36%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing and managing school plant resources</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
<td>36.36%</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>63.64%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing school community relations</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>72.73%</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>27.27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of the principles and practices of school administration</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>81.82%</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>18.18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of the board's policies and departmental personnel rules, regulations and procedures</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>63.64%</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>36.36%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of the principles and practices of educational technology with emphasis in curriculum and instructional areas</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>90.91%</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to administer the program of the school</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>72.73%</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>27.27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Level of Competency</th>
<th>Elementary Assistant Principals (N = 5)</th>
<th>Secondary Assistant Principals (N = 11)</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability to maintain school discipline</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>72.73%</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>27.27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to make decisions in accordance with laws,</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>81.82%</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>policies, rules and regulations</td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>18.18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to work effectively with the public and</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
<td>72.73%</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employees</td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>27.27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to communicate effectively</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
<td>63.64%</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>36.36%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to maintain records and prepare reports</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>90.91%</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three (3) years of professional teaching experience</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
<td>81.82%</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the appropriate grade level</td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>18.18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two (2) years of administrative and/or supervisory</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
<td>90.91%</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experience</td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p ≤ .05
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Teachers and Needed Competencies

The third perceptions of importance to this study in regard to principal competencies were those of the elementary and secondary teachers. It was hypothesized that differences in perceptions exist between elementary and secondary teachers on competencies for the position of principal in Guam. Data showing the results of the ratings of the elementary and secondary teachers on the 23 competencies are contained in Table 7. As noted earlier, responses were dichotomized above or below the median of the combined scores.

The null hypothesis that the proportion of ratings by the elementary teachers falling above or below the median equaled the proportion of ratings by the secondary teachers was tested by using the chi-square (Median test) technique, with alpha, the probability of committing a Type I error, equal to .05. The null hypothesis was rejected in four instances of the 23 competencies rated as shown in Table 7. The competencies which were perceived significantly different by the elementary and secondary teachers at one degree of freedom included (a) staff development (chi square = 6.02, \( p = .01 \)), (b) providing school community relations (chi square = 7.18, \( p = .00 \)), (c) knowledge of the principles and practices of educational technology with emphasis in curriculum and instructional areas (chi square = 7.38, \( p = .00 \)), and (d) ability to maintain records and prepare reports (chi square = 5.06, \( p = .02 \)). The elementary teachers considered these competencies as needed for the principalship to a greater extent than did the secondary teachers, thus confirming the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Level of Competency</th>
<th>Elementary Teachers (N = 145)</th>
<th>Secondary Teachers (N = 105)</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of program relevance</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>56.55%</td>
<td>55.24%</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>43.45%</td>
<td>44.76%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and organizing programs</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>56.55%</td>
<td>46.67%</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>43.45%</td>
<td>53.33%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing programs</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>67.59%</td>
<td>57.14%</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>32.41%</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating programs</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>51.43%</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>48.57%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing staff resources</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>53.10%</td>
<td>47.62%</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>46.90%</td>
<td>52.38%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competency</td>
<td>Level of Competency</td>
<td>Elementary Teachers (N = 145)</td>
<td>Secondary Teachers (N = 105)</td>
<td>( \chi^2 )</td>
<td>( p )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff development</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>53.79%</td>
<td>38.10%</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>46.21%</td>
<td>61.90%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating staff performance</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>53.10%</td>
<td>57.14%</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>46.90%</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing student services</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>57.24%</td>
<td>52.38%</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>42.76%</td>
<td>47.62%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieving student involvement</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>47.59%</td>
<td>53.33%</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>52.41%</td>
<td>46.67%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing and managing financial resources</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>59.31%</td>
<td>60.95%</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>40.69%</td>
<td>39.05%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing and managing school plant resources</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>55.86%</td>
<td>55.24%</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>44.14%</td>
<td>44.76%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competency</td>
<td>Level of Competency</td>
<td>Elementary Teachers (N = 145)</td>
<td>Secondary Teachers (N = 105)</td>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing school community relations</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
<td>7.18</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>57.14%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of the principles and practices of school administration</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>51.72%</td>
<td>44.76%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>48.28%</td>
<td>55.24%</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of the board's policies and departmental personnel rules, regulations and procedures</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>57.93%</td>
<td>52.38%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>42.07%</td>
<td>47.62%</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of the principles and practices of educational technology with emphasis in curriculum and instructional areas</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>86.21%</td>
<td>72.38%</td>
<td>7.38</td>
<td>.00*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>13.79%</td>
<td>27.62%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to administer the program of the school</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>62.86%</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>37.14%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to maintain school discipline</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>66.90%</td>
<td>67.62%</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>33.10%</td>
<td>32.38%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Level of Competency</th>
<th>Elementary Teachers (N = 145)</th>
<th>Secondary Teachers (N = 105)</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability to make decisions in accordance with laws, policies, rules and regulations</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>63.45%</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>36.55%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to work effectively with the public and employees</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>63.45%</td>
<td>61.90%</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>36.55%</td>
<td>38.10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to communicate effectively</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>64.14%</td>
<td>61.90%</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>35.86%</td>
<td>38.10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to maintain records and prepare reports</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>79.31%</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>20.69%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three (3) years of professional teaching experience in the appropriate grade level</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>72.41%</td>
<td>77.14%</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>27.59%</td>
<td>22.86%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two (2) years of administrative and/or supervisory experience</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>71.72%</td>
<td>61.90%</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>28.28%</td>
<td>38.10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p \leq .05$
research hypothesis on these instances. The only other competencies which came close to supporting the research hypothesis was that of implementing programs and 2 years of administrative and/or supervisory experience if one considers alpha, the probability of committing a Type I error, equal to .10.

Finally, one may note that the elementary and secondary teachers appear to consider the following competencies as needed for the principalship based on both their ratings falling above the median. The competencies included:

1. Assessment of program relevance
2. Evaluating programs
3. Evaluating staff performance
4. Providing student services
5. Providing and managing financial resources
6. Providing and managing school plant resources
7. Knowledge of the board's policies and departmental personnel rules, regulations and procedures
8. Knowledge of the principles and practices of educational technology with emphasis in curriculum and instructional areas
9. Ability to administer the program of the school
10. Ability to maintain school discipline
11. Ability to make decisions in accordance with laws, policies, rules and regulations
12. Ability to work effectively with the public and employees
13. Ability to communicate effectively
14. Three (3) years of professional teaching experience in the appropriate grade level
15. Two (2) years of administrative and/or supervisory experience.

Central Office Personnel and Needed Competencies

Additional perceptions of interest to this study regarding competencies needed for the position of principal were those of the consultants and administrators at the central office of the Guam Department of Education. It was hypothesized that the perceptions of consultants will differ from those of administrators in regard to needed competencies. Again, the same 23 competencies were rated by this group as did the teachers, assistant principals, and principals already mentioned. Table 8 shows the results of the ratings by the consultants and administrators.

The null hypothesis that the proportion of consultant responses falling above or below the median equaled the proportion of the responses of the administrators was tested by applying the Fisher exact technique with alpha, the probability of committing a Type I error, equal to .05. Based on results shown in Table 8, the null hypothesis was rejected only with the competency of ability to work effectively with the public and employees. Administrators perceived this competency as more important for the principalship than did the consultants.

If one may further note, only one other competency rating came close to confirming the research hypothesis. This is the competency of three (3) years of professional teaching experience in the appropriate grade level with alpha, the probability of committing a Type I
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Level of Competency</th>
<th>Consultants (N = 15)</th>
<th>Administrators (N = 13)</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of program relevance</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>61.54%</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>38.46%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and organizing programs</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>46.67%</td>
<td>46.15%</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>53.33%</td>
<td>53.85%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing programs</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>73.33%</td>
<td>84.62%</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>26.67%</td>
<td>15.38%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating programs</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>61.54%</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>38.46%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing staff resources</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>76.92%</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>23.08%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff development</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>61.54%</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>38.46%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating staff performance</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>53.33%</td>
<td>76.92%</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>46.67%</td>
<td>23.08%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing student services</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>46.67%</td>
<td>30.77%</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>53.33%</td>
<td>69.23%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competency</td>
<td>Level of Competency</td>
<td>Consultants (N = 15)</td>
<td>Administrators (N = 13)</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieving student involvement</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>53.33%</td>
<td>53.85%</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>46.67%</td>
<td>46.15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing and managing financial resources</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>84.62%</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>15.38%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing and managing school plant resources</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>61.54%</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>38.46%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing school community relations</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>73.33%</td>
<td>53.85%</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>26.67%</td>
<td>46.15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of the principles and practices of school administration</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>61.54%</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>38.46%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of the board's policies and departmental personnel rules, regulations and procedures</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
<td>61.54%</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>38.46%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of the principles and practices of educational technology with emphasis in curriculum and instructional areas</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
<td>76.92%</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>23.08%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to administer the program of the school</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>53.33%</td>
<td>76.92%</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>46.67%</td>
<td>23.08%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competency</td>
<td>Level of Competency</td>
<td>Consultants (N = 15)</td>
<td>Administrators (N = 13)</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to maintain school discipline</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>53.33%</td>
<td>76.92%</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>46.67%</td>
<td>23.08%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to make decisions in accordance with laws, policies, rules and regulations</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>76.92%</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>23.08%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to work effectively with the public and employees</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>92.31%</td>
<td>.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>7.69%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to communicate effectively</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>84.62%</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>15.38%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to maintain records and prepare reports</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>86.67%</td>
<td>84.62%</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>13.33%</td>
<td>15.38%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three (3) years of professional teaching experience in the appropriate grade level</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>46.67%</td>
<td>76.92%</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>53.33%</td>
<td>23.08%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two (2) years of administrative and/or supervisory experience</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>66.67%</td>
<td>53.85%</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>46.15%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P ≤ .05
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error equal to .08 in this instance.

The ratings of the consultants and administrators on the remaining competencies failed to reject the null hypothesis and thus the research hypothesis of differences in perceptions was not confirmed. Evidently there were no clear differences in perceptions between the consultants and administrators regarding these competencies.

Finally, outside of the aforementioned competencies, many of the competencies were shared by both consultants and administrators to be important for the principalship based on their above median ratings. The competencies included:

1. Assessment of program relevance
2. Implementing programs
3. Evaluating programs
4. Organizing staff resources
5. Staff development
6. Evaluating staff performance
7. Achieving student involvement
8. Providing and managing financial resources
9. Providing and managing school plant resources
10. Providing school community relations
11. Knowledge of the principles and practices of school administration
12. Knowledge of the board's policies and departmental personnel rules, regulations and procedures
13. Knowledge of the principles and practices of educational technology with emphasis in curriculum and instructional areas
14. Ability to administer the program of the school
15. Ability to maintain school discipline

16. Ability to make decisions in accordance with laws, policies, rules and regulations

17. Ability to communicate effectively

18. Ability to maintain records and prepare reports

19. Two (2) years of administrative and/or supervisory experience

It appears the consultants and administrators perceived nearly all of the competencies examined by this study to be important for the Guam principal position.

The Educator Groups and Needed Competencies

The final comparison of perceptions regarding the needed competencies for the principalship that was of interest to this study involved those of the combined perceptions of principals, assistant principals, teachers, and central office staff. It was hypothesized that between each of these groups there will be differences in opinions regarding needed competencies for the principalship. Table 9 displays the results of the responses by these four major groups of educators.

The null hypothesis that the proportion of responses above or below the median of principals, assistant principals, teachers, and central office staff was equal to each other was tested by the chi-square technique. As may be observed from Table 9, the null hypothesis was rejected on three competencies, (a) evaluating programs (chi square = 7.41 and $p = .05$), (b) organizing staff resources (chi square = 10.713, $p = .01$), and (c) knowledge of the principles
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Level of Competency</th>
<th>Principals (N = 34)</th>
<th>Assistant Principals (N = 16)</th>
<th>Teachers (N = 250)</th>
<th>Cent. Off. Staff (N = 28)</th>
<th>( \chi^2 )</th>
<th>( p )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of program relevance</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>58.82%</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>56.00%</td>
<td>60.71%</td>
<td>2.378</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>41.18%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>44.00%</td>
<td>39.29%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and organizing programs</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>67.65%</td>
<td>56.25%</td>
<td>52.40%</td>
<td>46.43%</td>
<td>3.467</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>32.35%</td>
<td>43.75%</td>
<td>47.60%</td>
<td>53.57%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing programs</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>61.76%</td>
<td>56.25%</td>
<td>63.20%</td>
<td>78.57%</td>
<td>3.141</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>38.24%</td>
<td>43.75%</td>
<td>36.80%</td>
<td>21.43%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating programs</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>67.65%</td>
<td>87.50%</td>
<td>56.40%</td>
<td>64.29%</td>
<td>7.411</td>
<td>.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>32.35%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>43.60%</td>
<td>35.71%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing staff resources</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>70.59%</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>50.80%</td>
<td>71.43%</td>
<td>10.713</td>
<td>.01*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>29.41%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>49.20%</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competency</td>
<td>Level of Competency</td>
<td>Principals (N = 34)</td>
<td>Assistant Principals (N = 16)</td>
<td>Teachers (N = 250)</td>
<td>Cent. Off. Staff (N = 28)</td>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td>$p$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff development</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>56.25%</td>
<td>47.20%</td>
<td>64.29%</td>
<td>3.271</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>43.75%</td>
<td>52.80%</td>
<td>35.71%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating staff performance</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>55.88%</td>
<td>68.75%</td>
<td>54.80%</td>
<td>64.29%</td>
<td>1.964</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>44.12%</td>
<td>31.25%</td>
<td>45.20%</td>
<td>35.71%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing student services</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>62.50%</td>
<td>55.20%</td>
<td>39.29%</td>
<td>3.251</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
<td>44.80%</td>
<td>60.71%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achieving student involvement</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>70.59%</td>
<td>62.50%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>53.57%</td>
<td>5.709</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>29.41%</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>46.43%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing and managing financial resources</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>61.76%</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>3.583</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>38.24%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing and managing school plant resources</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>58.82%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>55.60%</td>
<td>60.71%</td>
<td>.610</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>41.18%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>44.40%</td>
<td>39.29%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competency</td>
<td>Level of Competency</td>
<td>Principals (N = 34)</td>
<td>Assistant Principals (N = 16)</td>
<td>Teachers (N = 250)</td>
<td>Cent. Off. Staff (N = 28)</td>
<td>x²</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing school community relations</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>61.76%</td>
<td>81.25%</td>
<td>52.80%</td>
<td>64.29%</td>
<td>6.419</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>38.24%</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
<td>47.20%</td>
<td>35.71%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of the principles and practices of school administration</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>67.65%</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>48.80%</td>
<td>60.71%</td>
<td>8.477</td>
<td>.03*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>32.35%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>51.20%</td>
<td>39.29%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of the board's policies and departmental personnel rules,</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>64.71%</td>
<td>62.50%</td>
<td>55.60%</td>
<td>71.43%</td>
<td>3.423</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regulations and procedures</td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>35.29%</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
<td>44.40%</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of the principles and practices of educational technology</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>82.35%</td>
<td>93.75%</td>
<td>80.40%</td>
<td>78.57%</td>
<td>1.902</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with emphasis in curriculum and instructional areas</td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>17.65%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>19.60%</td>
<td>21.43%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to administer the programs of the school</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>70.59%</td>
<td>62.50%</td>
<td>61.20%</td>
<td>64.29%</td>
<td>1.167</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>29.41%</td>
<td>37.50%</td>
<td>38.80%</td>
<td>35.71%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competency</td>
<td>Level of Competency</td>
<td>Principals (N = 34)</td>
<td>Assistant Principals (N = 16)</td>
<td>Teachers (N = 250)</td>
<td>Cent. Off. Staff (N = 28)</td>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to maintain school discipline</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>64.71%</td>
<td>68.75%</td>
<td>67.20%</td>
<td>64.29%</td>
<td>.190</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>35.29%</td>
<td>31.25%</td>
<td>32.80%</td>
<td>35.71%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to make decisions in accordance with laws, policies, rules and regulations</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>79.41%</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>64.80%</td>
<td>67.86%</td>
<td>3.392</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>20.59%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>35.20%</td>
<td>32.14%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to work effectively with the public and employees</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>70.59%</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>62.80%</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>2.934</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>29.41%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td>37.20%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to communicate effectively</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>73.53%</td>
<td>68.75%</td>
<td>63.20%</td>
<td>75.00%</td>
<td>2.750</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>26.47%</td>
<td>31.25%</td>
<td>36.80%</td>
<td>25.00%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to maintain records and prepare reports</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>85.29%</td>
<td>93.75%</td>
<td>74.00%</td>
<td>85.71%</td>
<td>6.349</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>14.71%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>26.00%</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 9—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Level of Competency</th>
<th>Principals (N = 34)</th>
<th>Assistant Principals (N = 16)</th>
<th>Teachers (N = 250)</th>
<th>Cent. Off. Staff (N = 28)</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Three (3) years of professional teaching in the</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>70.59%</td>
<td>81.25%</td>
<td>74.40%</td>
<td>60.71%</td>
<td>3.053</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appropriate grade level</td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>29.41%</td>
<td>18.75%</td>
<td>25.60%</td>
<td>39.29%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two (2) years of administrative and/or supervisory</td>
<td>Above median</td>
<td>73.53%</td>
<td>87.50%</td>
<td>67.60%</td>
<td>60.71%</td>
<td>3.961</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experience</td>
<td>Below median</td>
<td>26.47%</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>32.40%</td>
<td>39.29%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p ≤ .05
and practices of school administration (chi square = 8.477, p = .03).
By descending order of needs emphasis, the assistant principals emphasized the competency of evaluating programs and knowledge of the principles and practices of school administration to a greater extent followed by the principals, central office staff, and then the teachers. Along the same line of descending order emphasis, the assistant principals, central office staff, principals, and teachers emphasized the competency of organizing staff resources. In these two instances, the research hypothesis of differences in opinions on principal competency need was confirmed. As regards the rest of the competencies, it appears no clear differences could be deduced from the responses of the principals, assistant principals, teachers, and central office staff.

One may observe further from Table 9 that there are competencies that were rated as most important by certain of the educator groups. Going down the table and looking at the highest proportion of the ratings on the competencies as the most important emphasis by the respective position holders, one may summarize as follows:

1. The principals rated the competencies of (a) planning and organizing programs, (b) achieving student involvement, (c) ability to administer the programs of the school, and (d) ability to make decisions in accordance with laws, policies, rules, and regulations as most important based on a comparison to the other responses.

2. The assistant principals rated the competencies of (a) assessment of program relevance, (b) evaluating programs, (c) organizing staff resources, (d) evaluating staff performance, and
(e) providing student services, (f) providing and managing financial resources, (g) providing school community relations, (h) knowledge of the principles and practices of school administration, (i) knowledge of the principles and practices of educational technology with emphasis in curriculum and instructional areas, (j) ability to maintain school discipline, (k) ability to work effectively with the public and employees, (l) ability to maintain records and prepare reports, (m) 3 years of professional teaching experience in the appropriate grade level, and (n) 2 years of administrative and/or supervisory experience as most important from a comparison to the rest of the responses. In two instances of the competencies (f and k), the assistant principals had similar ratings as the central office staff.

3. The central office staff, in the same vein, rated the competencies of (a) implementing programs, (b) staff development, (c) providing and managing school plant resources, (d) knowledge of the board's policies and departmental personnel rules, regulations, and procedures, and (e) ability to communicate effectively as most important.

Continuing from the same Table 9, the teachers did not rate any competency where they put the greatest emphasis when compared to the rest of the group.

Summary

Differences in perceptions were found between and among the elementary and secondary principals, assistant principals, teachers, and central office consultants and administrators regarding the
proportions of their ratings on 23 competencies. Differences were based on dichotomized responses above or below the median of the respective combined scores.

The null hypotheses were tested using sample data from the above group by applying appropriately either the Fisher exact test or the chi-square test for two and k independent samples with alpha, the probability of committing a Type I error, equal to .05.

Ten out of the 23 competencies examined as to need for the principalship were rated differently between and among at least one of the groups. The competencies rated differently included (a) implementing programs, (b) evaluating programs, (c) organizing staff resources, (d) staff development, (e) providing school community relations, (f) knowledge of the principles and practices of school administration, (g) knowledge of the principles and practices of educational technology with emphasis in curriculum and instructional areas, (h) ability to work effectively with the public and employees, (i) ability to maintain records and prepare reports, and (j) 2 years of administrative and/or supervisory experience.

The elementary and secondary principals differed in their opinions regarding the need for the competencies of implementing programs, ability to maintain records and prepare reports, and 2 years of administrative and/or supervisory experience for the principalship.

The elementary and secondary teachers differed in their ratings on the need for the competencies of staff development, providing school community relations, knowledge of the principles and practices of educational technology with emphasis in curriculum and instructional
areas, and ability to maintain records and prepare reports for the principal position.

The consultants and administrators differed in regard to how important they perceived the competency of ability to work effectively with the public and employees is to the principalship.

The principals, assistant principals, teachers, and central office staff showed different responses regarding the need of the competencies evaluating programs, organizing staff resources, and knowledge of the principles and practices of school administration for the principalship.

Finally, the elementary and secondary assistant principals did not differ in any of their ratings on the competencies needed for the position of principal in Guam.

Further, the ratings to the remaining 13 of the 23 competencies examined between and among the respective group sets failed to reject the null hypotheses when tested. The competencies where no differences in perception of need for the principalship were observed include (a) assessment of program relevance, (b) planning and organizing programs, (c) evaluating staff performance, (d) providing student services, (e) achieving student involvement, (f) providing and managing financial resources, (g) providing and managing school plant resources, (h) knowledge of the board's policies and departmental personnel rules, regulations, and procedures, (i) ability to administer the programs and activities of a school, (j) ability to maintain school discipline, (k) ability to make decisions in accordance with laws, policies, rules, and regulations, (l) ability to
communicate effectively, and (m) 3 years of teaching experience in the appropriate grade level.

The conclusions, implications, and recommendations, and the summary of the study follow in Chapter V.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS,
AND SUMMARY OF THE STUDY

The conclusions, implications, and recommendations are presented in this chapter followed by the summary of the study.

Conclusions

In this study, it was hypothesized that persons holding various positions in the Guam public schools will have differing perceptions in regard to competencies needed for the position of principal in the Guam public schools.

The first major conclusion to be drawn based on the findings of this study is that there are differences in perceptions which various educators hold in regard to needed competencies for the position of principal in Guam. In specific instances of competencies examined, which will be cited later, the research hypothesis predicting differences among the educator groups was confirmed. This conclusion lends support to Holder's (1962) contention of differing perceptions by teachers but adds the additional perceptions of principals and central office consultants and administrators.

Other major conclusions to be drawn from this study are:

1. Where the competencies were found to be rated different between the elementary and secondary school personnel, the elementary school personnel emphasized the need for the competencies rather than
the secondary school personnel.

2. Where the ratings on the competencies were found to be rated different between the consultants and the administrators, the latter position holders provided the emphasis on the importance of the competency.

3. Where the competencies were found to be rated different between the overall group of principals, assistant principals, teachers, and central office staff, the assistant principals, in most instances, provided the greatest emphasis on the competencies noted while the teachers provided the least emphasis on the same competencies noted.

The competencies perceived differently by the principals, assistant principals, teachers, and central office staff are further discussed in light of the school level, central office level, and overall combined level expectations.

**School Level Personnel Perceptions of Competencies**

At the school level, the findings of this study supported the contention in three instances of the competencies examined that elementary principals and secondary principals will hold differences of opinions in regard to competencies for the principalship. The elementary principals offered the three competencies of implementing programs, maintaining records and preparing reports, and 2 years of administrative experience to be of greater importance to the principalship than did the secondary school principals. This finding is in contrast to what Bowman (1977) found as an emphasis by the senior
high school principals based on reports by the principals on greatest amount of time spent on a particular role. The emphasis for the need of administrative experience is supported by Rose (1971) but found this in regard to the junior high principalship rather than the senior high principalship.

Elementary and secondary teachers confirmed the contention of this study that they will differ in competency expectations for the principalship. The elementary teachers offered the competencies of (a) staff development, (b) providing school community relations, (c) knowledge of the principles and practices of educational technology with emphasis in curriculum and instructional areas, and (d) ability to maintain records and prepare reports as very important for the principalship. In the particular competency of staff development, the secondary teachers greatly underrated the competency.

The competencies noted as important by the elementary teachers appear to indicate a concern for those which benefit them more closely. This phenomenon of the principal-teacher relationship was reported by Holder in 1962. The provision for school community relations as a major concern, however, differs with Holder's findings. He concluded that it was the least critical act of a principal as reported by teachers, principals, and superintendents. But Thorin (1961) found significant differences in opinions regarding school community relations when he sought the comparison of actual and ideal roles of a principal. Generally, there appears to be support on the importance of school community relations for educational administration as evidenced by most federally supported programs having advisory
councils in funded projects.

The competency concerning knowledge of the principles and practices of educational technology with emphasis in curriculum and instructional areas affords claim with the elementary teachers to what Melton (1971), Snyder (1968), and Lipham and Hoeh (1974) reiterated are the theoretical and practical competency needs for principals. This competency emphasis lends credence to Bowman's (1977) finding in which elementary principals reported having spent more time on their instructional leadership role than did the junior high and senior high principals. One should keep in mind and contrast, however, the earlier mentioned managerial roles which the elementary principals perceived for themselves. Melton's (1971) summary of the tension of ideal and actual roles perceived and interacting in the daily activity of a principal pointed out to this persistent role shifts in the principalship.

Because most of the competencies just noted were rated higher by the principals and teachers in the elementary school level, it might be concluded that the elementary educators are more definitive in their perceptions of needed competencies for the principalship. In addition, it may be concluded that needed competencies may be offered which agree more with what the elementary school personnel perceived for the principalship rather than by the secondary school personnel.

On the other hand, the principals and teachers in the secondary school level appear to rate lower in importance those competencies rated high by the elementary school personnel. This was quite evident by the secondary principals showing responses concentrated below the
median in the competencies of implementing programs and 2 years of administrative and/or supervisory experience. In the same way, the secondary teachers rated the competencies of staff development and providing school community relations as not too important for the secondary school principalship.

The findings of this study regarding the assistant principalship ratings perchance revealed that another phenomenon in rating may be occurring. The elementary and secondary assistant principals rated most of the competencies as important by the greater proportion of their responses above the median but failed to confirm the contention of this study that their perceptions will be different. It appeared that there were no clear differences in perceptions by these two groups of educators regarding needed competencies for the principalship. This finding possibly relates to what Smith and Wilson (1974a, 1974b, 1974c) found as the pervasive mentioning of functions, roles, and competencies in the literature but with no clear demarcation as to what school level principalship it may apply. Leu and Rudman (1963) addressed this concern by trying to separate so-called common and specialized learnings for school administration. It appeared the assistant principals as a whole were concentrating on common learnings or competencies and not concerned with specialized learnings or competencies. The principals and teachers, on the other hand, were able to proffer specialized learnings or competencies as evidenced by the competencies they were able to rate differently.
Central Office Personnel Perceptions

The central office staff consisting of consultants and administrators did rate the competency of ability to work effectively with the public and employees differently thus confirming the research hypothesis predicting differences in this instance. The administrators rated this competency quite highly. Campbell (1965) would appear to concur with this competency rating when he suggested that the central office expects the principal to be an overall communications agent by being a buffer between the central office, teachers, students, and the community.

Overall Educator Perceptions on Competency

Not only were there differences perceived between the respective sets of educators just mentioned, but when the responses of the principals, assistant principals, teachers, and central office staff were combined and compared, there were differences in ratings which the group as a whole put forward regarding the competencies. The contention that differences between these groups existed in regard to their ratings on needed principal competencies was confirmed in regard to the competencies of evaluating programs, organizing staff resources, and knowledge of the principles and practices of school administration. In most instances, the assistant principals and principals rated these competencies high whereas the teachers and central office staff had lower ratings when compared as a whole. Again, differences in rating appear to center on the concern for the theoretical and
practical aspects of a principal's function which Lipham and Hoeh (1974) perceived to be a dynamic process moving in a continuum from theory to practice and then vice versa. Cook and Van Otten (1973) support the principals and assistant principals in this instance when they found that superintendents, secondary principals, and secondary teachers from Utah and Colorado felt that principals ought to be spending most of their time in the functions of staff improvement, program evaluation and planning, and personnel staffing.

Implications and Recommendations

The school principal position is strategically situated where direct and indirect influences continually bear upon the teaching-learning environment. The principalship, therefore, calls for certain expectations of those occupying the position or involved with the position.

The findings of this study suggest that principals should be concerned with the competencies where differing perceptions are present. In some instances, as in the elementary school personnel responses, the competencies could be differentiated to a greater extent from one principalship level to the other. In other instances it was not too clear. In this latter situation, it is harder for the principal to discern expectations. By regarding the differences noted along descriptive statistics, especially those competencies where differences in ratings approached statistical significance, it may assist one in lessening the guesswork on the relative judgments of particular reference groups. One may note these with those
involved in this study.

In addition, by looking at the relative emphasis or nonemphasis of particular competencies by the respective groups of principals, assistant principals, teachers, and central office staff, present principals (elementary and secondary) may be able to deduce which competencies to concentrate on and develop and which to hold in abeyance. This is especially important if one agrees with Hemphill, Griffiths, and Frederiksen's (1962) suggestion on the relative judgments of school districts on what they perceived are successful principals.

Principals looking at the various and differing competency expectations may be able to judge the congruence or dissonance of perceptions when compared to theirs. Should the latter be the case, then some manner of reducing the conflicting perceptions should be worked out or else use the data on differences contained in this study to identify the differences and work toward accepting them. Lipham (1962) did stipulate that dissonance or noncongruent perceptions may be a healthy state in a profession necessary to produce change. Finally, the findings of this study may be used as a basis for conducting workshops on needed competencies for the principalship in Guam.

The design of the study and the results obtained appear to be satisfactory as a procedure in examining and differentiating competencies for the principalship. This should especially be noted since the 23 competencies examined were derived from the literature and those listed verbatim from the Guam principal job description.
Differences were discerned by the respondents even though the competency listings were from the literature and from the job description.

After an assessment of the data, several directions for further study seemed warranted concerning needed competencies for the principalship.

The results from the larger sample teachers in this study appear to suggest that it may be worthwhile to pursue the same examination of needed competencies but this time with larger samples of principals, assistant principals, and central office staff. In addition, other variables besides position should be incorporated and may include age, sex, educational background, ethnic background, prior positions held, and others.

Additionally, the study may be expanded to assess the following questions:

1. What behaviors are exemplary of those competencies identified by the respective groups of educators?

2. What do parents and students perceive as needed competencies for the principalship?

3. What do other education professionals and semi-professionals perceive are the needed competencies for the principalship? In regard to this question and number 2, one may use the suggested reference groups that Saxe (1968) mentioned.

4. When competencies for the principalship are discernible from various groups, how do they relate to school climate, student achievement, and other school performance indicators?
5. What are the needed competencies for other education professionals who complement the principalship in the education organization?

6. What are the interrelationships of principal competencies and other educator competencies?

These and other questions arising based on results obtained may complement and supplement this study.

Summary of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine differences in perceptions between various educators regarding needed competencies for the position of principal in Guam. The study was undertaken because of the relative lack of empirical data in Guam regarding competencies for education administrator positions. In addition, there appeared to be a need to examine the perceptions of others on competencies for the principalship outside of those included by Holder in 1962.

The research population consisted of 1,105 educators of the Guam school system. All the 34 principals, 16 assistant principals, and 14 administrators and 18 consultants of the central office were used for this study. In addition, a random sample of 365 teachers out of a population of 1,023 was also used. One hundred percent of the principals, assistant principals, and central office administrators provided usable responses. Eighty-three percent of the consultants and 67% of the teachers sampled provided usable responses.

A 54-item questionnaire was developed and used in this study from the competency listings of Lipham and Hoeh (1974), those found
in the literature, and those included in the present job description of the Guam principalship. Twenty-three competencies resulted from this procedure.

Responses on the ratings of the competencies by the elementary and secondary principals, elementary and secondary assistant principals, elementary and secondary teachers, and central office consultants and administrators, respectively, were compared using the dichotomy of responses above or below the median of the respective combined scores. The null hypotheses were tested by applying appropriately either the Fisher exact or the chi-square test for two and k independent samples with alpha, the probability of committing a Type I error, equal to .05.

Differences were found on the ratings of the competencies by the respective educator groups as follows:

1. The elementary and secondary principals differed in their opinions regarding the need for the competencies of implementing programs and 2 years of administrative and/or supervisory experience for the principalship.

2. The elementary and secondary teachers differed in their ratings on the need for the competencies of staff development, providing school community relations, knowledge of the principles and practices of educational technology with emphasis in curriculum and instructional areas, and ability to maintain records and prepare reports for the principal position.

3. The consultants and administrators differed in regard to how important they perceived the competency of ability to work
effectively with the public and employees is to the principalship.

4. The combined responses of principals, assistant principals, teachers, and central office staff showed different responses regarding the need for the competencies of evaluating programs, organizing staff resources, and knowledge of the principles and practices of school administration for the principalship.

However, no difference was found between the perceptions of the elementary and secondary assistant principals in regard to their ratings of the competencies needed for the position of principal in Guam.

The study concluded that certain competencies are perceived quite differently by the various educator groups and may be a basis for specifying principalship competencies for the Guam school system.
APPENDICES
Appendix A

School Principal Job Description
SCHOOL PRINCIPAL
(Elementary, Secondary, and Special Education)

NATURE OF WORK IN THIS CLASS:
This is professional administrative work involved in the management of a school. Employee is responsible for all functions of the education program of the school. Work is performed in accordance with Board policies, laws, rules and regulations.

ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLES OF WORK:
Administers the programs and activities of a school.

Conducts regular meetings with the faculty and department heads; discusses curricula or other problems pertaining to the objectives of the educational program.

Supervises the preparation of periodic reports concerned with pupils and teachers progress, attendance, disciplinary matters, and maintenance of the school plant and equipment.

Confers with pupils, teachers, and parents in matters concerning the individual adjustment of particular students, and, where necessary, takes appropriate disciplinary measures.

Promotes extra-curricular activities and assigns teachers to activities which are developed; initiates and promotes effective school-community relationships through contacts with community groups.

Prepares and submits the school's budget; monitors expenditures of funds.

Maintains and controls the various non-appropriated funds generated by student activities or school related activities.

Performs related duties as required.

MINIMUM KNOWLEDGE, ABILITIES, AND SKILLS:
Knowledge of the principles and practices of school administration.

Knowledge of the Board's policies and departmental personnel rules, regulations and procedures.

Knowledge of the principles and practices of educational technology with emphasis in curriculum and instructional areas.
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School Principal

Ability to administer the programs and activities of a school.
Ability to maintain school discipline.
Ability to make decisions in accordance with laws, policies, rules and regulations.
Ability to work effectively with the public and employees.
Ability to communicate effectively, orally and in writing.
Ability to maintain records and prepare reports.

MINIMUM EXPERIENCE AND TRAINING:

(a) Three (3) years of professional teaching experience at the appropriate level and graduation from a recognized college of university with a Bachelor's degree, including 18 semester hours of professional education courses, and 36 semester hours of graduate courses related to school administration and supervision (including school administration and supervision, curriculum development, school law, school finance, school personnel administration), and two (2) years of administrative and/or supervisory experience; or

(b) Three (3) years of professional teaching experience at the appropriate level and graduation from a recognized college or university with a Master's degree in school administration and supervision, including 24 semester hours of graduate courses related to school administration and supervision (including school administration and supervision, curriculum development, school law, school finance, school personnel administration), and two (2) years of administrative and/or supervisory experience; or

(c) Any equivalent combination of experience and training beyond a Bachelor's degree which provides the minimum knowledge, abilities and skills.

Established: June 1973
First Approved-Amendment: December 1978

DAVID R. FLORES, Executive Director
Civil Service Commission
SCHOOL PRINCIPAL
(Elementary, Secondary, Special and Career Education)
Duty: Twelve Months

Nature of Work:

This is responsible administrative and supervisory work in the direction, supervision and management of a school unit. An employee in this class is responsible for all aspects of the educational program of the school and work is performed in accordance with Board policies, prescribed rules, regulations, and procedures. Supervision is exercised over professional and subprofessional employees engaged in the implementation of educational programs and processes. General supervision is received from the Deputy Director of Education and work is reviewed through periodic visits, conferences, and submission of program objectives and performance reports.

Examples of Work:

- Directs and supervises teaching staff in the execution of an extensive school program; maintains contact with teachers through department heads and visits specific classrooms; directs school custodial and maintenance force engaged in minor maintenance and upkeep program.
- Conducts regular meetings with the faculty and department heads discussing curricula or other problems pertaining to the objectives of the educational program.
- Supervises the preparation of periodic reports concerned with pupils and teacher progress, attendance and disciplinary matters, and the maintenance of the plant and equipment.
- Conferences with pupils, teachers, and parents in matters concerning the individual adjustment of particular students and, where necessary, takes appropriate disciplinary measures.
- Promotes extra-curricular activities and assigns teachers to activities which are developed; stimulates effective school-community relationships through contacts with community groups.
- Prepares and submits the school's budgetary requests, and monitors expenditures of funds.
- Maintains and controls the various non-appropriated funds generated by student activities or school related activities.

Minimum Qualification Requirements:

(A) Master's degree with a minimum of 18 semester hours of professional education, and a minimum of 15 semester hours of graduate work in professional education with major emphasis on administration and supervision plus four years of successful teaching experience at the appropriate level and two years of successful school administrative and/or supervisory experience.
Appendix B

Letter of Request to Conduct Study
July 2, 1979

Ms. Elaine Cadigan, Director  
Department of Education  
Government of Guam  
Agana, Guam 96910

Dear Ms. Cadigan:

I am now at the dissertation stage of my terminal degree program and my interests are in doing a study that would be germane to the education scene in Guam. I have chosen as a topic the review and analysis of competencies for the position of principal in the Guam public schools. I plan to seek through a questionnaire instrument the perceptions of principals, assistant principals, teachers, consultants, and central office administrators on what competencies are important for the position of principal.

I am requesting your kind office for permission to conduct the study in the schools with the above mentioned population.

When the study is finished, I will be more than happy to share the results with you and the school district.

Thank you for your attention. I look forward to hearing your positive response.

Sincerely,

JOSE Q. CRUZ
Appendix C

Letter of First Approval to Conduct Study
July 17, 1979

Joe Q. Cruz  
Division of Business Research  
and Services  
College of Business and Public  
Administration  
University of Guam  
P.O. Box EK  
Agana, Guam 96910

Dear Mr. Cruz:

I received your letter of July 6 requesting permission to conduct a study of the principalship in our Guam public schools.

You may proceed with your study but bear in mind that responses are on a voluntary and confidential basis.

Good luck in your educational endeavor and I look forward to getting results of your study.

Sincerely,

MARY ELAINE CADIGAN
Appendix D

Letter of Second Approval to Conduct Study
April 24, 1980

Memorandum

To: Director of Education
From: Teofila P. Cruz
Subject: Research Study

I request your cooperation and assistance to visit the public schools to disseminate these questionnaire on behalf of my husband Jose Q. Cruz, a former Department of Education staff who is presently working on his Doctorate.

This research will be on a voluntary basis and all information will be held in confidence.

Attachment

APPROVED:

LEONILA L.G. HERRERO
Director of Education, Acting

Date: 4/24/80
Appendix E

Letter of Solicitation to Participate in Study
Research is an increasing and important endeavor in Guam. With the focus on the political, social, and educational developments in the Western Pacific, research activities are of critical importance to understanding Guam's position as well as its neighbors.

As a practitioner in the field of education, you probably share my interests in knowing more about present educational practices in Guam. As educators of Guam, our contributions to the understanding of these practices are necessary toward the island's educational development.

I am soliciting your assistance in sharing in the exciting activity of research. As a dissertation research, my particular interests are in the judgments of professionals regarding needed competencies for the position of principal. I hope you can spare a few minutes of your precious time to indicate your responses to the items in the enclosed questionnaire addressing this research concern.

If you will notice, the questionnaire is coded so as to allow for appropriate follow-up should it be necessary. Your responses will be kept confidential and the number code is to be used for purposes of this study only. After the study is completed, the number coding will be destroyed.

After you are done, please send in your completed questionnaire in the enclosed stamped envelope.

If you wish a copy of an abstract of the study, please include your address when returning the questionnaire.

Thank you for your assistance and cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Jose Q. Cruz
Doctoral Associate

Uldis Smidchens, Ph.D.
Professor
Appendix F

Follow-Up Letter
Recently I sent you a short questionnaire seeking your judgment on needed competencies for the position of principal in Guam. Since I sent out only a specific number of these questionnaires, your responses are very important to the accuracy of the study. To date I have not received your questionnaire responses.

I would appreciate your assistance in completing the enclosed questionnaire and returning it to me in the enclosed self-addressed, stamped envelope. Please be assured that although the questionnaire is coded your responses will be kept in strictest confidence and for purposes of this study only.

In the event that you have already filled out and returned the first questionnaire, please disregard this letter.

Thank you for your assistance and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Jose Q. Cruz
Doctoral Associate

Uldis Smidchens, Ph.D.
Professor
Appendix G

Principal Competency Questionnaire
The purpose of this study is to identify the competencies needed for the position of principal in the Guam public schools. The first section of the questionnaire asks general information about yourself. The second section asks your perception of needed competencies for the principalship.

1. I am now a:

- Principal--elementary
- Principal--junior high
- Principal--senior high
- Assistant Principal--elementary
- Assistant Principal--junior high
- Assistant Principal--senior high
- Teacher--elementary
- Teacher--junior high
- Teacher--senior high
- Central Office Administrator
- Central Office Consultant/Coordinator

2. The highest university or college degree I have earned to date is:

- Associate
- Bachelor
- Master
- Doctorate
- Other Specify

3. I am:

- Female
- Male

In the following competency statements, please judge the importance of the competencies for the principalship you presently hold, or with which you work or are associated the most.

Competencies are defined as the technical, human, and conceptual skills that enable a principal to perform his or her job adequately. Please read carefully the rating scale. Indicate your estimation of the importance of the stated competencies by circling your response for each item as follows:

1 = No Importance
2 = Very Little Importance
3 = Less Than Average Importance
4 = Above Average Importance
5 = Highly Important
6 = Critical in Importance
I. ASSESSMENT OF PROGRAM RELEVANCE

1. Assessing trends in society that demand curricular change 1 2 3 4 5 6

2. Delineating general and specific learner needs that are basic to the instructional program 1 2 3 4 5 6

3. Directing the assessment of learner needs that are unique to the school and community 1 2 3 4 5 6

4. Integrating school goals and objectives 1 2 3 4 5 6

II. PLANNING AND ORGANIZING PROGRAMS

1. Examining and recommending program alternatives, procedures, and structures for instructional programs 1 2 3 4 5 6

2. Using research and other information in formulating viable alternatives for change 1 2 3 4 5 6

3. Using planned techniques and models for short and long range goals 1 2 3 4 5 6

4. Articulating programs within grades and between grades 1 2 3 4 5 6

III. IMPLEMENTING PROGRAMS

1. Allocating and assigning staff to accomplish instructional goals and objectives 1 2 3 4 5 6

2. Providing resource materials, equipment, and facilities to accomplish instructional goals and objectives 1 2 3 4 5 6
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRINCIPAL COMPETENCY</th>
<th>NO IMPORTANCE</th>
<th>CRITICAL IMPORTANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Acquiring consultant and other technical assistance for program implementation</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Using alternative organizational structures or models for implementing programs</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IV. EVALUATING PROGRAMS

1. Developing administrative information systems for evaluation                    | 1 2 3 4 5 6   |
2. Devising appropriate instruments for evaluation                                 | 1 2 3 4 5 6   |
3. Collecting, organizing, and interpreting data on programs implemented            | 1 2 3 4 5 6   |
4. Using evaluation results for changing school programs                            | 1 2 3 4 5 6   |

V. ORGANIZING STAFF RESOURCES

1. Interviewing and selecting the best qualified teachers, counselors, and other support staff | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
2. Assigning staff to best achieve organizational goals and the goals of individual staff | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
3. Articulating and coordinating individual staff and sub-unit goals and programs with building and overall school system goals and programs | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
4. Encouraging the communication of all staff towards the achievement of school goals and objectives | 1 2 3 4 5 6 |
VI. STAFF DEVELOPMENT

1. Engaging in development activities necessary to update professional knowledge and skills related to educational and administrative processes

2. Using credential requirements in guiding staff improvement

3. Conducting a systematic program of staff improvement

4. Procuring alternative ways to enhance the development of teachers and other support personnel competencies

VII. EVALUATING STAFF PERFORMANCE

1. Achieving staff agreement on the purposes of evaluation and the procedures to be utilized

2. Collecting, analyzing, and reporting data regarding staff performance

3. Using staff performance evaluation results to improve the processes and products of teaching

4. Providing for mutual feedback regarding staff performance evaluation

VIII. PROVIDING STUDENT SERVICES

1. Providing for appropriate student health services
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRINCIPAL COMPETENCY</th>
<th>NO IMPORTANCE</th>
<th>CRITICAL IMPORTANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Providing for the appropriate development and use of student counseling services</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Providing for nutrition and other growth needs of students</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Coordinating with community services available to students</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IX. ACHIEVING STUDENT INVOLVEMENT

1. Making provisions for active student involvement in school program developments | 1 2 3 4 5 6   |                     |
2. Planning, evaluating, and staffing extracurricular programs in the school       | 1 2 3 4 5 6   |                     |
3. Developing and supporting appropriate student government activities             | 1 2 3 4 5 6   |                     |
4. Planning, developing, and implementing programs encouraging the informal interaction of students and the school staff | 1 2 3 4 5 6   |                     |

X. PROVIDING AND MANAGING FINANCIAL RESOURCES

1. Developing and implementing a budget that will enhance school and learning outcomes | 1 2 3 4 5 6   |                     |
2. Procuring local, federal, and other financial resources supplementing budgetary appropriations | 1 2 3 4 5 6   |                     |
3. Providing for appropriate accounting and bookkeeping of all financial resources  | 1 2 3 4 5 6   |                     |
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4. Coordinating school and overall educational system financial needs 1 2 3 4 5 6

XI. PROVIDING AND MANAGING SCHOOL PLANT RESOURCES

1. Procuring equipment and supplies necessary to implement school programs 1 2 3 4 5 6

2. Providing for the appropriate maintenance of buildings, grounds, and equipment for optimum use 1 2 3 4 5 6

3. Managing the appropriate inventorying of school supplies and equipment 1 2 3 4 5 6

4. Providing safe buildings and grounds for all school use 1 2 3 4 5 6

XII. PROVIDING SCHOOL COMMUNITY RELATIONS

1. Coordinating and linking various public and private institutions and agencies operating or related to education 1 2 3 4 5 6

2. Providing interaction between parents, teachers, and students 1 2 3 4 5 6

3. Providing information to the community about school programs 1 2 3 4 5 6

4. Coordinating communication and other appropriate relationship with Central Office staff 1 2 3 4 5 6

XIII. KNOWLEDGE

1. Knowledge of the principles and practices of school administration 1 2 3 4 5 6
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2. Knowledge of the Board's policies and departmental personnel rules, regulations, and procedures 1 2 3 4 5 6

3. Knowledge of the principles and practices of educational technology with emphasis in curriculum and instructional areas 1 2 3 4 5 6

XIV. ABILITIES

1. Ability to administer the programs of the school 1 2 3 4 5 6

2. Ability to maintain school discipline 1 2 3 4 5 6

3. Ability to make decisions in accordance with laws, policies, rules, and regulations 1 2 3 4 5 6

4. Ability to work effectively with the public and employees 1 2 3 4 5 6

5. Ability to communicate effectively 1 2 3 4 5 6

6. Ability to maintain records and prepare reports 1 2 3 4 5 6

XV. EXPERIENCES

1. Three (3) years of professional teaching experience in the appropriate grade level 1 2 3 4 5 6

2. Two (2) years of administrative and/or supervisory experience 1 2 3 4 5 6

THANK YOU

Please return the completed questionnaire, in the envelope supplied, to:

Mr. Jose Q. Cruz
P.O. Box 1935
Agana, Guam 96910
Appendix H

Comparison of Principal Competencies
As Found in the Literature
Lipham & Hoeh's (1974) List of Principal Functions and Corresponding Other Lists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lipham &amp; Hoeh (1974)</th>
<th>Other Authors/Investigators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Improvement of Instruction</td>
<td>Instructional Leader (Bowman, 1977; Sause, 1974)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Program assessment</td>
<td>a. Formal or informal evaluation of existing programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Planning and organizing programs</td>
<td>b. Meeting with individuals or groups to determine performance criteria for improvement of instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Implementing programs</td>
<td>c. Becoming more familiar with instructional programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Evaluating programs</td>
<td>d. Acting as a resource person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and Development (Cook &amp; Van Otten, 1973)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program Evaluation (Cook &amp; Van Otten, 1973)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction (Graff &amp; Street, 1956)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving Educational Opportunity (Griffith, 1966)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing School Unit Goals and Objectives (McIntyre, 1974)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing Needs and Evaluating Programs (McIntyre, 1974)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction (Melton, 1958; Smith &amp; Wilson, 1974; Snyder, 1968)</td>
<td>a. Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working With and Providing Leadership for Teachers and Other Personnel (Holder, 1962)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing and Administering the School Program (Holder, 1962)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lipham & Hoeh (1974)

1. Improvement of Instruction (Cont.)

2. Staff Personnel Services
   a. Organizing staff resources
   b. Staff development
   c. Evaluating staff performance

Other Authors/Investigators

Curriculum Function (Thorin, 1961)
   a. Assisting teachers in diagnosing pupil difficulties
   b. Assisting teachers to plan effective instruction
   c. Stimulating and upgrading departmental activities

Personnel Leader (Bowman, 1977; Sause, 1974)
   a. Selection and hiring of staff
   b. Supervision of professional and nonprofessional staff
   c. Formal or informal measures of promoting good staff morale

Personnel Guidance (Melton, 1958; Smith & Wilson, 1974; Snyder, 1968)
   a. Evaluation

Professional Development (Melton, 1958; Smith & Wilson, 1974; Snyder, 1968)

Staff Personnel (Graff & Street, 1956)

Organizational Structure (Graff & Street, 1956)

Obtaining and Developing Personnel (Griffith, 1966)

Allocating Staff Personnel (McIntyre, 1974)

Developing In-Service Programs (McIntyre, 1974)

Curriculum Function (Thorin, 1961)
   a. Orienting new staff and improving staff relations
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Lipham & Hoeh (1974)

2. Staff Personnel Services (Cont.)

3. Student Personnel Services

Other Authors/Investigators

Curriculum Function (Thorin, 1961) (Cont.)

b. Stimulating and upgrading professional staff leadership
c. Supervising professional staff

Administrative Function (Thorin, 1961)

a. Scheduling professional staff assignment
b. Rating the effectiveness of individual staff members

Personnel Staffing (Cook & Van Otten, 1973)

Staff Improvement (Cook & Van Otten, 1973)

Organizing and Administering the School Program (Holder, 1962)

School Manager (Bowman, 1977; Sause, 1974)

a. Extra-curricular activities
b. Student discipline
c. Student government
d. Coordination of special services

Personnel Guidance (Melton, 1958; Smith & Wilson, 1974; Snyder, 1968)

Improving Educational Opportunity (Griffith, 1966)

Coordinating Non-instructional Support Services (McIntyre, 1974)

Student Personnel (Graff & Street, 1956)

Student Personnel (Cook & Van Otten, 1973)
3. Student Personnel Services (Cont.)

Lipham & Hoeh (1974)

4. Financial and Physical Resources

Other Authors/Investigators

Student Control (Cook & Van Otten, 1973)

Student Activities (Cook & Van Otten, 1973)

Curriculum Function (Thorin, 1961)

a. Stimulating and upgrading the pupil activity program
b. Stimulating and upgrading pupil reporting procedures
c. Stimulating and upgrading the guidance program
d. Stimulating and upgrading programs for exceptional children

Working With and Caring for Students (Holder, 1962)

School Manager (Bowman, 1977; Sause, 1974)

a. Budget preparation
b. Scheduling classes

Administrative Responsibility (Melton, 1958; Smith & Wilson, 1974; Snyder, 1968)

a. Evaluation

Providing and Maintaining Funds and Facilities (Griffith, 1966)

School Plant (Graff & Street, 1956)

Finance & Business Organization (Graff & Street, 1956)

Transportation (Graff & Street, 1956)

Allocating Time & Space (McIntyre, 1974)
4. Financial and Physical Resources
   (Cont.)

5. School Community Relations
   a. Providing school community relations

Other Authors/Investigators

Developing and Utilizing Materials, Equipment, and Facilities
(McIntyre, 1974)

Business Affairs (Cook & Van Otten, 1973)

School Plant and Building Level Organization and Control
(Cook & Van Otten, 1973)

Administrative Function (Thorin, 1961)
   a. Distributing budget equitably
   b. Inventorying supplies
   c. Supervising internal accounts
   d. Maintaining good condition of building
   e. Keeping building free from safety hazards

Organizing and Administering the School Program (Holder, 1962)

Community Leader (Bowman, 1977; Sause, 1974)
   a. Formal or informal meetings with parents of students
   b. Working with non-educational agencies

School Community Relations (Melton, 1958; Smith & Wilson, 1974; Snyder, 1968)

Relating to the Community (Griffith, 1966)

Developing School Community Relations (McIntyre, 1974)

Transportation (Graff & Street, 1956)
Lipham & Hoeh (1974)

5. School Community Relations (Cont.)

Other Authors/Investigators

Public Relation Function (Thorin, 1961)

a. Encouraging and fostering P.T.A.
b. Creating community goodwill
c. Interpreting school program to community
d. Developing teacher understanding of impact students have on school-community relations

Working With Line Organization Superiors (Holder, 1962)

Working With Individual Parents (Holder, 1962)

Working With Community Groups and Agencies (Holder, 1962)
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