Portland State University

PDXScholar

Dissertations and Theses

Dissertations and Theses

1989

A Comparison of Assistant Principal and Principal Perceptions of the Assistant Principalship as a Training Ground in the Secondary School

Patricia Ann Howell
Portland State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/open_access_etds

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Howell, Patricia Ann, "A Comparison of Assistant Principal and Principal Perceptions of the Assistant Principalship as a Training Ground in the Secondary School" (1989). *Dissertations and Theses*. Paper 1373.

<https://doi.org/10.15760/etd.1372>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations and Theses by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

A COMPARISON OF ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL AND PRINCIPAL
PERCEPTIONS OF THE ASSISTANT PRINCIPALSHIP AS A
TRAINING GROUND IN THE SECONDARY SCHOOL

by

PATRICIA ANN HOWELL

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
in
EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP

Portland State University

1989

TO THE OFFICE OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH:

The members of the Committee approve the dissertation
of Patricia Ann Howell presented April 24, 1989.

John D. Lind, Chair

Carrol Tama

Carol Peterman

Maxine Thomas

Gerald Guthrie

APPROVED:

Robert B. Everhart, Dean, School of Education

Bernard Ross, Vice Provost for Graduate Studies

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
LIST OF TABLES	vi
LIST OF FIGURES	vii
CHAPTER	
I INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY	1
Background	4
Purpose of the Study	7
Importance of the Study	9
Limitations of the Study	10
Outline of the Study	11
II LITERATURE REVIEW	12
Lack of Definition for the Assistant Principal's Role	14
Lack of Training Programs and Proposed Solutions	22
The Importance of the Principal in On-the-Job Training Programs	27
Summary	33
III RESEARCH METHODS	35
Research Design	35
Subjects and Sampling	37
Instrumentation	38

	Procedure	41
	Pre-Survey Contact	
	Cover Letter and Survey	
	Post-survey Contact	
	Data Analysis	42
	Summary	45
IV	RESULTS	47
	Data Processing and Pre-Analysis	
	Variable Manipulation	47
	Descriptive Analysis of Demographic	
	Data	50
	Perceptions of the Assistant	
	Principalship as Training for the	
	Principalship: Differences Between	
	Principals and Assistants	57
	Overall Perception of Training	
	Perception of Training by Individual	
	Area	
	Perception of Additional Factors	
	Factors Affecting the Perceptions of	
	Assistant Principals	65
	Staff Size	
	Assistant Principalship as Career	
	Goal	
	Actual Assignments	
	Gender	
	Factors Affecting Principals'	
	Perceptions	80
	Principals' Experience as Assistant	
	Principals	
	Experience as Principal	
	Number of Assistant Principals	
	Supervised	
	Gender	

CHAPTER	PAGE
Factors Affecting the Perceptions of Principals and Assistants: An Interaction Effect Between Group Membership and Gender	88
Summary	92
V SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	98
Summary of Findings	100
Comparison of Principals' and Assistant Principals' Perceptions Factors Influencing Assistant Principals' Perceptions Factors Influencing Principals' Perceptions Interactive Influence of Group Membership and Gender on Perceptions	
Implications of the Findings	107
Recommendations for Future Research . .	109
Conclusion	112
REFERENCES	113
APPENDICES	119
A PILOT STUDY PARTICIPANTS	119
B PILOT STUDY COVER LETTER	121
C PILOT STUDY QUESTIONNAIRE	123
D ALPHABETICAL LIST OF COSA MEMBERS SURVEYED	129
E POSTCARD SENT PRIOR TO QUESTIONNAIRE	176
F QUESTIONNAIRE COVER LETTER	178
G QUESTIONNAIRE	180
H FOLLOW-UP POSTCARD	186

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I	Definitions for Assignment Abbreviations . . .	55
II	Comparison of Training-Value Ratings With Assistant Principals' Actual Assignments	72
III	Gender and Assignment Areas	79
IV	An Examination of the Interaction Between Group Membership and Gender on the Perception of Training Value Using Analysis of Variance	91

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE		PAGE
1.	Demographic Information	51
2.	Comparison of Principal and Assistant Principal Daily Responsibilities	56
3.	Perceived Training Value of Assistant Principal Position	60
4.	Comparative Importance of Assistant Principal Duties	62
5.	Differences in Perceived Value of Training in Small vs. Large Staffs	67
6.	Assistant Principal Assignments in Schools with Small vs. Large Staffs	69
7.	Comparison of Assistant Principal Perceptions with Assignments	74
8.	Perceived Differences in the Value of Training Index Items	77
9.	Differences in the Assignments of Male and Female Assistant Principals	81
10.	Effect of Experience as Assistant Principal on Principals' Perceptions of Training	83

FIGURE

PAGE

11.	Effect of Experience as Principal on Principals' Perceptions of Training	85
12.	Effect of Staff Size on Principals' Perceptions of Training	87
13.	Perceived Differences in the Value of Training Index Items	89
14.	Comparison of Mean Training Scores for Male and Female Assistants and Principals	93
15.	Differences in Perceptions of Training By Male Assistants and Principals	94
16.	Differences in Perceptions of Training By Female Assistants and Principals . . .	95

AN ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION OF Patricia Ann Howell for
the Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership presented
April 24, 1989.

Title: A Comparison of Assistant Principal and Principal
Perceptions of the Assistant Principalship as a
Training Ground in the Secondary School

APPROVED BY MEMBERS OF THE DISSERTATION COMMITTEE:

[REDACTED]

John D. Lind, Chair

[REDACTED]

Carrol Tama

[REDACTED]

Carol Peterman

[REDACTED]

Maxine Thomas

[REDACTED]

Gerald Guthrie

Although the assistant principalship has been an
important part of American secondary schools for over thirty
years, the educational establishment has yet to arrive at a

formal definition of the assistant principal's role in that institution. Researchers have tended to find the assistant in a role defined by procedures. At the same time, they have called for a new definition of the assistant based on policy-making activities. This outcome has had several important consequences, not the least of which has been failure to provide formal guidelines for training assistants in their role and preparing them for future administrative assignments.

This study has investigated the relationship between fourteen areas of responsibility connected with secondary school administration and the role of the assistant principal in meeting these responsibilities. Unlike previous studies, it has emphasized, not the areas themselves, but the perceptions of principals and assistants who rated the value of each area as a training ground for the principalship. By classifying the areas perceived to be most valuable for training, the study contributes to the emerging definition of the assistant principalship. Also, by explaining the relationship between the administrators' backgrounds and their influence on the ratings given, this study has attempted to account for the factors that affected the respondents' perceptions.

The study was organized around three research questions: (1) Do principals and assistant principals differ in the extent to which they perceive the assistant

principalship as an adequate training ground for the principalship? (2) What factors affect the perceptions of assistant principals? (3) What factors influence the perceptions of principals?

In order to address these questions, secondary school administrators who were members of the Confederation of Oregon School Administrators (COSA) were surveyed. They rated fourteen areas of responsibility for their training value and for the extent to which assignments to the areas were made on the basis of gender stereotyping. In addition, the areas to which the respondents were currently assigned were reported. The respondents also supplied background information concerning the years of experience in their current position and size of the administrative staff of which they were a part. Of the 454 members surveyed, 373 returned completed questionnaires, yielding a response rate of 71%. Assistant principals comprised 57% of the sample, while principals comprised 43%. Females comprised 16% of the sample and males 84%.

Major findings suggest that while principals and assistants differed in the amount of value they awarded each area of responsibility, they consistently identified the same areas as valuable. Assistants' perceptions were found to be influenced by staff size and gender. Principals' perceptions were related to their length of tenure as

assistant principals, how long they had been principals, number of assistant principals they supervised, and gender.

These findings have implications for the future definition of the assistant principalship and improved training for assistants because they showed that principals believed in the value of the assistant principalship as a training ground. Thus, they also suggested the feasibility of combining the leadership of the principal and the concept of teamwork in both the definition and training of assistants.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Even though expanding student populations dictated more widespread use of the assistant principal in secondary school administrations nearly 30 years ago (Gillespie, 1961), the role of the assistant principal has remained poorly defined. An important consequence of the failure to define the assistant principal's role has been the inability to provide its occupants with a well outlined program of training. A second consequence of a poorly understood role for the assistant principal is that new administrators may lack preparation to move into higher administrative positions. This study adopts the position that progress toward filling these needs can come, in part, from a better understanding of how both principals and their assistants view the role of the assistant principal and its place in the preparation of future administrators.

In their attempts to broaden understanding of the assistant principal's role, a number of educational researchers have begun to rely on two themes that have emerged from the educational literature. The first focuses on methodology, i.e., on the requirements of running the secondary school and its consequences for a new definition

of the assistant principal's role. The second theme stresses the assistant principalship as a training ground in its own right and the role of the principal in shaping this training ground.

The first theme is methodological and advocates investigations which survey secondary school administrators. These investigations stress the importance of the administrators' first-hand knowledge in shaping the definition of the assistant principal's role. Smith (1984) exemplifies this methodology. He surveyed assistant principals, principals, and directors of secondary education in Washington. MacDonald (1981), Austin and Brown (1970), and Reed (1984) also conducted investigations which adopted this emphasis.

The second theme to emerge from the literature over the past fifteen years concerns the need to acknowledge the usefulness of the assistant principalship as a training ground and to emphasize the role of the principal in shaping it. Many remedies have been proposed to improve the kind of preparation assistant principals receive before they assume higher administrative positions (cf., Peterson, Marshall, & Grier, 1987; Howley, 1985; Hess, 1985; Bilbao, 1980). But it is only as researchers have turned to investigating the view of secondary school administrators themselves that the value of the assistant principalship as on-the-job training has been fully recognized. However, once recognized, seeing

the value of the principal in shaping the training ground was a short step away. Kelly (1987) recommended that school districts explicitly regard the assistant principalship as a training ground for the principalship. Hall and Guzman (1984) maintained that the principal was the main facilitator for creative change and demonstrated how the principal's role affected the definition of the assistant principal.

In combination these two themes suggest the usefulness of assessing how each administrator, the assistant and the principal, places value on the various responsibilities of the assistant principalship when they are viewed as a training ground. This study pursues that objective by surveying secondary school administrators.

The survey asked respondents to provide ratings of the areas of responsibility routinely assigned to assistant principals. The purpose of the ratings was to identify the areas which were perceived most valuable in preparing assistants to assume the principalship and other administrative positions.

The study made an assessment of the factors which influenced the administrators' perceptions, and broke new ground in this area. While it was hypothesized that background factors influenced the administrators' perceptions, there was a void in the literature to suggest what those factors might be. Thus, this study explored a

set of straightforward possibilities based on the experience of the researcher.

Factors influencing the perceptions of principals and assistants were hypothesized to emanate from the same sources. Problems affecting day-to-day life in the secondary school may involve such facts of school life as the size of the administrative staff, past experience as an administrator (either at the assistant or principal level) and, therefore, the qualifications to handle problems. Additionally, since women have more recently joined the ranks of administrators in larger numbers than in the past, gender may also influence the respondents' perceptions of the assistant principalship.

When the administrators' perceptions of the training value of individual areas of responsibility were combined with the factors which influenced their beliefs about the value of training, a definition of the assistant principal's role emerged which was consistent with the literature and contributed a better understanding of how these respondents arrived at their view.

BACKGROUND

The job of running a school, especially a high school, is a complex one and often too demanding for a single administrator. This observation is especially true as student populations grow. As the number of students

increases, the number of problems to be solved also increases. This growth increases not only the number of student-related problems requiring attention, but those related to instruction, maintenance, evaluation, etc. increase as well.

Researchers (e.g., Greenfield, 1985; Kelly, 1987; Gorton, 1987; Jarrett, 1985) and administrators alike are beginning to recognize that the assistant principal should become a more integral part of the administrative team and make significant contributions to the school's performance and growth. Yet they have failed to define precisely what the role of the assistant principal should be. For example, Norton and Kreikard (1987) concluded that "in spite of this acknowledged importance of the assistant principal . . . the position had been a forgotten step-child so far as administrative study and research were concerned" (p. 23).

In spite of this recognition, school districts continue to underutilize the interests and talents of the assistant principal with the consequence that they remain unprepared to assume higher administrative posts. While researchers blame the underutilization and training of the assistant principal on the educational establishment's failure to provide an adequate definition for the assistant's role (Austin & Brown, 1970; Novak, 1963; Gatti & Gatti, 1975), a number of attempts to define the role have bogged down.

The attempts to define the assistant principal's role have been hampered by the nature of the position. The requirements of daily management in the secondary school inhibit the assistant principals' involvement in the kinds of tasks that lend themselves to professional growth. Empirical investigations of daily life in the secondary school (Smith, 1984; MacDonald, 1981; Austin & Brown, 1970) observed the assistant principal largely absorbed in procedural tasks such as activity supervision or maintenance. At the same time investigators have also identified a need for greater participation in policy making in the assistant's day-to-day life (Greenham, 1972; Smith, 1984; Greenfield, 1985). Thus attempts to define the role of the assistant principal have evolved around differences in the extent to which the assistants' time is exclusively devoted to policy or procedure.

A consequence of the failure to formally define the assistant principal's role has been an ensuing failure to define what constitutes an adequate training program for the assistant principal. A number of remedies have been proposed to close the training gap--special academies, graduate education, internships, improved in-service, etc. However, only a few have begun to focus on the job itself as a training ground (in particular, see Kelly, 1987) and to utilize the perceptions of administrators who hold the job

in building a new definition for the assistant principalship (Smith, 1984).

.One approach to better role definition and training is focused on the role of the principal as team leader and trainer (Gorton, 1987; Jarrett, 1985; Valentine, 1980; First & Carr, 1986; Evans, 1986). These researchers have expressed the view that if the position of the assistant principal is to improve, it will require enlightened and dedicated leadership by principals. They claim that principals who provide active and creative leadership within a team management framework are fostering a better training ground for assistant principals and the development of their potential. Yet the same investigators suggested that most principals had not defined the role of the assistant principal, nor had they determined their own role in training the assistant principal for a principalship. Thus, an investigation which polls assistant principals for their perceptions of their role and its place in shaping their training needs to include principals as well.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study is to compare the perceptions of principals and assistant principals with regard to the value of the assistant principalship as a training ground. Fourteen areas of responsibility

identified by observing the day-to-day activities of assistant principals will be rated for their value as components in the assistant principals' training. The perceptions of principals and assistants will also be compared to learn what specific areas of responsibility each group of administrators believes to be most valuable in the training of assistants for future administrative assignments, in particular the principalship. Factors affecting the respondents' perceptions will also be explored.

In order to address these issues, the study poses three research questions:

1. Do principals and assistant principals differ in the extent to which they perceive the assistant principalship as an adequate training ground for the principalship?

2. What factors affect the perceptions of assistant principals?

3. What factors influence the perceptions of principals?

The answers to these questions will emerge from the statistical analysis of survey data. This information can then be incorporated into the refinement of the definition of the assistant principal's role, the molding of the assistant principalship into an improved training ground.

and a more clear understanding of the role of the principal in the process.

IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

This research explored a refined definition for the assistant principal's role by comparing the perceptions of assistants and principals. In particular it examined the value of the assistant principalship as a training ground and sought to identify the areas of daily responsibility most valued by secondary school administrators for their training. In addition, the study also sought to identify factors influencing the respondents' perceptions.

The study extends the body of current research and stands apart from earlier investigations in several ways. First, it has added to the body of research that relies on data generated by the expertise and authority of practicing administrators. Second, from statistical evidence based on this data, it argued for a new definition of the assistant's role based on a combination of procedural and policy-making responsibilities. Third, the study was based on a comparative analysis of administrators' perceptions, those offered by assistants and principals. Fourth, it assessed factors that influenced those perceptions. Thus, the study captured both points of view in formulating its recommendations for new perspectives.

Given the problems of declining enrollment and diminishing financial resources for many school districts, fewer assistant principals may want to enter the system and fewer will advance. The pool from which principals and central office administrators will ultimately be selected will be smaller, since the numbers moving in and out of the entry-level positions will decrease over time. This implies that the importance of training and preparation for entry-level administrators is more vital and at the same time more in danger of being ignored. This study and others after which it has been patterned may contribute remedies that will offset the adverse effects of this growing problem.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The result of this study may be limited by the following factors.

1. The survey instrument used was a mailed questionnaire and the researcher was unable to predict the number of returned questionnaires.
2. The data were self-reported and although perceptions might have been strongly indicated they might not have always reflected the true picture.
3. The findings were subject to the limitations of surveying one professional organization.

4. This was the first survey of this nature to this particular professional group, therefore, there was no previous data with which to make a comparison.

OUTLINE OF THE STUDY

The recognition that the assistant principal's role was, in Hess's (1985) words, "haphazardly" defined was slow to appear, and its consequences for training have only begun to be realized. The documentation of this process, along with some of the remedies currently being proposed, are presented in Chapter II.

This study analyzed responses to a mailed survey to address the research questions it proposed. Chapter III describes the research design, methodology, subject selection, survey design, procedure, and statistical analysis.

Statistical results are presented in Chapter IV, while Chapter V summarizes the study, describes implications of the findings, and makes recommendations for future research.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Since the future success of American secondary education in part depends on the grooming of new administrators, it is reasonable to assume that the role of the assistant principal is well understood by the educational establishment. This is not the case, however. Even though expanding student populations dictated more widespread use of the assistant principal in secondary school administrations nearly 30 years ago (Gillespie, 1961), the role of the assistant principal has remained poorly defined. As recently as 1985, Hess voiced the complaint that the position of assistant principal evolved in a haphazard manner without systematic planning and still remains without any general objective or design.

An important consequence of the failure to define the assistant principal's role is the inability to provide its occupants with a well outlined program of training. Formal education for administrators in most states is poorly specified and usually consists of little more than 30 hours of post-baccalaureate work that focuses on diffuse topics and has no central philosophy or core. There are no national licensing agencies for federal educational

organizations that are charged with educational quality control, curricula content, or the evaluation of course content (Guthrie and Reed, 1986). Nor, is there an accreditation system for school administration programs.

A second consequence of a poorly understood role for the assistant principal is that new administrators may lack preparation to move into higher administrative positions. It remains unclear whether or not the jobs currently performed by assistant principals prepare them for growth or merely allow them to assist in the day-to-day management of the school.

This study adopts the position that progress toward filling these needs can come in part from a better understanding of how both principals and their assistants view the role of the assistant principal and its place in the preparation of future administrators. This chapter reviews the literature that identifies these problems and out of which the need for this study was formulated. It should be noted, however, that there was no information available in the literature review that addressed the area of gender and how it might influence the role of the assistant principalship. The sections that follow discuss the lack of role definition and the lack of training programs along with the solutions that have been proposed to fill the gap.

LACK OF DEFINITION FOR THE ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL'S ROLE

A complete definition of the assistant principal's job that would be universally accepted in the field of education has been slow to develop. The variety of jobs performed by assistant principals do not add up to a cohesive job description. According to Austin and Brown (1970) " . . . [For] most people in secondary schools the assistant principal occupied a position which was not well labeled by titling it 'assistant to' anyone or anything" (p. 23). Novak (1963) also characterized the assistant principalship as "vaguely defined" (p. 19) and stressed the need for more clarity and specificity in descriptions and definitions of not only the assistant principal's role, but his/her status, functions, and duties.

In a study by Norton and Kreikard (1987), 81 percent of the principals from schools of more than 500 pupils reported that they had an assistant principal. While this statistic suggests assistant principals are present in a large majority of schools, little has been done to broaden understanding of the assistant principal's administrative role. Norton and Kreikard concluded that "in spite of this acknowledged importance of the assistant principal...the position had been a forgotten step-child so far as administrative study and research were concerned" (p. 23).

Gatti and Gatti's (1975) description of the assistant principalship also emphasized the vagueness of the position and the tendency for the assistant principal's role to fluctuate in the course of the school day depending on the kind of activity in progress.

The vice-principal was part of the administration and was not a part of the teaching staff while carrying out his or her administrative functions. He or she was considered an employee and not an officer of the school board. The vice-principal reported directly to the principal and was generally in charge of specific areas such as student discipline. The vice-principal was liable for his or her own acts, but not the acts of teachers unless the vice-principal knew or should have known of the potential conduct (p. 301).

Although it has become clear that a precise definition for the assistant principal's role is required, attempts to fill the requirement have been hampered by the nature of the position. A natural tension exists between long and short term requirements. Assistant principals need to prepare to move into higher administration to benefit the system as a whole over the long term. However, the short term requirements of daily management in the secondary school inhibit their involvement in the kinds of tasks that lend themselves to professional growth.

As a result, two competing concepts to characterize the role of assistant principals have arisen. Roughly speaking the concepts can be compared to the distinction between policies and procedures. On the one hand, growth as

an administrator is enhanced by participation in activities dedicated to policy setting. On the other, day-to-day management activities dictate that the assistant principal administer ongoing procedures. Many examples in the literature demonstrate the inadequacy of either concept to define the assistant's role.

Several researchers have implied the desirability of a policy setting role for the assistant principal. For example, Greenham (1972) contended that the position of assistant principal was often too heavily weighted in the direction of para-professional tasks, duties that must be performed for the school to function, but that did not necessarily promote professional growth for the assistant principal. Similarly, Smith (1984) in a survey of assistant principals, principals, directors of secondary education, and district superintendents in Washington, concluded that while the respondents to the study were in general agreement concerning what secondary assistant principals were currently doing, they believed they should be doing something else. Smith reported that respondents viewed assistant principals as educational leaders and that they should be encouraged to participate more in tasks of a curricular and instructional nature.

Greenfield (1985) suggested the role of the assistant principal as it is presently conceived is not particularly attractive and that limiting its functions to monitoring

student behavior, maintenance, and organizational stability robs both teachers and school principals of a potentially vital instructional resource. He concluded that the use of assistant principals in instructional and organizational matters could result in a more effective use of the administrative resources available to schools without sacrificing the student supervision and scheduling functions that needed to be addressed.

While investigators such as Greenham, Smith, and Greenfield were in pursuit of the policy setting definition for the assistant principal, the empirical work of other investigators was demonstrating that on a day-to-day basis the procedural assistant principal was more often found in practice. From their work (Fallon, 1974; Brown & Rentaschler, 1975; Black, 1980; Austin and Brown, 1970; Reed, 1984; Bates and Shank, 1983; Weldy, 1979; McDonald, 1981; Hentges, 1976; and Paus, 1970) a common theme emerges concerning the typical duties that define the assistant principal: the prominence of pupil personnel functions. Fallon (1974) stated that, "As assistant principal, there are two areas of prime responsibility that would either make or break an administrator. These are attendance and school discipline" (p. 77). In determining the five duties most frequently assigned to Indiana assistant principals, Brown and Rentaschler (1975) found, as Austin and Brown (1970) had, that pupil personnel activities were usually a prime

focus for the assistant principal. Reed's (1984) field study of eight large Southern California high schools found that most of the assistant principals studied dealt with student discipline, with the assistant principals being responsible for the methods by which they dealt with student misconduct. Bates and Shank (1983) stated that when students, parents, or assistant principals themselves were asked to describe the job of the assistant principal, a common response was "discipline, attendance, and supervision of student activities" (p. 111). School administrators, even assistant principals, commonly described the job as a necessary but unrewarding step on the career ladder. Administrators concluded that such a role was not good for the individual of the school.

Black (1980) characterizes this observation as a consequence of the position development. She reports that the assistant principalship was established primarily to handle clerical duties, and has never evolved into a solid job description. Consequently, the secondary assistant principal lacks a level of importance in the school's administration. In addition, Black found that high levels of frustration are associated with the lack of time necessary for assistant principals to complete all the tasks for which they become responsible in the course of the given day.

Black further suggested that the role of the secondary school principal needed to be changed to grow with any job description currently being used, or else the job description should be changed to comply with the present role. Ranyako and Rorie (1987) felt the modern assistant principal must first be thought of as a principal, and only secondarily as a deputy to the principal.

Black (1980) stated that it is possible for the ordinary assistant principal to go for weeks or even months buried in custodial, clerical, disciplinary, and social duties, to the total exclusion of meaningful interaction with teachers and students in the classroom setting. Weldy (1979) called this the "Busy Person Syndrome" (p. 20), which he defined as the school administrator who was never able to see the best students and teachers in the school. The findings of McDonald (1981) dramatized Black's point. In a study of the workday of the urban high school assistant principal, McDonald discovered that on the average the assistant principal spent 48 percent of his/her workday in meetings, both scheduled and unscheduled. She also observed that 17 percent of the day was spent at desk work, 6 percent on phone calls, and the remaining 34 percent in observational and informational tours.

The problems associated with the "Busy Person Syndrome" are exacerbated by the fact that the assistant principal is given little responsibility. Austin and Brown

(1970), in one of the more extensive studies made of the assistant principalship, discovered that the assistant principal was often the person who kept the school running. They surveyed secondary school administrators and found that while the assistant principals were "generally caught up in practically all aspects of the administrative processes of their school" (p. 34), they were given little responsibility. While the level of responsibility varied from situation to situation, it was rarely absolute. It was more likely to be "slight" or "shared" (p. 46).

Both Hentges (1976) and Paus (1980) had findings similar to those of Austin and Brown (1970). A study conducted by Hentges (1976) in Minnesota found that while assistant principals were involved in nearly all administrative processes, they were often not allowed total responsibility for a task. The only area in which the assistant principal was perceived as having a high level of authority was once again in the role of student disciplinarian. The bulk of the assistant principal's activities were in curriculum, and instructional tasks, staff personnel activities and pupil personnel. This point was also driven home by Paus in a survey of junior and senior high schools in Oregon. Paus (1980) found that assistant principals were delegated a wide variety of primary responsibilities, but that there was little consistency in the tasks assigned.

In short, the assistant principal spends much time in the execution of pupil personnel activities, but has assigned to him or her no clear and consistent set of responsibilities. This observation lead Austin and Brown (1970) to a definition consistent with the procedures definition of an assistant principal. They concluded that the assistant principal was an intermediary who was essential to the school's ability to function, but who had no consistent set of responsibilities except that of supervision of the school in the absence of the principal.

A more recently identified difficulty associated with the procedures definition of the assistant principal is job dissatisfaction. Assistant principal job dissatisfaction seems to stem from the more routine and clerical tasks: maintenance, student photos, attendance, transportation and testing. Black's (1980) survey, conducted in Maryland, revealed that for 66 percent of those who responded, the best-liked job areas were related to the instructional program. Discipline-related tasks were least liked by 83 percent. This gives credence to Greenfield's (1985) argument that assistant principal responsibilities be extended to instructional and organizational areas.

Kalla (1983) surveyed secondary school assistant principals in Kentucky and discovered that, while assistant principals were generally satisfied with their positions, there was a low positive correlation between job

satisfaction and the assistant principal's perceptions of responsibility and job importance. In this study, the type and importance of the job assigned influenced the perceived satisfaction of the assistant principal. Thus, Kalla's findings suggested that change in the level of responsibility and job importance could enhance the assistants' perception of job satisfaction.

LACK OF TRAINING PROGRAMS AND PROPOSED SOLUTIONS

Perhaps the most important consequence of education's inability to arrive at a consistent definition for the assistant principal's role has been the subsequent inability to derive a training program for the position. This section identifies the lack of specifications for training and describes some of the remedies identified in the literature for converting the assistant principal's day-to-day experience into a training ground for later administrative positions, in particular the principalship.

For the most part, the training which could provide assistant principals with the opportunity to enhance their professional growth has been ignored. The in-service needs of assistant principals are rarely addressed, which affords them few chances to develop aspects of their profession outside of the school environment. The literature (Guthrie and Reed, 1986) indicates that more training needs to be available that is specifically designed to meet the needs

for professional growth of the assistant principal. This lack of training may be one reason that assistant principals sometimes express dissatisfaction with their jobs and frustration with the lack of potential for career growth.

Kolb (1984) stated that considerable improvement could be made in the experiential learning of administrators, as this type of learning was crucial to the ultimate acquisition of skills and knowledge. Thriving programs could improve the professional growth capabilities of their administrators by emphasizing the possibilities of learning from experience. According to Peterson (1985), additional training, socialization, and support would make for more effective administrators. Through the conscious efforts of those involved in the preparation, training, and development of assistant principals, substantial changes could occur in the overall quality of school administrators.

A number of remedies have been proposed to eliminate this deficit. Many of them adopt Kelly's (1987) recommendation that school districts regard the assistant principalship as a training ground for the principalship.

A frequently proposed remedy has been an assistant principal academy. According to Peterson, Marshall, and Grier (1987), an assistant principals' academy could provide some of the formal training and on-the-job socialization necessary for professional growth. The purpose of the academies would be to give assistant principals the

opportunity to work with teachers, central office administrators, and incumbent assistant principals before their administrative roles are crystallized and while they are open to innovative ways of filling administrative positions. The academies could assist in the professional development of administrators by providing ongoing support and the opportunity to address the deficiencies and needs identified by the participants. The authors concluded that assistant principal academies could be effective ways of giving technical training and promoting a shared culture among school districts while increasing the pool of qualified administrators. The enterprises involve certain costs and risks, but the potential they have for reshaping the administrative workforce is considered substantial and well worth the effort and challenge.

A second type of remedy involves the use of continuing education at the graduate level. Howley (1985) made specific recommendations for the professional development of assistant principals in curriculum strategy, change, and awareness. The author also recommended that the assistant principal should rotate duties with the principal in order to avoid "job burnout" and the assistant principal should remain active in the classroom in order to maintain a perspective on school functions.

Still a third remedy has been the utilization of internships. Hess (1985) suggested that, at the university

classroom level, future assistant principals should undertake internships in order to develop an understanding of operations management. An internship should be structured around objectives that relate to the professional fulfillment and development of the individual who undertakes it.

An improved in-service training program for the assistant principals has also been recommended. In Southern Idaho, Bilbao (1980) conducted a study to identify the in-service needs of secondary assistant principals. The study found a significant difference in the ratings made by assistant principals and principals regarding the needs of the community and staff personnel. Critical in-service needs were discovered in all areas surveyed. Principals agreed with all other in-service needs voiced by assistant principals except in the areas of curriculum and instruction, where assistant principals expressed a need for better in-service design. Bilbao recommended that assistant principals be appraised of the study's findings in order to increase their own understanding of common needs. Similarly, the results should be communicated to district and state educational administrators and organizations with the intent of developing local and regional programs designed to meet the in-service needs of assistant principals. Assistant principals were also encouraged to seek the leave and financial support necessary to

participate in national and regional programs and workshops which addressed their professional growth. This observation has suggested to many investigators that the role of the principal in the development of these programs deserves further research.

Still another remedy is based on London's (1985) recommendation that organizes a training program around the assistant principal's tenure in his/her job. London identified three stages of socialization of the assistant principal. The kinds of support, feedback, and discussions or organizational mission and goals present in the first stage (the first year) of socialization were augmented by the personal ties a new assistant principal developed to the organization. During the second stage of development (the second through fourth years), new administrators needed to develop a sense of achievement and be acknowledged for the importance of their contribution. In the third stage of socialization (the fifth year and beyond), administrators needed continual reinforcement of their effectiveness within the organization and ongoing contact with other administrators. During this period, the norms and values established during the early years must be maintained and reinforced by superiors.

Peterson (1985) felt that incomplete or inappropriate socialization of assistant principals could occur if any of these stages were not properly developed. At no point

during the process could assistant principals be seen as totally on their own, separated and isolated in their schools. Ties to the district mission and to the broader concerns of the school system needed to be built, maintained, and adjusted to changing situations. Without ongoing socialization, administrative effectiveness might falter.

A common thread throughout all the remedies is training on the job. Academics, internships, and in particular, in-service emphasize the potential for training specifications to arise in practice.

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE PRINCIPAL IN ON-THE-JOB TRAINING PROGRAMS

Most researchers placed primary responsibility for developing an on-the-job training program for the assistant principal at the doorstep of the principal. Many have expressed the view that if the position of the assistant principal is to improve, it will require enlightened and dedicated leadership by principals (e.g. Gorton, 1987; Novak, 1963; Kelly, 1987; Jarrett, 1985; Austin and Brown, 1979; Valentine, 1980; Manasse, 1982; First and Carr, 1986; and Evans, 1986).

An assistant principal's future growth and success seem largely to depend upon the extent to which principals share administrative responsibilities and take an active

role in preparing assistant principals for advancement. Principals who provide active and creative leadership within a team management framework are seemingly fostering a better training ground for assistant principals and the development of their potential. Yet, these investigators suggested that most principals had not defined the role of the assistant principal, nor had they determined their own role in training the assistant principal for a principalship.

Gorton (1987) found that most assistant principals wanted more responsibility--and were qualified to take on such responsibility--in the areas of curriculum improvement, advising parents' groups, public relations, and the school budget. He concluded that "the key person to maximize the assistant principal's contribution was the school principal" (p. 2). No other individual worked more closely with the assistant principal, and no other person was more important to his or her professional success. Gorton stated that the principal could help the assistant by expanding the demand of the assistant principal's job, advocating the job itself as well as the possibility for increased rewards, and facilitating professional growth.

Novak (1963) expressed the concern felt by many about relations between principal and assistant principal:

It is necessary for the principal and the vice principal to be able to operate comfortably within a mutually acceptable point of view that allows each his individuality and free expression of opinion, yet permits a reasonably united

front. A vice principal who performs minor errands without latitude or authority to make any decision on his own is not justified in his salary, loses self-respect, the position itself suffers, and he might lack assurance and creativity if he ever should emerge from the shadow of the principal (p. 20).

Kelly (1987) concured with the findings of Gorton and Novak. He concluded that the role of the assistant principal was defined and shaped largely by the principal, with only a philosophical foundation provided by the superintendent and school board. While the school districts identified instructional leadership as the major aspect of the principalship, and the assistant principalship as the training ground for that position, assistant principals were not involved in the instructional leadership responsibilities of the administration. Kelly recommended that "school districts explicitly regard the assistant principalship as a training ground for the principaiship" (p. 18). The validity of this position depended almost entirely on the principal.

In short, a number of investigators have demonstrated the importance of the principal in converting the assistant principalship into a training ground. Jarrett's (1985) findgins echo the work of many others who recommended that assistant principals should have a more active role in the supervision of departments. Yet evidence exists which suggests that principals frequently fail to see the dilemma in this light. In their study, Austin and Brown (1970)

found that "more principals than assistant principals have positive perceptions of the role the assistant principal plays in the school" (p. 47).

Other researchers have been more specific in their recommendations. The principal needs to function as a specific type of leader, not just one who makes assignments, in order to best train his or her assistants. They have also recommended that the most effective training method is the team management approach, with the principal acting as team leader. For example, Valentine (1980) stated that principals were typically overlooking their obligation to train assistant principals. Consequently, Valentine recommended a team management system, wherein communication was encouraged among team members with the effect being that assistants could learn more about the decision-making process. Each assistant principal would have assigned responsibilities, and his performance would be assessed by the principal on a regular basis. The team approach would provide a framework for administrative goal setting and skills evaluation. Manasse (1982) felt that effective principals were those who were able to expand the roles of lower-level administrators.

An important outcome of focusing on the principal may be the emergence of a new definition of the assistant principal's role. By reintroducing the concept of teamwork, a number of researchers have put assistant principals in a

policy-implementing role. While they are still charged with many day-to-day activities, in this view they emerge as part of a team whose responsibility is implementing change.

Research by First and Carr (1986) and Evans (1986) casts the principal in the role of a leader. First and Carr called these leaders "change masters" (p. 48), in that they created a vision of a possible future that allowed themselves and lower-level administrators to envision a new reality for the organization and to aid in its translation into concrete terms. The role of the "change master" involved a departure from traditional patterns of management behavior. A "change master" must help his administration to understand that the environment is rich with information and full of opportunities for innovation. Evans concerned that the central task of school administration should be to develop and regulate the planning and decision-making processes of the organization. Leaders are judged by the worth of their decision, and very simply, the worth of a given decision is directly related to the degree in which the goals of the organization are attained.

Hall and Guzman (1984) also maintained that the principal is the main facilitator for creative change and demonstrated how the principal's role affected the definition of the assistant principal. In their study, when principals were passive, assistant principals maintained the status quo; when active principals involved assistant

principals there tended to be a dynamic change-facilitating team.

Gross, Shapiro, and Meehan (1980) investigated the circumstances under which teamwork was most successful. They found two sets of circumstances. The first was that administrators had very few preconceived notions concerning the roles to be filled by the principals and the assistants. There was flexibility in role definition and a willingness to shift roles and responsibilities when necessary. The second circumstance was that administrators believed the entire team should be involved as much as possible in the total management of the school, especially in areas where he or she exhibited a special talent. The authors found the teamwork approach fostered an attitude of openness on the part of the administrator, which in turn helped other forms of communications within the school.

Rodrick (1986) also argued for a teamwork type of approach. He asserted that the principal take the first steps to reassess and upgrade expectations for assistant principals. One of Rodrick's suggestions was to assign assistant principals as staff committee monitors who would attend committee meetings, support the chair's planning by previewing strategies before each meeting and review progress and events after, provide information and resources to the committee, and inform members of how their activities affected the rest of the school. Another means of achieving

staff interaction would be to assign assistants the responsibility for interviewing, hiring, and evaluating a portion of the staff. A third method would be to place an assistant in charge of solving an educational problem, using interaction and input from the staff.

SUMMARY

Although educational researchers have made numerous attempts to define the role of the assistant principal, they have met with little success. Some investigators have attempted to define the assistant as an administrator involved primarily in policy setting. They have been largely contradicted by empirical investigations of the assistant principal's daily activities. These studies found assistants who wished to be involved with policy but who were largely involved in procedural duties instead. They also reported that many assistant principals felt they had too little responsibility and they were experiencing some job dissatisfaction.

Two important consequences emerge from the failure to reach a consensus on a definition for the role of the assistant principal. The first concerns training. Failure to define the assistant principal's role has led to a lack of specifications for training. Since no clear role has been defined, no curriculum has evolved that is designed to prepare new educators who aspire to move into administrative

ranks. The second consequence is that over the long term, the system will have fewer well-prepared administrators than it requires.

A number of solutions have been proposed by researchers to remediate this difficulty. Continuing education on the graduate level, internships, more in-depth in-service programs, among others, have been proposed and evaluated in the literature. Although no single remedy promises to alleviate the problems described, two themes run through this body of research and appear to hold promise. The first focuses on new attempts to define the role of the assistant principal in investigations of the daily life of running the secondary school, i.e., in evaluating the potential of the assistant principal's position as a training ground. The rationale for this approach grows out of the idea that if the worth of the position as a training ground can be identified, the identification may lead to a better definition of the assistant principal's role. The second theme stresses the role of the principal in shaping this training ground. In combination, the themes suggest the usefulness of assessing how each administrator, the assistant and the principal, views the assistant principalship as a training ground. Such an investigation is the primary objective of this study.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODS

The purpose of the study is to compare the perceptions of principals and assistant principals regarding the role of the assistant principalship as a training ground. This chapter describes the research methodology utilized to conduct the study. The sections below describe the research design, subject selection, instrumentation, procedure, and data analysis.

RESEARCH DESIGN

Previous research related to the development of administrative skills in the assistant principalship has most often involved case studies, field studies, or on-site research methods. A review of literature revealed that previous research had largely involved the observation of a small group of administrators over a short period of time. The obvious limitation of this type of study was its failure to gather large amounts of data which would allow for in-depth comparison and evaluation of those factors deemed most important for the assistant principal's administrative development. Therefore, in order to increase the amount of data available, it was desirable to study a large group of

assistant principals and principals. Additionally, by involving a large number of study participants, the risk of misleading results was reduced and the reliability of findings was enhanced.

A mail survey was the most expedient method for obtaining a large data base. The survey made it possible to conduct a study which described not only the similarities and differences in administrators' perceptions, but also which assessed relationships between their perceptions and other factors that might have an influence.

Since no pre-existing survey instrument was available in the literature, the researcher, with the assistance of other educational professionals, designed a survey especially for the investigation. As described below, the survey was refined and its face validity evaluated during a pilot study. On completion of the pilot, surveys were mailed to 454 principals and assistant principals at the secondary level who were members of the Confederation of Oregon School Administrators. Statistical analyses of the results focused on the research questions which addressed differences in principals' and assistant principals' perceptions of the worth of the assistant principalship as a training ground.

SUBJECTS AND SAMPLING

In order to enhance the usefulness of the study, a sample of survey respondents was sought whose characteristics would be representative of the population of secondary school administrators throughout Oregon. Thus a group of individuals was required which would reflect this population as well as be accessible through the mail. The Confederation of Oregon School Administrators (COSA) was chosen for this purpose.

COSA is the leading professional organization of Oregon school administrators and claims a majority of administrators among its membership. Surveying the membership of this organization enhances the generalizability of study results because many different types of schools are served by them. Two school statistics, administrative staff size and student population, attest to the variety of school types represented. According to COSA statistics, administrative staff size varies from one to five, while student populations vary from 50 to 2,000.

The organization is also recognized as a forum for growth and professional development for its membership. Through literature, conferences, and workshops the organization provides continuing education and growth for its members and serves as a focal point for much of their professional activity. All administrators currently

holding positions in the state of Oregon are invited by the organization to join, and the membership currently numbers nearly 1,000.

At the time the survey was administered, there were 454 COSA members who were secondary school administrators. Since mail surveys tend to be returned at a low rate, the decision was made to bypass sampling from the 454 members and mail surveys to all of them. The rationale for this decision was based on the idea that should the response rate fall as low as 50% or less, the number of surveys that could be analyzed would still be high.

INSTRUMENTATION

Since no pre-existing questionnaire was available which addressed questions posed by the study, a survey was specially designed. The investigator used the review of literature, a pilot study, and interviews with experts in the field to design the survey.

Development of the survey instrument took place in several steps. With the help of the literature review and expert consultation, a first draft of the survey instrument was prepared and then revised with input from a second panel of experts. This draft was then subjected to a pilot study. The pilot study was conducted in the Huntington Beach Union High School District of Orange County, California. Suggestions and input provided by pilot respondents were

then used to modify the questionnaire. Several modifications were implemented as a result of the pilot. In particular, the survey was shortened somewhat in order to encourage the largest response rate possible. Content of the final survey is described in succeeding paragraphs, and a complete survey is provided in Appendix G.

A review of literature (e.g., Guthrie & Reed, 1986; Gutek, 1983; Knezevich, 1975; Bortner, 1972) uncovered fourteen areas of responsibility that were consistently associated with secondary school administration. They were: (1) discipline; (2) curriculum development; (3) budgetary process; (4) community relations; (5) teacher evaluation; (6) staff development; (7) maintenance; (8) athletic supervision; (9) activity supervision; (10) school improvements; (11) guidance and counseling; (12) hiring and selection; (13) special education; and (14) improvement of instruction. Since the research questions addressed the relationship between the fourteen areas and the respondents' perceptions of the assistant principalship as a training ground, the respondents' ratings of the areas in several different contexts formed the major portion of the survey.

The primary research question addressed the extent to which principals and assistants differed in their perceptions of the assistant principalship, as defined by the fourteen areas. Thus, the first section of the survey asked respondents to rate how much each area contributed to

preparation for the principalship. Ratings were in the form of a six-point Likert scale with the following values: (0) not at all; (1) very little; (2) little; (3) somewhat; (4) very; (5) extremely. Since gender was believed to be a factor that would influence perceptions, respondents were also asked to rate the extent to which they believed each area of responsibility was subject to assignment stereotyping, i.e., to which assistant principals were more likely to be assigned because of their gender. The same six-point Likert scale was used with these items. Finally, it was theorized that a comparison of respondents' perceptions of each area with actual performance in the area would shed light on the statistical results. Thus, each respondent was asked to indicate in a third section of the survey whether or not he/she was currently assigned duties in each of the fourteen areas.

Ten additional items queried respondents for their perceptions in more general areas of responsibility such as staff complaints and role clarification. Two items in this series, whether or not respondents' believed the assistant principalship was a satisfactory career goal in itself and whether in general they believed the assistant principalship prepared them for higher administrative positions, were focal points in the analysis described below.

The two remaining research questions addressed factors that might influence the perceptions of principals and

assistants. It was hypothesized that these influences would be related to the respondents' experience in the field of education. Thus the survey contained demographic items related to the administrators' background, such as years of experience in the present position and the number of assistant principals on staff.

In total the survey was four pages in length and contained some 58 items in all. Establishing the validity and reliability of the survey instrument forms part of the analysis described below. Face validity was assured by the acceptance of the instrument by the panel of experts. However, construct validity and internal consistency were also addressed by the statistical analysis.

PROCEDURE

The most important aspect of procedure concerned the steps taken to insure a high response rate for the survey. This procedure can be described as a series of contacts occurring in three stages.

Pre-Survey Contact

A postcard was mailed to all individuals with a brief explanation of the study and its importance in their particular professional field (see Appendix F). The postcard indicated that the individual would receive a

survey questionnaire within ten days. The card also highlighted the importance of the participants' responses.

Cover Letter and Survey

This correspondence included an explanation of the study, the purpose of the survey, and the importance of the research. The survey questionnaire and a postage-paid return envelope were included along with the cover letter. A time limit of three weeks was set for returns from the first mailing. (See Appendices F and G.)

Post-Survey Contact

After three weeks, a follow-up postcard was sent as a third contact to encourage those who had not initially responded to take action and to thank those who had responded. (See Appendix H.) Again, this card stressed the importance of the active participation of all concerned to the successful completion of the study. A cut-off date was set for receiving and tabulating responses.

DATA ANALYSIS

The data analysis was conducted in two stages. The first was devoted to establishing the reliability and validity of the survey instrument. The second was devoted to the description of the sample and the research questions.

Validation of the instrument was limited to an assessment of its construct validity. According to Carmines and Zeller (1979):

. . . construct validation has generalized applicability in the social sciences. The social scientist can assess the construct validity of an empirical measurement if the measure can be placed in theoretical context. . . . Specifically, if the performance of the measure is consistent with theoretically derived expectations, then it is concluded that the measure is construct valid (p. 27).

Validation of the measures arising from the survey instrument thus depended on their successful use in the investigation of the assistant principalship as a training ground. Results presented in Chapter IV will suggest that the instrument proved to be highly valid.

Reliability of the survey items was assessed by evaluating the internal consistency of the subscales to be analyzed. This assessment of reliability is customarily evaluated by Cronbach's alpha (Nunnally, 1978; Carmines & Zeller, 1979). Coefficient alpha was computed for each scale which combined the fourteen areas of responsibility. Descriptions of how each scale was computed are provided in Chapter IV.

The second stage of the analysis was devoted to a description of the sample and statistical evaluation of the research questions. A series of univariate frequency distributions were used to assess the gender of the respondents, the numbers of years spent in the current

administrative position, the number of years respondents recommended be spent as an assistant principal, and the number of assistant principals in the respondent's school.

The analyses that addressed all three research questions used indices computed from the respondents' ratings of the fourteen areas as their dependent variables (see Chapter IV for a detailed description of their construction). The first research question asked whether or not principals and assistants differed in their perceptions of the assistant principalship as a training ground. Depending on the level of measurement in the variables analyzed, a series of t-tests and chi-square tests were performed to assess differences in perception. When differences were detected, a more detailed analysis using comparative graphs of univariate frequency distributions were employed to explore specific areas in detail.

The second and third research questions asked what factors might influence the perceptions of principals and assistant principals. In these analyses, principals and assistants were analyzed separately. The bivariate relationships between a variable thought to be an influencing factor and the dependent variable was assessed using the student's t-test and the chi-square test once again.

A primary concern of the study was to explore differences in the perceptions of principals and assistants,

but it was also theorized that gender may play an important factor influencing these perceptions. Therefore, a final analysis explored the interaction between the respondents' status as principal or assistant and gender in the explanation of the respondents ratings. Two-way analysis of variance was used to conduct this assessment.

SUMMARY

The research design for the study consisted of a analysis of responses from a mailed survey. Subjects for the study were 454 secondary school principals and assistant principals who were members of the Confederation of Oregon School Administrators (COSA). No special sampling procedures were employed, since all secondary school administrators in the organization were surveyed. With over 900 members, representing many types of schools, it is believed results will be widely generalizable.

The investigator designed the survey instrument for the study using the scientific literature, consultation with experts, and a pilot study. The instrument was comprised of 58 items and was four pages in length. Respondents were required to rate fourteen areas of responsibility, such as discipline and activity supervision, for their usefulness in preparing the assistant principal for future administrative positions. Demographic items assessing the respondents' experience in the field of education were also included.

Administration of the survey consisted of three steps: a mailed, pre-survey contact; mailing of cover letter and survey; and a post-survey follow-up urging return of completed surveys.

Data analysis was focused in the areas of establishing reliability and validity, describing the sample, and addressing the research questions.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The research questions were addressed through statistical analysis of the returned questionnaires. This chapter reports those findings. An overview of data processing and pre-analysis variable manipulation will precede a discussion of the sample demographics. Discussion will then turn to the results which portray similarities and differences in the perceptions of principals and assistant principals with respect to assistant principal training for the principalship. Factors which influence these perceptions are also addressed.

DATA PROCESSING AND PRE-ANALYSIS VARIABLE MANIPULATION

The 323 surveys returned were encoded on mark-sense reader forms to convert responses to machine readable form and were entered into the VAX/VMS computing system at the University of California, Irvine. Data files were then downloaded into a personal computer for analysis using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (Norusis & SPSS, Inc., 1988).

Two major dependent variables were employed in the analysis: (1) an overall measure of the value of the assistant principalship as training ground, and (2) an overall measure of perceived stereotyping in the assignment of assistant principal responsibilities. These dependent variables were constructed from individual questionnaire items. The overall measure of the value of perceived training, hereinafter referred to as TRAINING, was constructed from Question 1, items A through N. These items asked respondents to rate the value of each of fourteen areas of responsibility on a six-point scale ranging from 0, not at all valuable, to 5, extremely valuable. The variable TRAINING was created by summing the fourteen responses supplied by each respondent to create a scale score ranging from 0 to 70.

An identical procedure was performed on Question 2, items A through N, in which respondents were asked to rank the degree to which assistant principal job assignments are related to stereotypical beliefs about gender. Once again respondents were presented with a six-point scale on which they ranked the degree of stereotyping they believed was present for that area. An overall measure of perceived stereotyping, hereinafter referred to as STEREOTYPE, was created by summing the fourteen responses and again producing a scale ranging from 0 to 70.

The reliability of these two indices as measures of the perceived value of training and presence of gender stereotyping can be evaluated statistically with a measure of their internal consistency. This assessment of reliability is customarily evaluated by Cronbach's alpha (Nunnally, 1978; Carmines & Zeller, 1979). In this sample, high reliability coefficients resulted for both indices, .8759 for TRAINING and .9423 for STEREOTYPE. On the basis of these statistics, the two indices were included in the analysis as major dependent variables. Other dependent variables were also employed in the course of the analysis and are described below as the discussion warrants.

It was often desirable to modify the rating schemes in the two sets of fourteen items that were used to construct TRAINING and STEREOTYPE. Many results were easier to interpret and assess when the six rating categories used in the individual items were reduced to two. Thus in many of the graphic and tabular presentations to follow, the six rating categories used were reduced to two as follows: The ratings 'not at all', 'very little', and 'little' were placed in a single category described as 'no value to little value'. The ratings 'somewhat valuable', 'very valuable' and 'extremely valuable' were collapsed into a second category of 'somewhat to extremely valuable'. Thus, when the fourteen areas of responsibility used in the creation of

both TRAINING and STEREOTYPE are presented individually, they often appear in this two-category form.

DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS OF DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

All 454 members of the Confederation of Oregon School Administrators at the secondary level were surveyed in this study. Since 323 surveys were returned, the rate of response was calculated to be 71%. The high rate of return suggested that the results presented below were representative of the group's membership and could be generalized with a moderate to high degree of confidence.

Although principals and assistant principals responded to the survey in nearly equal numbers (138 and 184, respectively), principals responded in greater proportion to the number surveyed: 75% of principals returned their surveys while only 68% of assistants returned theirs. However, since there were more assistants to begin with, the total of returned surveys produced a sample in which 43% were principals and 57% were assistants. (This was proportionally representative of the COSA secondary membership where approximately 40% were principals and 60% were assistant principals.)

Figure 1 summarizes demographic characteristics that further describe the sample of respondents. Male respondents outnumber their female counterparts by a wide margin, with 84% of the sample being male and 16% being

**GENDER OF PRINCIPAL AND ASSISTANT
PRINCIPAL RESPONDENTS**

CHART A

**NUMBER OF YEARS EXPERIENCE IN
PRESENT POSITION**

CHART B

**NUMBER OF YEARS RECOMMENDED AS
ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL**

CHART C

**NUMBER OF ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS
IN RESPONDENT'S SCHOOL**

CHART D

Figure 1. Demographic information.

female. This was also proportionally representative of the COSA secondary membership where approximately 88% were male and 12% were female.) Chart A depicts the gender of the respondents as well as their status as principals or assistants and shows that 79.2% of assistant principals were male, while 20.8% of assistants were female. The difference between male and female principals was even wider with 90.6% of principals being male and only 9.4% being female. The chart also illustrates the point that a higher proportion of male respondents were principals and a higher proportion of female respondents were assistant principals.

Chart B in Figure 1 depicts the number of years both principals and assistants have held their present position. In the majority of cases respondents from both groups had been in their current position over three years. Moreover, both groups were nearly equally represented in both time categories, so that equal numbers of principals and assistants had been in their jobs three years or less and over three years.

Respondents were asked to recommend how long assistant principals should serve in that position in order to be adequately trained for promotions to the principalship. Assistants and principals disagreed about the time that should be served. This result is shown in Chart C of Figure 1. Principals were equally divided in their recommendations, with half (49%) recommending three years or

less and half (51%) recommending over three years. Assistant principals, on the other hand, recommended a longer time period by nearly a two-to-one margin (69% vs. 31%). Not shown in the chart, principals were also asked to state how long a period they served as assistants before being promoted to principal. Their time in the assistant principalship very nearly matched their recommendations with 42% having spent three years or less as an assistant and 58% having served over three years.

Respondents varied with respect to the size of the administrative staff on which they served. Since it was believed that this number may affect their perceptions of the work environment in various ways, respondents were asked to report the number of assistant principals employed in their high school. These results are summarized in Chart D of Figure 1. More assistants (69% vs. 31%) reported that they served on a staff having more than one assistant principal. The opposite was true for principals; a minority of principals (44% vs 56%) were members of a staff having more than one assistant principal. This seems to indicate that most (56%) of the principals in this sample work alone or with only one assistant and that most assistants (69%) divide the assistant principal's responsibilities with others.

A final question in the demographic category required respondents to report which of the fourteen areas of

responsibility they were involved in on a daily basis. The fourteen areas are summarized in Table I, which also presents a series of two-letter abbreviations for the areas used throughout the tables and figures presented below. Figure 2 summarizes the percentage of principals and assistant principals who reported daily involvement in each area.

As seen in the figure, the area of evaluation (EV) involved over 80% of administrators from both categories on a daily basis. A similar pattern of nearly equal management by both principals and assistants was seen in the areas of athletic supervision (AT), activity supervision (AC), guidance and counseling (GD), and special education (SE), although the proportion of individuals reporting involvement in these areas was less. In other areas, however, the involvement of assistants and principals was less balanced. Principals indicated greater involvement in the areas of curriculum development (CD), budgetary process (BG), community relations (CR), staff development (SD), maintenance (MN), school improvement (SI), hiring and selection (HS), and improvement of instruction (II). Assistant principals were more often charged with discipline (DC).

TABLE I
DEFINITIONS FOR ASSIGNMENT ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviation	Area of Responsibility
DC	Discipline
CD	Curriculum Development
BG	Budgetary Process
CR	Community Relations
EV	Teacher Evaluation
SD	Staff Development
MN	Maintenance
AT	Athletic Supervision
AC	Activity Supervision
SI	School Improvement
GD	Guidance and Counseling
HS	Hiring and Selection
SE	Special Education
II	Improvement of Instruction

Figure 2. Comparison of principal and assistant principal daily responsibilities.

PERCEPTIONS OF THE ASSISTANT PRINCIPALSHIP
AS TRAINING FOR THE PRINCIPALSHIP:
DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRINCIPALS
AND ASSISTANTS

The first research question addressed the issue of the quality of training received in the assistant principalship. It asked: Do principals and assistant principals differ in the extent to which they perceive the assistant principalship as an adequate training ground for the principalship?

When principals and assistants are combined in a single analysis, the sample size is 323, which is large enough to detect very small statistical differences if the alpha to reject the null hypothesis is set at the customary .05 level. In order to insure that significant results were also relatively important to this area of research, i.e., of some consequence to the educational research community, the decision was taken to set alpha at .01 when the entire sample of 323 was included in an analysis. When subsamples were analyzed, e.g. principals alone or assistants alone, the usual .05 level to reject would remain in force.

The survey queried principals and assistants about their perceptions of the assistant principalship as an adequate training ground in three ways: (1) the overall value of the assistant principalship as a training ground, (2) the value of each of the fourteen areas of

responsibility as training, and (3) the value of additional factors in training.

Overall Perception of Training

Question 12 on the survey (see Appendix G for the complete survey) asked respondents to rate the experiences of the assistant principalship in general as appropriate preparation for the principalship. They were asked to indicate, on a six-point scale ranging from 0 to 5, whether the preparation provided was not at all useful, of very little use, little use, somewhat useful, very useful, or extremely useful. In order to assess whether principals and assistant principals differed in their rating of this general form of the question. The six categories of rankings were reduced to two ('not at all useful to little use' and 'somewhat to extremely useful') as described above. Then, the responses of principals and assistants were compared and a Chi-square statistic was computed to test for significant differences in perceived value. The resulting comparison is depicted in Figure 3. The Figure shows that 9.8% of assistants and 14.5% of principals rated the assistant principalship as not at all useful or of little use, while 90.2% of assistants and 85.5% of principals rated it somewhat to extremely useful. The Chi-square statistic of 1.22 (with $df=1$) was non-significant, indicating no difference in the perceptions of principals and assistant

principals. As suggested by Figure 3, both groups tended to rate the assistant principalship highly useful as a training ground.

Perception of Training by Individual Area

A second approach to this research question was to examine differences in the perceived value of training as indicated by the ratings given by principals and assistants to the fourteen areas of responsibility. The areas of responsibility were taken one at a time and then summed to form the TRAINING index described above. This way of measuring the respondents' perception of the assistant principalship as training ground differed from the first approach in-as-much as it allowed them to rank one area of responsibility at a time rather than approach the issue of preparation generally. Once combined in a scale, it was assumed by the investigator, that the TRAINING index would provide a more sensitive measure of the respondents' perceptions. Thus a Student's t-test was applied to assess differences in the mean TRAINING index scores for principals and assistants. The mean for principals was 39.78 (n=138) while that for assistants was considerably higher at 46.98 (n=184). A t-value of 4.83 (df=320) was found to be significant ($p=.000$), and indicated that assistants ranked the value of the assistant principalship as a training ground significantly higher than principals.

Figure 3. Perceived training value of assistant principal position.

Since the TRAINING index of respondents' ratings was a composite score assessing ratings over 14 areas of responsibility, a more detailed analysis was conducted to assess which areas contributed to the differences detected by the t-test. The results of this analysis are presented graphically in Figure 4.

To create Figure 4, each of the fourteen areas of assistant principal responsibility was recoded into its two-category form, 'no value to little value' and 'somewhat to extremely valuable'. Then, the percentage of respondents rating each area 'somewhat to extremely valuable' was plotted on the graph.

The graph depicts two areas of interest. First, which areas principals and assistants rated most valuable for the training of assistants and, second, how their perceptions differed. The topic of most highly rated areas is addressed first. There were five areas rated "somewhat to extremely valuable" by more than 80% of assistant principals. They were discipline (DC), community relations (CR), evaluation (EV), activity supervision (AC), and school improvement (SI). Principals gave their highest ratings to four of these areas. They were discipline (DC), community relations (CR), evaluation (EV), and activity supervision (AC). Principals replace school improvement (SI) with guidance and counseling (GD) in their highest ratings. These ratings can be compared with the actual daily responsibilities of

Figure 4. Comparative importance of assistant principal duties.

assistants and principals (see Figure 2). Assistants are more frequently assigned than principals to discipline, evaluation, and activity supervision and less frequently assigned than principals to the highly rated areas of community relations and school improvement. In a similar vein, assistant principals are more frequently assigned to the area of guidance and counseling, the area in which principals and assistants differed in their ratings of the five most important areas.

Differences in the perceptions of principals and assistants were a consequence of the fact that the percentage of assistant principals who rated the usefulness of the areas 'somewhat to extremely valuable' was consistently higher than the percentage of principals. This created a small, but uniform difference. The curves for the two administrative categories are similar in shape but different in magnitude. Two exceptions to this general observation were in the areas of curriculum development (CD) and guidance and counseling (GD) where the two groups of administrators were nearly equal in their ratings.

By way of summary, it should be noted that the two approaches to differences in principals' and assistants' perceptions yielded different results. When queried in general about the usefulness of the assistant principalship as a training ground, no significant differences in principals' and assistant principals' perceptions were

found. However, when ratings of individual areas were combined in a TRAINING index, significant differences in principal and assistant mean scores were found. A graphic analysis of ratings of individual items showed this difference could be attributed to the fact that more assistant principals than principals rated each area 'somewhat to extremely valuable'. It may also suggest that differences which were imperceptible to the raters when presented with the general form of the question became more salient when they rated one area of responsibility at a time.

Perception of Additional Factors

Differences in principal and assistant principal perceptions was focused in survey questions 3 through 11 which were concerned with the nine areas of: (1) supervision and evaluation duties; (2) staff complaints and problems; (3) size of administrative staff; (4) clarification of the role of the assistant principal; (5) the assistant principalship as a satisfactory goal in and of itself; (6) the number of assignments given each assistant principal; (7) the specialization of job assignments; (8) professional interaction; and (9) communication between the assistant principal and principal. Separate chi-square tests for the relationship between ratings in each of the nine areas and the principal or assistant status of the

respondents were computed. With the alpha level set at .01 to reject the null hypothesis, none of these areas were found to be significantly associated to the administrative status of the respondents. It was concluded that there were no differences in the principals' and assistants' perceptions of the value of these areas for training.

FACTORS AFFECTING THE PERCEPTIONS OF ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS

Research question 2 asked what factors affected the assistant principals' perceptions of the assistant principalship as a training ground. The analysis presented below investigated the potential for four factors to affect their perceptions: (1) the number of other assistant principals with whom the respondent worked (staff size); (2) whether or not assistants believed the assistant principalship was a satisfactory career goal in its own right; (3) whether the assistants were actually assigned to an area; and (4) whether or not gender affected their perceived value of training.

Staff Size

The first factor investigated was the number of assistant principals working in the same school as the respondent. The investigator hypothesized that assistant principal perceptions of training may be related to the size of the administrative staff. The fewer assistants in a

school, the greater the number of areas of responsibility each will be assigned. Similarly, the greater the number of assistants, the fewer areas of responsibility available for each. Thus, the kind of experience each assistant can have may be related to the number of other assistants in the same school.

To explore the relationship between staff size and perceptions of training, a t-test was computed which compared the mean TRAINING index for assistants in schools with one assistant principal with that for assistants in schools with two or more assistant principals. The mean for respondents in schools with one assistant principal was 44.11 (n=56) while that for respondents in schools with two or more assistant principals was four points higher at 48.22 (n=127). This difference produced a significant t-value of -2.69 (df=181, $p=.008$) indicating that respondents in schools with two or more assistant principals rated the value of their training higher.

In Figure 5, the percentage of assistant principals rating each area of responsibility 'somewhat to extremely valuable' are shown. The ratings of assistants in schools with one assistant principal are contrasted with those from schools with two or more assistant principals. Of the fourteen areas rated, only four received similar ratings from both groups of assistants: discipline (DC), community relations (CR), athletic supervision (AT), and hiring and

Figure 5. Differences in perceived value of training in small vs. large staffs.

selection (HS). In all cases but three, higher ratings were awarded by respondents from schools with two or more assistant principals.

One theory put forward earlier in regard to the issue of staff size was that staff size affected perception by limiting the areas of responsibility assigned. To explore this facet of the analysis in greater depth, a second graph was computed depicting the proportion of respondents actually assigned to each area in schools with one, or two or more, assistant principals. These results are portrayed in Figure 6. The figure reveals that although training-value ratings for the two groups were moderately dissimilar, their actual assignments are similar to one another. Both the shape of the curves and the height of the points plotted on the scale are also similar. However, there were seven areas where assignments differed according to staff size. They were curriculum development (CD), athletic supervision (AT), activity supervision (AC), guidance and counseling (GD), hiring and selection (HS), special education (SE), and improvement of instruction (II). Although the proportion of assistants actually assigned to each area of responsibility appears to be unaffected by staff size, there are differences in half of the areas. At the same time, the significant t-test indicated that staff size did influence the assistant principals' perception of their training.

Figure 6. Assistant principal assignments in schools with small vs. large staffs.

Assistant Principalship as Career Goal

A second factor believed to affect the assistant principals' perceptions of their training was whether or not they believed the assistant principalship was a satisfactory career goal in and of itself. A majority of the assistants (76%) who responded indicated that the assistant principalship was indeed a satisfactory career goal, while 24% believed it was not. Did assistant principals who aspired to become principals perceive the value of the assistant principalship as a training ground differently than assistant principals who were not interested in promotion? A t-test was computed to compare the ratings of the training value of the assistant principalship for these two groups. Those who believed the assistant principalship to be a satisfactory career had a mean on the TRAINING index of 47.38 (n=140), while those who believed it was not satisfactory had a mean of 45.73 (n=44). This was not a significant difference. Assistants' perceptions of the value of their training was apparently unaffected by their beliefs of the assistant principalship as a satisfactory career goal.

Actual Assignments

A third factor concerned whether actual assignments affected the training-value ratings given individual areas of responsibility. It was reasoned that areas to which the

assistants were assigned would receive greater importance than those in which they were uninvolved. This reasoning was tested by crosstabulating the assistants' actual areas of assignment with the ratings they gave each area as a training ground for the principalship. A Chi-square test was applied to each crosstabulation to assess the statistical relationship between actual assignment to an area and the rating it recieved. Those results are presented in Table II.

The table reports the percentage of assistants who rated an area 'somewhat to extremely valuable' and omits those rating the area 'not at all to little value'. (For this reason percentages will not total 100%.) The table then compares the percentage of assistants who gave high ratings and were assigned to an area with those who gave high ratings and were not assigned. The Chi-square test and probability of observing this difference by chance are also reported.

The table indicates that the training-value ratings given by assistants to each area of responsibility were highly related to the areas they were currently assigned. When an assistant was actually assigned to an area, he or she tended to rate the value of the area as a training ground higher. For example, assistants who were charged with hiring were more likely to rate this area higher than assistants who were not involved in hiring. There were

TABLE II
COMPARISON OF TRAINING-VALUE RATINGS WITH
ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS' ACTUAL ASSIGNMENTS

AREA	% ASSIGNED	% NOT ASSIGNED	CHI- SQUARE	PROB
DISCIPLINE	96.0	84.5	7.34	.007
CURR DEVELOP	92.4	56.9	28.13	.000
BUDGET	87.9	58.5	15.55	.000
COMM. RELATIONS	95.1	87.1	3.43	N.S.*
EVALUATION	85.2	62.1	8.65	.003
STAFF DEVELOP	80.0	70.0	2.22	N.S.
MAINTENANCE	79.7	61.5	6.26	.012
ATHLET SUPERVIS	84.0	59.1	14.03	.000
ACTIVITY SUPERV	83.8	84.2	0.01	N.S.
SCHOOL IMPROVE	88.4	72.3	6.80	.009
GUIDANCE	85.1	66.7	7.29	.007
HIRING	90.9	62.3	20.89	.000
SPECIAL ED	84.7	51.2	19.04	.000
IMPROVE INSTRUC	85.9	68.9	7.16	.008

*N.S. = not significant

three exceptions to this general observation. They were in the areas of community relations, staff development, and activity supervision where no significant difference in percentages was found.

Several other observations concerning this set of relationships can be made from Table II. First, all assistants tended to rate the value of each of the areas fairly high. For example, even among assistants not assigned to an area, the percentage of respondents rating the area 'somewhat to extremely valuable' never fell below 51.2%. By the same token, among assistants who were assigned to an area, the percentage rating 'somewhat to extremely valuable' never fell below approximately 80%.

This result can be reinforced by examining the comparisons graphically. Figure 7 plots the percentage of assistants rating the areas 'somewhat to extremely valuable' alongside the percentage of assistants actually assigned to a given area. The strength of the result is seen from the fact that the shape of the two curves is virtually identical. With exception of the area of evaluation (EV), this observation can be interpreted to mean that the relative worth of each of the areas as a training ground is a function of the number of assistants who are involved in these assignments on a daily basis.

Figure 7. Comparison of assistant principal perceptions with assignments.

Gender

Gender was a fourth factor believed to affect the assistant principals' perceptions of their training. Three separate analyses were used to explore the influence of gender. First, male and female assistants' ratings of their training as measured by the TRAINING index were compared using the t-test. Second, male and female perceptions of the extent to which job assignments were based on gender, as measured by the STEREOTYPE index, were compared using the t-test. Third, a statistical assessment was made to determine whether male and female assistants were actually assigned to specific areas in proportions greater than would be expected by chance. In the paragraphs following each of these analyses is described in turn.

It was hypothesized that males and females could view the value of their training differently. Since male assistants outnumbered their female counterparts by a sizeable margin--there were nearly four times as many male assistants--females may view their experience differently than males in the same position. This was tested by assessing male and female scores on the TRAINING index. A t-test showed males with a mean score of 46.12 ($n=145$) and females with a mean score of 50.63 ($n=38$). With $df=181$, a t-value of -2.61 was found to be significant ($p=.01$). Male and female assistant principals viewed the value of

their training differently, with more females viewing the experience as valuable.

Once again a graph was prepared in which the proportion of male and females assistants reporting an area 'somewhat to extremely valuable' was plotted. Those values are depicted in Figure 8. There were two points along the curves in which male and female assistants tended to agree on the worth of a particular area in training. They were budgetary process (BG) and community relations (CR). Males rated the areas of discipline (DC), maintenance (MN), athletic supervision (AT), and school improvement (SI) higher than females. The female assistants rated the value of the remaining areas higher than the males. These areas were curriculum development (CD), teacher evaluation (EV), staff development (SD), guidance and counseling (GD), hiring and selection (HS), special education (SE), and improvement of instruction (II).

It was also hypothesized that male and female assistant principals might perceive differences in the degree to which job assignments were made on the basis of gender. To address this question the STEREOTYPE index was used as the dependent variable. This composite measure was the sum of the respondents ratings of the extent of stereotyping in each area of responsibility. A t-test comparing male and female assistants' ratings on this index showed a mean STEREOTYPE score of 12.87 (n=145) for males

Figure 8. Perceived differences in the value of training index items.

and 13.32 ($n=38$) for females. With $df=181$ and a t -value of -0.18 , there was no significant difference in the mean STEREOTYPE score for male and female assistant principals.

Item G on page four of the questionnaire (see Appendix G) asked each respondent to indicate the area to which he or she was actually assigned. With this information it was possible to evaluate the extent to which male and females were actually assigned to particular areas of responsibility at a rate higher than would be expected by chance. The gender of the 184 assistant principals was cross-tabulated with each area of responsibility, and a Chi-square test was computed to assess the strength of association between gender and each assignment area. A significant correlation was found in four areas: discipline, athletic supervision, maintenance, and improvement of instruction. The proportions of male and female assignments to these areas is summarized in Table III. The table illustrates that males were assigned to discipline, athletic supervision and maintenance more frequently than would be expected by chance while the same was true for females assigned to the area of improvement of instruction. It is interesting to note that women were assigned to the areas of discipline, maintenance, and athletic supervision less often than men and women perceived them as less valuable assignments (see Figure 8). The differences between male and female assignments across all fourteen areas of responsibility are plotted in

TABLE III
GENDER AND ASSIGNMENT AREAS

AREA	% MALES	% FEMALES	CHI- SQUARE	PROB.
DISCIPLINE			5.62	.017
assigned	83.9	16.1		
not assigned	68.4	31.6		
MAINTENANCE			8.21	.004
assigned	90.6	9.4		
not assigned	72.4	27.6		
ATH. SUPERVISION			4.07	.044
assigned	84.9	15.1		
not assigned	72.7	27.3		
IMPROVEMENT OF INSTRUCTION			4.31	.038
assigned	71.4	28.6		
not assigned	84.4	15.6		

Figure 9, which supports the statistical summary presented in Table III. As seen in the graph, most assignment areas are neutral with regard to gender, the exceptions being discipline (DC), maintenance (MN), athletic supervision (AT), and improvement in instruction (II).

FACTORS AFFECTING PRINCIPALS PERCEPTIONS

Research question 3 asked what factors influenced the perceptions held by principals of the training value of the assistant principalship. It was hypothesized that principals' perceptions could be affected by four factors: (1) the amount of time they served as assistant principals; (2) the length of time they had been principals; (3) the number of assistant principals they currently supervised; and (4) gender. This section reports results of these analyses.

Principals' Experience as Assistant Principals

Familiarity with the assistant principal's position was believed to affect the principals' rating of each area as a training ground. Thus, time spent in this position might account for differences in the percentages of principals who rated each area 'somewhat to extremely valuable'. To test this belief, a t-test was computed to compare differences in the mean TRAINING index score for principals who had spent three years or less as assistants

Figure 9. Differences in the assignments of male and female assistant principals.

and those who had spent more than three years as assistants. Principals who spent less time as assistants had a mean score on the TRAINING index of 34.60 (n=53) compared to that for principals who were assistants for a longer time, 42.64 (n=73). With $df=124$, a t-value of -2.66 was significant ($p=.009$). Thus, the shorter the time spent as an assistant, the less value awarded overall to the assistant principalship as a training ground.

A detailed analysis of this difference is presented in Figure 10 which compares the percentage of principals giving high ratings and spending three years or less as assistants with the percentage of principals giving high ratings and spending four years or more as an assistant principal. The differences between the two groups of principals are spread fairly evenly over all fourteen areas of responsibility with the exception of budget (BG), evaluation (EV) and maintenance (MN).

A second means by which past experience affects current perception can be seen in the way the length of time principals spent as assistants influenced the length of time they recommended assistants should spend in that position. Principals' were asked to recommend an appropriate length of time, three years or less or four years or more, for assistants to remain in that position before promotion to the principalship. This rating was then crosstabulated with the length of time each principal had spent as an assistant.

Figure 10. Effect of experience as assistant principal on principals' perceptions of training.

The results showed principals tended to recommend a length of time that was commensurate with their own past experience. Sixty-eight percent of principals who had spent three years or less as assistants recommended this length of time as ideal, while 79% who had spent four years or more recommended this time period (Chi-square 29.05, $df=1$, $p=.0000$).

Experience as Principal

It was hypothesized that principals' training-value ratings would be influenced by the length of time they had been principals. Thus the mean TRAINING index score for principals who had been in their position three years or less was compared to that for principals on the job four years or more. Principals who had been in their position four years or more scored significantly higher on the TRAINING index (mean=43.88, $n=77$) than those in the position a shorter time (mean=34.83, $n=58$; $t=-3.16$, $df=133$, $p=.002$).

Figure 11 analyzes the differences between these two groups area by area. The figure demonstrates that with the exception of maintenance (MN), a larger percentage of principals with four years or more in their current position consistently rated each area 'somewhat to extremely valuable'.

Figure 11. Effect of experience as principal on principals' perceptions of training.

Number of Assistant Principals Supervised

The size of staff supervised by the principal was also thought to affect his or her ratings of the training-value of each area. Thus principals who supervised staffs with one or no assistant principals were contrasted with those who supervised two or more assistants. The resulting t-test showed that principals supervising two or more assistants had a higher mean score on the TRAINING index (44.31, $n=61$) than those who supervised one or none (35.88, $n=76$; $t=-2.99$, $df=135$, $p=.003$).

Figure 12 analyzes these differences in detail. As before, this graph plots the percentage in each group rating an area 'somewhat to extremely valuable'. The figure demonstrates that principals supervising two or more assistants consistently rated each area 'somewhat to extremely valuable' in greater numbers than those supervising one or no assistants. This parallels the views of assistant principals that the training of assistant principals in schools with more than one assistant is perceived as more valuable than for those with a smaller staff size.

Gender

A fourth factor believed to affect principals' ratings of training value was gender. Until recently, the principalship has been largely a male domain. It was

Figure 12. Effect of staff size on principal's perceptions of training.

hypothesized that female principals might differ considerably in their perceptions of the assistant principalship as a training ground. To test this belief, a t-test was computed to compare male and female principals' mean scores on the TRAINING index. Female principals rated the overall training value of the assistant principalship significantly lower (mean=29.38, n=13) than their male counterparts (mean=40.86, n=125). With df=136, the resulting t-value of 2.37 was significant at the .019 level of probability.

As in past analyses, area differences were evaluated graphically. The results of this comparison are illustrated in Figure 13 which plots the percentage of male and female principals rating each area 'somewhat to extremely valuable'. With the exception of two areas, curriculum development (CD) and special education (SE), female principals gave lower ratings to all the areas of responsibility. Therefore, male principals placed more value on the areas of responsibility as a training ground.

FACTORS AFFECTING THE PERCEPTIONS OF PRINCIPALS
AND ASSISTANTS: AN INTERACTION EFFECT
BETWEEN GROUP MEMBERSHIP AND GENDER

A comparison of the graphic analyses of the effect of gender on the respondents' ratings, especially in Figures 7 and 13, suggests that gender influences the ratings of principals and assistants differently. That is, female

Figure 13. Perceived differences in the value of training index items.

assistant principals rated each area 'somewhat to extremely valuable' in higher proportions than male assistants. But for female principals the reverse is true; they rated each area 'somewhat to extremely valuable' in lower proportions than male principals. This observation suggests that group membership interacts with gender to influence the respondents' ratings of the value of assistant principal training. To test this observation further, a two-way analysis of variance was computed to learn if such an interaction was statistically significant. Independent variables in the analysis were group membership and gender. The dependent variable was the TRAINING index. The results of this analysis are presented in Table IV. The table indicates that while group membership and gender are taken as single main effects, only group membership shows a significant difference in mean TRAINING index scores. However, when group membership and gender are considered as a two-way interaction term, the result is highly significant and suggests that gender influences the ratings of principals and assistants differently.

A comparison of the four group means on the TRAINING index suggests the source of the interaction: Male assistant principals were found to have a mean TRAINING index score of 46.12 while male principals had a mean of 40.86. Female assistant principals were found to have a mean of 50.63,

TABLE IV

AN EXAMINATION OF THE INTERACTION BETWEEN
GROUP MEMBERSHIP AND GENDER ON THE
PERCEPTION OF TRAINING VALUE
USING ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

SOURCE OF VARIATION	SUM OF SQUARES	DF	MEAN SQUARE	F	SIGNIF. OF F
GENDER	.013	1	.013	.000	.993
GROUP MEMBERSHIP	4059.950	1	4059.950	23.903	.000
TWO-WAY INTERACTION: GENDER & GROUP MEMBERSHIP	2165.304	1	2165.304	12.748	.000
MEAN SQUARED ERROR	53843.614	317	169.854		

while the mean for female principals dropped to 29.38. The interaction effect is shown graphically in Figure 14. Female assistant principals on average gave higher ratings on the fourteen areas comprising the TRAINING index than did male assistants, whereas the reverse is true for principals where female principals on average gave lower ratings.

A detailed analysis comparing the proportions of male principals and assistants rating each area 'somewhat to extremely valuable' is presented in Figure 15. Figure 16 presents a comparable analysis for female assistants and principals. What can be observed in the two figures is a much greater similarity in the male ratings than those provided by females. Evidently, the ratings of female respondents were more influenced by their group membership as assistant principal or principal than those provided by males.

SUMMARY

Surveys from 323 assistant principals and principals who were members in the Confederation of Oregon School Administrators were analyzed statistically to answer three research questions:

1. Do principals and assistant principals differ in the extent to which they perceive the assistant principalship as an adequate training ground for the principalship?

Figure 14. Comparison of mean training scores for male and female assistants and principals.

Figure 15. Differences in perceptions of training by male assistants and principals.

Figure 16. Differences in perceptions of training by female assistants and principals.

2. What factors affect the perceptions of assistant principals?

3. What factors influence the perceptions of principals?

The major dependent variable used in the analyses performed to answer these questions was an index of overall ratings of the value of training. It was computed by summing the ratings of fourteen areas of responsibility. The six category rating scales were then reduced to two categories for use in graphs and to enhance interpretation.

Comparisons of assistant principals' and principals' scores showed they differed significantly on their ratings of training value. Further analysis demonstrated a number of factors influenced the ratings and may account for the differences between assistants and principals.

When the factors affecting the assistant principals' ratings were assessed, two characteristics of assistants, staff size and gender, were found to significantly affect their ratings. There were no significant differences when assistants were grouped by their belief that the assistant principalship was a satisfactory career goal in its own right.

Four factors were found to influence the ratings of principals: the length of their experience as assistant principals; the amount of time they had been principals, the

number of assistant principals they currently supervised, and their gender.

Taken together, gender and group membership, were found to interact in their influence of the respondents' ratings of the training value of the assistant principalship.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Although the assistant principalship has been an important part of American secondary schools for over thirty years, the educational establishment has yet to arrive at a formal definition of the assistant principal's role in that institution. Researchers have tended to find the assistant in a role defined by procedures. At the same time, they have called for a new definition of the assistant based on policy-making activities. This outcome has had several important consequences, not the least of which has been failure to provide formal guidelines for training assistants in their role and preparing them for future administrative assignments.

In their attempt to remediate these problems, a number of educational researchers have begun to rely on two themes that have emerged from the educational literature. The first focuses on new attempts to define the role of the assistant principal in investigations of the daily life of running the secondary school, i.e., in evaluating the potential of the assistant principal's position as a training ground. The rationale for this approach grows out of the idea that if the worth of the position as a training

ground can be identified, the identification may lead to a better definition of the assistant principal's role. The second theme stresses the role of the principal in shaping this training ground. In combination, these themes suggest the usefulness of assessing how each administrator, the assistant and the principal, views the assistant principalship as a training ground.

This study was cast in that mold. It has investigated the relationship between fourteen areas of responsibility connected with secondary school administration and the role of the assistant principal in meeting them. Unlike previous studies, it has emphasized, not the areas themselves, but the perceptions of principals and assistants who rated the value of each area as a training ground for the principalship. By classifying the areas perceived to be most valuable for training, the study contributes to the emerging definition of the assistant principalship. Also, by explaining the relationship between the administrators' backgrounds and their influence on the ratings given, this study has attempted to account for the factors that affected the respondents' perceptions.

The study was organized around three research questions:

- (1) Do principals and assistant principals differ in the extent to which they perceive the assistant

principalship as an adequate training ground for the principalship?

(2) What factors affect the perceptions of assistant principals?

(3) What factors influence the perceptions of principals?

In order to address these questions, secondary school administrators who were members of the Confederation of Oregon School Administrators (COSA) were surveyed. They rated fourteen areas of responsibility for their training value and for the extent to which assignments to the areas were made on the basis of gender stereotyping. In addition, the areas to which the respondents were currently assigned were reported. The respondents also supplied background information concerning the years of experience in their current position and size of the administrative staff of which they were a part. Of the 454 members surveyed, 373 returned completed questionnaires, yielding a response rate of 71%. Assistant principals comprised 57% of the sample, while principals comprised 43%. Females comprised 16% of the sample and males 84%.

Major findings suggest that while principals and assistants differed in the amount of value they awarded each area, they consistently identified the same areas as valuable. Assistants' perceptions were found to be influenced by staff size and gender. Principals' perceptions

were related to their length of tenure as assistant principals, how long they had been principals, number of assistant principals they supervised, and gender. This chapter summarizes those findings, describes the implications of the study, and makes recommendations for future research.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

This section summarizes the substantive findings of the study. It addresses each research question in turn.

Comparison of Principals' and Assistant Principals' Perceptions

In order to answer the first research question, the perceptions of principals and assistants were compared. The differences in the overall value placed by principals and assistants on the assistant principalship as a training ground were examined. When queried in general about the preparation value of the assistant principalship, there were no differences in principal and assistant perceptions; both perceived the assistant principalship as highly valuable (see Figure 3).

In contrast, when ratings of the fourteen areas were made separately and then summed, assistants and principals were found to differ significantly. A detailed analysis of these differences made on an item-by-item basis (see Figure 4) showed that the difference was a consequence of the

fact that more assistant principals than principals perceived the fourteen areas as good preparation for the principalship.

Six areas were identified as most valuable in preparing the assistant to move into the principal's position by the two groups of administrators. Principals judged discipline, community relations, teacher evaluation, activity supervision, and guidance and counseling as the most valuable areas of responsibility for training. Assistant principals perceived the same areas as most valuable with the exception of guidance and counseling for which they substituted school improvement. (See Figure 4.) If all six areas are taken into consideration, and classified as either procedure-based or policy-based they are evenly divided between the two categories. Discipline, activity supervision, and guidance and counseling can be classified as procedural while community relations, teacher evaluation and school improvement emphasize policy making. Although each area has some elements of both, this classification scheme suggests that principals and assistants recognize the need for assistants to be involved in both categories of activity.

Factors Influencing Assistant Principals' Perceptions

The second research question asked what factors influenced the perceptions of the assistant principals. Two

factors were found to significantly influence their perceptions. They were staff size and gender.

Assistants from schools with two or more assistants tended to rate the value of the fourteen areas higher. This finding may be explained by the fact that assistant principals in schools with larger staff sizes tended to be assigned to policy areas at a higher frequency (see Figure 6). When the frequency of assignments differed, assistant principals in schools with a higher staff size were more frequently assigned to curriculum development, hiring and selection, and improvement of instruction. At the same time, assistants from schools with low staff size were more frequently assigned to athletic supervision and activity supervision. This finding suggests that schools with larger staffs may have more policy-oriented training grounds for their assistant principals.

The second area found to significantly influence the assistant principal perceptions was gender. Although there were some areas (discipline, athletic supervision, maintenance, and improvement of instruction) where male and female assistants were assigned at a greater rate than expected by chance, there was no difference between their ratings of the extent to which assignments were made on the basis of gender stereotyping. Of the areas where differential assignment was shown to exist, females were more frequently assigned to the policy area of improvement

of instruction while males were more frequently assigned to the procedural areas of discipline, athletic supervision and maintenance (see Figure 9).

A comparison of male and female ratings of the worth of each of the fourteen areas showed significant differences in their perceptions. These differences were in large part attributable to the fact that more female assistant principals rated the policy areas of curriculum development, teacher evaluation, staff development, hiring and selection, and improvement of instruction higher than their male counterparts (see Figure 8).

Factors Influencing Principals' Perceptions

Research question three asked what factors influenced the principals' perceptions. There were four factors in all that were found to be significantly influential: amount of time as assistant principals, length of time as principals, number of assistants supervised, and gender.

The first was length of time principals spent as assistant principals. Principals who had spent over three years as assistants tended to rate the assistant principalship as valuable more often than those who were assistants three years or less (see Figure 10). This result suggests that greater time spent by principals as assistants may have enhanced their appreciation of the value of the assistant principalship as a training ground.

The second factor was length of time spent as a principal. The pattern for these ratings was similar to that discussed above. Respondents who had been principals more than three years tended to rate the fourteen areas higher than those who had been principals three years or less (see Figure 11). Taken together, these two results may lead to the conclusion that principals who placed more value on the assistant principalship are more likely to work within the teamwork approach and devise new ways to shape the assistant principalship as a training ground.

The size of the staff supervised by principals was also shown to influence their perceptions. Principals supervising a staff with two or more assistants tended to rate all fourteen areas more valuable (see Figure 12). One explanation for this result is suggested by the relationship between staff size and student population. The larger the population, the greater the number of tasks for administrators. Thus, if staff size is a surrogate measure for the size of student population, then it also measures the number of tasks a principal must face. These findings may point to the fact that principals with more tasks come to appreciate the abilities of their assistants and therefore the value of the assistant principalship as a training ground.

As was the case with assistant principals, gender was also shown to affect the principals perception of the

assistant principalship as a training ground. Male principals consistently rated the value of the large majority of the areas higher than their female counterparts (see Figure 4.13). Gender differences are complicated by their relationship with group membership. These findings are described in the following section.

Interactive Influence of Group Membership and Gender on Perceptions

The pattern of male principals rating the value of assignments higher than female principals constituted a reversal of that seen for male and female assistants and lead to a more complex analysis of the relationship between the respondents' group membership as principal or assistant, their gender, and the value placed on the assistant principalship as a training ground. A multivariate analysis which simultaneously assessed the effects of group membership and gender on the respondents' ratings uncovered the fact that female assistants and female principals differed substantially in their ratings of the value of the assistant principalship as a training ground. Whereas male principals and assistants were highly similar in their ratings, female principals rated the fourteen areas significantly lower than female assistants (see Figure 16).

These results lead to the speculation that male and female principals may reach the principalship by a different

path. It also suggested that promotion to principal may have changed the female principals' perceptions of their training. This outcome could also affect the way principals adopt the concept of teamwork in the school-site training of the assistants they supervise.

The size of the subpopulations based on gender within the sample reflected the distribution of males and females who actually held administrative positions in secondary schools in Oregon. However, it would be useful to replicate these results, since the number of female principals in this sample was small (n=13).

IMPLICATIONS OF THE FINDINGS

The study has addressed the problem of a definition for the role of assistant principal and has investigated similarities and differences in how principals and assistants perceived the value of the assistant principalship as a training ground. The findings showed that both principals and assistants had identified six areas that were rated most valuable for training and, more importantly, that the areas chosen demonstrated the respondents' belief that the role of the assistant principal should be a blend of procedural and policy-making duties. Other investigators (cf., Greenham, 1972; Smith, 1984; Greenfield, 1985; Black, 1980; Reed, 1984; Hentges, 1976) have stressed either a procedural or policy-making function

for the assistant. This investigation suggested that principals and assistant principals themselves were placing greatest value on, and would operationally define the role of the assistant as, a combination of both policy and procedure.

It was important to note that principals concurred with assistants' perceptions of the most valuable areas. This observations suggested a successful future for the teamwork concept in making day-to-day life in the secondary school a more adequate training ground for assistant principals. When the question was posed in general, there was no significant difference in the groups' perceptions of the assistant principalship as a training ground (see Figure 3). When they did differ in their ratings of the value of the fourteen areas, it was because fewer principals than assistants gave high ratings. It was not because they rated different areas most valuable (see Figure 4).

These findings have implications for the future definition of the assistant principalship and improved training for assistants because they showed that principals believed in the value of the assistant principalship as a training ground. Thus, they also suggest the feasibility of combining the leadership of the principal and the concept of teamwork in both the definition and training of assistants.

Since both groups concurred that a combination of policy and procedure best defined the assistant principal's

role, principals and assistants may be more prepared than they realize to implement the recommendations made recently in the newsletter of the National Association of Secondary School Principals:

Perhaps the most important concept is involving the assistant principal in policy making, planning, and daily decision making with regard to school administration. Since the assistant principal's authority to act must be delegated and supported by the principal, a real sharing of responsibility by means of an administrative team built on collegial relationships is essential (November, 1988, p. 1).

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

There are several research questions that could usefully be answered in new research efforts.

1. A new study could determine whether or not school size affects administrators' perceptions more dramatically than could be shown in a sample with as much diversity as that employed here. Staff size was shown in this investigation to significantly affect the respondents' perceptions. Therefore, it might be useful to comparatively survey samples of small and large schools. Such research could uncover the fact that the role of the assistant principal should vary according to school size.

2. Replication of this research also presents an opportunity to seek out and include a larger number of female administrators. The findings reported here could be

reinforced by increasing the number of female administrators' perceptions analyzed.

3. These findings suggested that female principals significantly differed from female assistant principals in their ratings of the assistant principalship as a training ground. While it would be useful to confirm these findings with a larger sample, it would also be informative to account for these differences by comparing male and female principals and female principals and assistants along a number of dimensions. It would be valuable to know if male and female principals moved into their positions by different paths. Were they assistant principals for different lengths of time? Have they been principals for comparable lengths of time? Additionally, such research could ask what factors account for the apparent change in the way female assistants and principals value the assistant principalship as a training ground.

4. An area of concern in the literature was job dissatisfaction among assistant principals (e.g., Black, 1980). These findings have shown that male assistants are sometimes given more procedural assignments than female assistants. These observations present an opportunity to confirm the notion that a combination of procedural and policy making assignments would enhance job satisfaction. This issue could be addressed by answering the question:

Do assistants with a combination of procedural and policy-making assignments have greater job satisfaction?

5. The TRAINING index proved to be a useful tool in determining perceptions of the administrators as to the value of each of the 14 areas of assignment. Additional research could utilize this idea in determining how administrators view the assignments as to the value by procedure vs. policy-making classifications by employing similar tools designed as PROCEDURE and POLICY indexes. Such an investigation would give administrators a more in-depth analysis of the areas of responsibility and assist them in revising assistant principal job descriptions to further promote professional growth within the assistant principalship.

6. The results indicated that assistant principals who had served in the assistant principalship for over three years tended to place more value on the position as a training ground. In a similar vein, principals who had served in the principalship for over three years tended to place more value on the assistant principalship as a training ground. It would be interesting to determine if at some point in their professional careers this perception changes. Do assistant principals or principals have the view of the assistant principalship after having served in their respective role for over five years, over seven years, etc? Is there a certain point in one's career after having

served in the assistant principalship a number of years that you no longer place as much value on the position as a training ground?

CONCLUSION

The assistant principal has become an integral part of secondary school administration over the last thirty years. Yet as the education system has evolved, the role of the assistant principal as described in the literature has remained constant. Recent research has tried to explore the assistant's role in order to enhance the value of the assistant principal's efforts. However, without continued focus on the development of the assistant's role and its evolution in the decades to come, the educational establishment will not effectively be utilizing what may be one of its most valuable resources. This study has focused on refining the definition of the assistant principal in the hope that the value of the position in the ongoing development of secondary school administration will not be overlooked.

REFERENCES

- Austin, D. B., & Brown, H. L., Jr. (1970). Report of the assistant principalship. volume 3: The study of the secondary school principalship. Washington, D.C.: National Association of Secondary School Principals. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 053 499)
- Barratt, T. K. (1955). Assistant principals. School Board Journal, 130, p. 56.
- Bates, R. C. & Shank, J. G. (1983, April). The associate principalship: a better, more effective way to manage schools. NASSP Bulletin, 67(462), pp. 111-114.
- Bilboa, J. B. (1980). A study of the inservice needs of secondary assistant principals in southwestern Idaho. Dissertation Abstracts International. (University Microfilms No. ADG 81-00,380)
- Black, A. B. (1980, May). Clarifying the role of the assistant principal. NASSP Bulletin, 64(436), pp. 33-39.
- Bordinger, D. L. (1973, October). Making the assistant principalship a career position. NASSP Bulletin, 57, pp. 10-15.
- Bortner, D. (1972). Public relations for public schools. Cambridge, MS: Schenkman Publishing Co.
- Brown, G. J., & Rentschler, J. E. (1973, October). Why don't assistant principals get the principalship? NASSP Bulletin, 57, pp. 36-47.
- Burgess, L. (1972). The new assistant principal--key person in the principal's team. Anaheim, CA: Paper presented at the National Association of Secondary School Principals Annual Convention. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 062 717)
- Burgess, L. (1973, October). Accepting the challenges of career development. NASSP Bulletin, 57, pp 48-52.
- Burgess, L. (1976, April). The assistant principalship: where now? NASSP Bulletin, 60, pp. 67-81.

- Carmines, E. G. & Zeller, R. A. (1979). Reliability and validity assessment. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Clements, J. (1980, May). Enhancing the role of the assistant principal. NASSP Bulletin, 64, pp. 14-22.
- Evans, D. (1986, January). Leadership misconstrued: the myth of 'super principal.' Thrust, 15(14), pp. 37-39.
- Fallon, B. V. (1974). Advice to the prospective assistant principal. NASSP Bulletin, 58, pp. 76-80.
- First, P. & Carr, D. (1986, November/December). Do you still want to be principal? Thrust, 16(3), pp. 48-50.
- Garawski, R. A. (1978, September). The assistant principal: his job and organizational potency. Clearing House, 52(1), pp. 8-10.
- Gatti, R. D. & Gatti, D. J. (1975). Encyclopedic dictionary of school law. West Nyack, NY: Parker Publishing Company, Inc.
- Gillespie, T. M. (1961). The assistant principal: status, duties, and responsibilities. National Association of Secondary School Principals, 45, pp. 59-68.
- Gorton, R. (1987, October). Improving the assistant principalship: the principal's contribution. NASSP Bulletin, 71, pp. 1-4.
- Greenfield, W. D. (1985, November). Developing an instructional role for the assistant principal. Education & Urban Society, 71, pp. 85-92.
- Greenham, W. H. (1972, September). Who is the assistant principal? Explorations into an elusive role. American Secondary Education, 2(4), pp. 27-32.
- Gross, R. A., Shapiro, M., & Meehan, J. (1980, May). Principals and assistants--how the management team concept can succeed. NASSP Bulletin, 64(436), pp. 26-28.
- Guthrie, J. W. & Reed, R. J. (1986). Educational administration and policy. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

- Gutek, G. (1983). Education and schooling in america. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Hall, G. E. & Guzman, F. (1984). Sources of leadership for change in high schools. Washington D. C.: National Institute of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 250 815)
- Hamlen, B. R. (1983). The campus coordinator's role as technical assistant to the principal. Dissertation Abstracts International. (University Microfilms No. ADG 84-12,022)
- Hampel, Sister J. (1987, October). Women administrators: networking for success. NASSP Bulletin, 71, pp. 44-45.
- Hentges, J. T. (1976). A normative study of the assistant principalship in selected Minnesota secondary schools. Mankato State University: Educational Specialist Theses. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 168 148)
- Hess, F. (1986). Study of sexual stereotyping in job selection. Chicago, IL: A paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Midwestern Educational Research Association. (University Microfilms No. ADG 86-16324)
- Hess, F. (1985, November). The socialization of the assistant principal from the perspective of the local school district. Education and Urban Society, 18(1), pp. 93-106.
- Howley, P. (1985, January). From the inside out--the assistant principalship--changes, speculations offered. NASSP Bulletin, 59(477), pp. 88-92.
- Hurley, L. (1965). The vice principal. NASSP Bulletin, 49, pp. 12-14.
- Jarrett, R. W. (1958, September). The activities of the assistant principal in secondary schools. The Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, 42, pp. 28-32.
- Kalla, M. M. (1983). A study of Kentucky secondary assistant principals: job responsibilities, importance, and satisfaction. Dissertation Abstracts International. (University Microfilms No. ADG 84-02,958)

- Kelly, G. (1987, October). The assistant principalship as a training ground for the principalship. NASSP Bulletin, 71, pp. 13-18.
- Kolb, D. A. (1984). Experiential learning: experience as the source of learning and development. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Kriekard, J. A. (1985). A validation of competencies for the secondary school assistant principal (performance based). Dissertation Abstracts International. (University Microfilms No. ADG 85-14,333)
- Kriekard, J. A. & Norton, M. S. (1980, May). Using the competency approach to define the assistant principalship. NASSP Bulletin, 64(436), p. 1-8.
- London, L. (1985). Developing managers. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Long, C. M. (1957, February). Duties of secondary school vice principals. National Association of Secondary Schools Principals, 41(226), pp. 26-37.
- Manasse, A. L. (1982, March). Effective principals: effective at what? Principal, 61(4), pp. 10-15.
- Mazzei, R. (1976). What is a vice-principal? Clearing House, 49, p. 319.
- McDade, T. E. (1981). Career path models for women administrators (Doctoral dissertaion, Arizona State University, 1981). Dissertation Abstracts International, 8117175.
- McDonald, P. S. (1981). An observational study of the workday of the urban high school assistant principal (Doctoral dissertation, Portland State University, 1981). Dissertation Abstracts International, 8120797).
- McIntyre, K. E. (1988, November). How to increase the assistant principal's effectiveness. Tips for principals from NASSP. Renton, VI.
- Michigan State Department of Education. (1985). The Michigan institute for educational management assessment center program. Lansing, Michigan. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 253 565)

- Norton, M. S. & Kierkard, J. A. (1987, October). Real and ideal competencies for the assistant principal. NASSP Bulletin, 71, pp. 23-29.
- Norusis, M. (1988) SPSS/PC+V2.0 Base manual for the IBM PC/XT/AT and PS/2. Chicago, IL: SPSS, Inc.
- Novak, B. J. (1963, June). Examining the role of the vice-principal. American School Board Journal, 146(6), pp. 19-20.
- Nunnally, J. C. (1978) Psychometric theory. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Company.
- Panyako, D. & Rorie, L. (1987, October). The changing role of the assistant principal. NASSP Bulletin, 71, pp. 6-8.
- Paus, G. S. (1970, February) The assistant principal. Oregon School Study Council Bulletin, 13(6), pp. 1-29.
- Peterson, K. D. (1985, March). Principals' work, socialization, and training: developing more effective leaders. Theory Into Practice, 25(3), pp. 151-155.
- Peterson, K. D., Marshall, C. & Grier, T. (1987, October). The assistant principals' academy: technical training and socialization of future leaders. NASSP Bulletin, 71, pp. 32-38.
- Potter, J. M., Jr. (1980, May). Ten suggestions: enhancing the role of the assistant principal. NASSP Bulletin, 64, pp. 9-12.
- Reed, D. B. (1984). The work of the secondary vice principalship: a field study. Dissertation Abstracts International. (University Microfilms No. ED-246 527)
- Roderick, L. (1986, February). Between us principals: working with assistant principals to achieve maximum value. NASSP Bulletin, 70(487), pp. 91-94.
- Smith, J. A. (1987, October). Assistant principals: new demands, new realities, and new perspectives. NASSP Bulletin, 71, pp. 9-12.
- Smith, J. A. (1984). A comparative study of the role of the secondary assistant principal: new demands, new realities, and new perspectives. Dissertation Abstracts International. (University Microfilms No. ADG 84-24,947)

- Turner, H. E. (1973, October). The VIP as a VIP. NASSP Bulletin, 57, pp. 53-62.
- Valentine, J. (1980, May). Preparing your assistant for the principalship. NASSP Bulletin, 64(436), pp. 40-43.
- Webster, J. R. (1985). Case studies of women superintendents, assistant superintendents, secondary principals, and secondary assistant principals in the state of Maine. Dissertation Abstracts International. (University Microfilms No. ADG 85-17,434)
- Weldy, G. R. (1979, May). Principals: what they do and who they are. NASSP Bulletin, 63, pp. 20-22.
- Wells, P. C., Nelson, R. H., & Johnsen, E. M. (1965). The assistant secondary school principal. NASSP Bulletin, 49, pp. 15-22.

APPENDIX A
PILOT STUDY PARTICIPANTS

Edison High School:

Jack A. Kennedy, Principal
Brian Garland, Assistant Principal
Bill Blankinship, Assistant Principal
Tony Lipold, Activities Director
Jim Buhman, Dean
Carla Rush, Dean

Fountain Valley High School:

Mike J. Kasler, Principal
Hal Gubernick, Assistant Principal
Wayne Mickaelian, Assistant Principal
Jim Lande, Assistant Principal
Mike Bryan, Activities Director
Derek Harrison, Dean
Carol Osbrink, Dean

Huntington Beach High School:

Gary D. Ernst, Principal
Leon Stoabs, Assistant Principal
Joanne Haukland, Assistant Principal
Darrell Stillwagon, Activities Director
Ron Wootton, Dean
Tracy Brennan, Dean

Marina High School:

Dr. Ira Toibin, Principal
Jeannine Lucan, Assistant Principal
Jim Keating, Assistant Principal
Dave Thompson, Activities Director
Mark Attebery, Dean
Barbara Ryan, Dean

Ocean View High School:

John P. Myers, Principal
George Clemens, Assistant Principal
Shirley Pyle, Assistant Principal
Jim Staunton, Dean
Paul Zack, Dean

Westminister High School:

Robert A. Boehme, Principal
Ed Harcharik, Assistant Principal
Frank Paredes, Assistant Principal
Don Griffiths, Asctivities Director
Carolyn Stephenson, Dean
Rosemarie Whitworth, Dean

APPENDIX B

PILOT STUDY COVER LETTER

OCEAN VIEW HIGH SCHOOL

17071 GOTHARD STREET, HUNTINGTON BEACH, CA 92647

PHONE: (714) 848-0656

September, 1987

Dear Colleague:

Working with the College of Education at Portland State University, we are currently seeking to analyze the role of the Assistant Principalship in obtaining administrative skills as perceived by assistant principals and principals in the state of Oregon. The administrative teams of the high schools in the Huntington Beach Union High School District have been selected to participate in a pilot study that will enhance the development of the questionnaire and the further investigation of the assistant principalship.

We are seeking your cooperation in the evaluation of the enclosed questionnaire. We desire input as to the appropriateness of the structure and content of the questions and their ability to develop perspectives on the central issue of this study. Please feel free to add to or delete in the content area of the questions. The questionnaire will then be sent to approximately 500 principals and assistant principals who are members of the Confederation of Oregon School Administrators. Please note that in Oregon, building administrators who report to the principal carry the title of assistant or vice principal.

Your prompt response will help us complete this very important educational project. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Patricia A. Howell
Activities Director

APPENDIX C
PILOT STUDY QUESTIONNAIRE

AN ANALYSIS OF THE ROLE OF THE
ASSISTANT PRINCIPALSHIP
IN OBTAINING ADMINISTRATIVE SKILLS

by
Patricia A. Howell

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for
the Doctor of Education Degree
in Educational Leadership

School of Education
Portland State University
Portland, Oregon

September, 1987

QUESTIONNAIRE

An Analysis of the Role of the Assistant Principalship
in Obtaining Administrative Skills

The information desired by this questionnaire will hopefully resolve the following objective:

What effect do the present on-site duties of an assistant principal have in obtaining the necessary skills for professional advancement?

1. To what extent does the present job description of an Assistant Principal at your high school prepare you for the role of a principal in the following areas: Please circle one response for each item.	Not at all	Very Little	Little	Somewhat	Very	Extremely
A. discipline	0	1	2	3	4	5
B. curriculum development	0	1	2	3	4	5
C. budgetary processes	0	1	2	3	4	5
D. community relations	0	1	2	3	4	5
E. teacher supervision/evaluation	0	1	2	3	4	5
F. staff development	0	1	2	3	4	5
G. on-site building maintenance	0	1	2	3	4	5
H. athletic supervision	0	1	2	3	4	5
I. activity supervision	0	1	2	3	4	5
J. other _____	0	1	2	3	4	5
-
2. To what extent does there tend to be a stereotyping by sex as to the capability to perform assignments in the following roles. Please circle one response for each item.	Not at all	Very Little	Little	Somewhat	Very	Extremely
A. discipline	0	1	2	3	4	5
B. curriculum development	0	1	2	3	4	5
C. budgetary processes	0	1	2	3	4	5
D. community relations	0	1	2	3	4	5
E. teacher supervision/evaluation	0	1	2	3	4	5
F. staff development	0	1	2	3	4	5
G. on-site building maintenance	0	1	2	3	4	5
H. athletic supervision	0	1	2	3	4	5
I. activity supervision	0	1	2	3	4	5
J. other _____	0	1	2	3	4	5

3. To what extent do supervision/evaluation duties prepare the Assistant Principal to evaluate potential new personnel within the scope of district hiring policies?
Please circle one response.

Not at all
0
1 Very Little
2 Little
3 Somewhat
4 Very
5 Extremely

4. To what degree does supervision/evaluation prepare the Assistant Principal to handle staff complaints and problems?
Please circle one response.

Not at all
0
1 Very Little
2 Little
3 Somewhat
4 Very
5 Extremely

5. What effect does the size of the administrative staff have on the depth in which the Assistant Principal is able to understand the complexity of job assignments given to him/her?
Please circle one response.

Not at all
0
1 Very Little
2 Little
3 Somewhat
4 Very
5 Extremely

6. To what extent to you feel there needs to be clarification as to the exact role of the Assistant Principal?
Please circle one response.

Not at all
0
1 Very Little
2 Little
3 Somewhat
4 Very
5 Extremely

7. To what degree do you believe being an Assistant Principal in and of itself can be a satisfactory professional goal?
Please circle one response.

Not at all
0
1 Very Little
2 Little
3 Somewhat
4 Very
5 Extremely

8. To what degree do the number of assignments given each Assistant Principal effect their ability to obtain administrative skills?
Please circle one response.

0 Not at all
1 Very Little
2 Little
3 Somewhat
4 Very
5 Extremely

3

9. Is too much specialization in the job assignment of an Assistant Principal a factor in his/her obtaining needed administrative skills for advancement?
Please circle one response.

0 Not at all
1 Very Little
2 Little
3 Somewhat
4 Very
5 Extremely

10. To what degree does an Assistant Principal have professional interaction with individuals that he/she would have to interact with as a principal?
Please circle one response.

0 Not at all
1 Very Little
2 Little
3 Somewhat
4 Very
5 Extremely

11. Does the length of time as an Assistant Principal have any relationship to the preparation for a principalship?
Please circle one response.

0 Not at all
1 Very Little
2 Little
3 Somewhat
4 Very
5 Extremely

12. To what extent do the Assistant Principal and the Principal communicate with each other as to the structure of the Assistant Principal's role in becoming a principal?
Please circle one response.

0 Not at all
1 Very Little
2 Little
3 Somewhat
4 Very
5 Extremely

13. To what extent do the experiences of an Assistant Principal provide adequate and appropriate preparation for a principalship? Please circle one response.

0 Not at all
1 Very Little
2 Little
3 Somewhat
4 Very
5 Extremely

The following demographic questions will be used to ascertain the effects of independent factors on the central issue of the study.

- A. Male _____ Female _____
- B. Assistant Principal _____ Principal _____
- C. Number of years of experience in present position:
0-3 _____ 4-7 _____ over 7 _____
- D. Number of years of experience as an Assistant Principal before being promoted to Principal:
0-3 _____ 4-7 _____ over 7 _____
- E. Professional Background:
_____ Initially prepared for administration
_____ Moved into administration from teaching
- F. Number of Assistant Principals in building:
0-2 _____ 3-5 _____ over 5 _____
- G. Number of major job assignments in your position:
0-2 _____ 3-5 _____ 5-7 _____ over 7 _____

APPENDIX D

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF COSA MEMBERS SURVEYED

Mr. Allen Abrahamson, Vice Principal
Cleveland High School
3400 SE 26th Avenue
Portland, OR 97202

Mr. Robert Adrian, Principal
Milwaukie High School
11300 SE 23rd Avenue
Milwaukie, OR 97222

Mr. David Aiken, Vice Principal
Roosevelt High School
6941 N. Central Street
Portland, OR 97203

Mr. Gary Anderson, Principal
Jewell High School
Elsie Route Box 1280
Seaside, OR 97138

Ms. Joanne Anderson, Assistant Principal
Gresham High School
1200 N. Main
Gresham, OR 97030

Mr. Lee Anderson, Student Activities Director
Seaside High School School
1901 N. Holladay
Seaside, OR 97138

Mr. Robert Anderson, Principal
North Eugene High School
200 Silver Lane
Eugene, OR 97404

Mr. R. Aultman, Principal
Vernonia High School
399 Bridge Street
Vernonia, OR 97064

Ms. Rosalie Ayora, Principal
Mapleton High School
PO Box 98
Mapleton, OR 97453

Mr. Allan Bacheller, Principal
Redmond High School
675 SW Rimrock Drive
Redmond, OR 97756

Ms. Verna Bailey, Vice Principal
Beaverton School District
PO Box 200
Beaverton, OR 97075

Mr. John Baird, Principal
Newport High School
322 NE Eads Street
Newport, OR 97365

Mr. Richard Baker, Principal
Gladstone High School
18800 Portland Avenue
Gladstone, OR 97027

Mr. Hazen Barnard, Principal
Warrenton High School
Rt. 1 Box 2151
Warrenton, OR 97146

Ms. MaryAnn Barnedkoff, Vice Principal
Hillsboro High School
3285 SW Rood Bridge Road
Hillsboro, OR 97123

Mr. Phil Barnekoff, Assistant Principal
Gencoe High School
2700 NW Glencoe Road
Hillsboro, OR 97123

Mr. Ray Barned, Principal
Vale Union High School
505 Nachez Street
Vale, OR 97918

Mr. Dan Barnum, Assistant Principal
Sheldon High School
2544 Willakenzie Road
Eugene, OR 97401

Mr. M. Barstad, Principal
Gilchrist High School
PO Box 668
Gilchrist, OR 97737

Mr. Charles Bates, Assistant Principal
Occupational Skills Center
14211 SE Johnson Road
Milwaukie, OR 97267

Mr. Robert Bates, Principal
Pine Eagle High School
PO Box 737
Halfway, OR 97834

Ms. Carol Beatty, Assistant Principal
Lebanon High School
South 5th Street
Lebanon, OR 97355

Dr. Shirley Beaty, Assistant Principal
Jefferson High School
336 Talbot Road
Jefferson, OR 97352

Mr. Richard Behn, Principal
Crescent Valley High School
4444 NW Highland
Corvallis, OR 97330

Mr. James Bergene, Principal
Ashland High School
201 South Mountain Avenue
Ashland, OR 97520

Mr. Roland Bevell, Vice Principal
La Grande High School
708 K Avenue
La Grande, OR 97850

Mr. Jim Bier, Principal
Heppner High School
PO Box 67
Heppner, OR 97836

Mr. Dennis Biggerstaff, Vice Principal
Creswell High School
33390 E. Nieblock Lane
Creswell, OR 97426

Mr. Jack Bimrose, Principal
Lincoln American School
1632 SW Westwood Court
Portland, OR 97201

Mr. John Bond, Principal
Yoncalla High School
PO Box 568
Yoncalla, OR 97499

Mr. David Booher, Assistant Principal
Lakeridge High School
1235 SW Overlook Drive
Lake Oswego, OR 97034

Ms. Dolores Bowman, Vice Principal
Jefferson High School
5210 N. Kerby
Portland, OR 97217

Mr. Joseph Bowman, Principal
Portland Evening High School
515 15th Avenue
Portland, OR 97232

M. Chris Boyle, Assistant Principal
Waldport High School
PO Box 270
Waldport, OR 97394

Mr. Marvin Brenneman, Principal
Pleasant Hill High School
36386 Highway 58
Pleasant Hill, OR 97401

Mr. Beryl Brodersen, Assistant Principal
North Salem High School
765 14th NE
Salem, OR 97301

Mr. Dennis Brooks, Principal
Willamina High School
266 Washington Street
Willamina, OR 97396

Mr. Gerry Brown, Vice Principal
Canby Union High School
721 SW 4th Street
Canby, OR 97013

Mr. Kenneth Brown, Assistant Principal
Dallas High School
901 SE Ash Street
Dallas, OR 97338

Mr. Ron Brown, Principal
Imbler High School
Imbler, OR 97841

Mr. Ronald Brown, Assistant Principal
Sprague High School
2373 Kuebler Road South
Salem, OR 97302

Mr. Donald Bryant, Dean of Students
Grants Pass High School
522 NE Olive Street
Grants Pass, OR 97527

Mr. Grant Budge, Assistant Principal
Hidden Valley High School
651 Murphy Creek Road
Grants Pass, OR 97527

Sister Mary Burke, Principal
St. Mary's Academy
1615 SW Fifth Avenue
Portland, OR 97201

Mr. Jack Burri, Assistant Principal
Newport High School
311 NE Eads Street
Newport, OR 97365

Mr. Robert Buss, Adm. Assistant
Thurston High School
333 N 58th Street
Springfield, OR 97477

Ms. Marilyn Bryne, Assistant Principal
North Eugene High School
200 Silver Lane
Eugene, OR 97404

Mr. Guido Caldarazzo, Principal
McKay High School
2440 Lancaster Drive NE
Salem, OR 97305

Mr. Jerry Campbell, Assistant Principal
Estacada High School
500 NE Main Street
Estacada, OR 97023

Mr. Rene Cardiff, Dean of Students
Roseburg High School
547 West Chapman Avenue
Roseburg, OR 97470

Sister Rita Carey, Assistant Principal
St. Marys Academy
1615 SW 5th Avenue
Portland, OR 97201

Mr. Len Carpenter, Principal
Reynolds High School
1200 NE 201st Avenue
Troutdale, OR 97060

Mr. Leonard Case, Vice Principal
Aloha High School
PO Box 200
Beaverton, OR 97075

Mr. Jack Catton, Principal
Butte Falls High School
PO Box 167
Butte Falls, OR 97522

Mr. William Caughell, Vice Principal
Reedsport High School
2260 Longwood Drive
Reedsport, OR 97467

Mr. Bradley Cermak, Vice Principal
Grant High School
2245 NE 36th Street
Portland, OR 97212

Dr. Johnm Chamberlain, Assistant Administrator
Clackamas High School
13801 SE Webster Road
Milwaukie, OR 97222

Mr. Thomas Chapman, Principal
McMinnville High School
PO Box 838
McMinnville, OR 97128

Mr. Robert Chiodo, Assistant Principal
Centennial High School
3505 SE 182nd Avenue
Gresham, OR 97030

Mr. Arthur Christiansen, Assitant Principal
McNarry High School
505 Sandy Drive North
Salem, OR 97303

Mr. Thomas Christiansen, Vice Principal
Roosevelt High School
6941 North Central
Portland, OR 97203

Mr. Glen Clark, Athletic Administrator
Dallas High School
901 SE Ash Street
Dallas, OR 97338

Mr. Peter Clark, Assistant Principal
Banks High School
PO Box 458
Banks, OR 97106

Mr. Joseph Clyde, Principal
South Umpqua High School
501 NW Chadwick
Myrtle Creek, OR 97457

Mr. Russell Conklin, Principal
McKenzie High School
51187 Blue River Drive
Finn Rock, OR 97488

Mr. Richard Coon, Assistant Principal
LaPine High School
51633 Coach road
LaPine, OR 97739

Mr. James Cornoyer, Principal
Neah-Kah-Nie Jr./Sr. High
24705 Highway 101 North
Rockaway Beach, OR 97136

Mr. Richard Correa, Principal
Gresham High School
1331 NW Eastman Parkway
Gresham, OR 97030

Mr. Tom Correia, Assistant Principal
Taft High School
PO Box 888
Lincoln City, OR 97367

Mr. Michael Costello, Principal
Dayville School District
PO Box C
Dayville, OR 97825

Ms. Laura Couture, Principal
Rainier High School
PO Box 498
Rainier, OR 97048

Mr. John Cover, Vice Principal
Lincoln High School
1600 SW Salmon Street
Portland, OR 97105

Mr. Patrick Cowan, Principal
Elgin High School
PO Box 68
Elgin, OR 97827

Ms. Joan Crosby, Vice Principal
Grant High School
2245 NE 36th Avenue
Portland, OR 97212

Mrs. Nancy Cross, Vice Principal
Tigard High School
9000 SW Durham Road
Tigard, OR 97223

Ms. Beverly Crouter, Assistant Principal
Santiam High School
PO Box 199
Mill City, OR 97360

Mr. Dennis Crow, Assistant Principal
Sandy High School
17100 Bluff Road
Sandy, OR 97055

Mr. Paul Curtis, Principal
Pendleton High School
1800 NW Carden
Pendleton, OR 97801

Mr. Sam Daterman, Assistant Principal
Riverside High School
PO Box 140
Boardman, OR 97818

Mr. Edwin Davidson, Principal
Corw High School
25863 Crow Road
Eugene, OR 97402

Mr. John DeBoie, Assistant Principal
South Albany High School
3705 S. Columbus
Albany, OR 97321

Mr. Lester DeHart, Principal
Sheridan High School
433 S. Bridge Street
Sheridan, OR 97378

Ms. Linda Denny, Assistant Principal
Sunset High School
PO Box 200
Beaverton, OR 97075

Mr. Gordon Detzel, Vice Principal
Redmond High School
675 SW Rimrock Drive
Redmond, OR 97756

Mr. Richard Deuel, Jr., Vice Principal
Lake Oswego High School
PO Box 310
Lake Oswego, OR 97034

Mr. Herbert DeVos, Principal
Thurston High School
3333 N. 58th Street
Springfield, OR 97477

Mr. Steve Dickenson, Vice Principal
South Umpqua High School
501 NW Chadwick
Myrtle Creek, OR 97457

Mr. Harley Dickerson, Dean
Eagle Point High School
203 N. Platt Ave.
Eagle, Point, OR 97502

Dr. James Dixon, Associate Principal
David Douglas High School
1400 SE 130th
Portland, OR 97233

Mr. Stanley Dmytryk, Principal
Madras High School
650 10th Street
Madras, OR 97741

Mr. David Doty, Principal
Crook County High School
1st & Knowledge
Prineville, OR 97754

Mr. Eugene Douthit, Principal
Grant High School
2245 NE 36th Avenue
Portland, OR 97202

Mr. Theodore Dowell, Assistant Principal
Junction City High School
1135 6th Avenue
Junction City, OR 97448

Mr. George Down, Principal
Central High School
1530 Monmouth Street
Independence, OR 97351

Mr. Loyd Drake, Assistant Principal
Springfield High School
875 N. 7th
Springfield, OR 97477

Mr. Gary Drill, Principal
Scio High School
38875 NW First Avenue
Scio, OR 97374

Mr. Dyron Dudley, Assistant Principal
North Eugene High School
200 Silver Lane
Eugene, OR 97404

Mr. James Duncan, Vice Principal
Coquille High School
499 W. Central
Coquille, OR 97423

Mr. George Dyer, Assistant Principal
South Salem High School
1910 Church Street SE
Salem, OR 97302

Mr. Gene Eakin, Assistant Principal
Lebanon High School
South 5th Street
Lebanon, OR 97355

Mr. Deno Edwards, Assistant Administrator
Putnam High School
4950 SE Roethe Road
Milwaukie, OR 97267

Mr. Hud Edwards, Assistant Principal
Central Linn High School
32433 Highway 228
Halsey, OR 97348

Mr. Carl Elliott, Principal
North Marion High School
20167 Grim Road NE
Aurora, OR 97002

Mr. Glenn Elliott, Dean of Activities
Hood River Valley High School
1220 Indian Creek Road
Hood River, OR 97031

Mr. Daniel Ellsworth, Principal
Nyssa High School
PO Box 334
Nyssa, OR 97913

Mr. Paul Erickson, Principal
Vocational Village High School
5040 SE Milwaukie Avenue
Portland, OR 97202

Mr. S. Evans, Principal
Stayton High School
757 West Locust
Stayton, OR 97383

Mr. Charles Farrell, Principal
Vernonia High School
299 Bridge Street
Vernonia, OR 97064

Mr. Jeffery Faust, Vice Principal
Elmira High School
Territorial Road
Elmira, OR 97437

Mr. Jim Ferguson, Assistant Principal
Amity High School
PO Box 138
Amity, OR 97101

Mr. Luke Fiorante, Vice Principal
Madison High School
2735 NE 82nd
Portland, OR 97220

Mr. Don Fisher, Vice Principal
Siuslaw High School
Rt 2 Box 4
Florence, OR 97439

Mr. Earl Fisher, Principal
Knappa High School
Rt 6 Box 226
Astoria, OR 97103

Dr. James Fisher, Principal
Willamette High School
8689-0731 Hollow Road
Eugene, OR 97402

Mr. Gerald Fitzpatrick, Vice Principal
Mazama High School
3009 Summers Lane
Klamath Falls, OR 97601

Mr. Marvin Flitcroft, Vice Principal
Cleveland High School
3400 SE 26th Avenue
Portland, OR 97202

Mr. Richard Flood, Assistant Principal
Gresham High School
1200 North Main
Gresham, OR 97030

Mr. James Ford, Principal
Creswell High School
33390 Nieblock Lane
Creswell, OR 97426

Mr. Bill Forgam, Principal
Alsea High School
PO Box B
Alsea, OR 97324

Mr. Victor Fox, Principal
Molalla High School--South Campus
PO Box 188
Molalla, OR 97038

Mr. Frank Frangipani, Vice Principal
Franklin High School
5405 SE Woodward Street
Portland, OR 97206

Mr. Zan Freeburn, Principal
St. Helens High School
2375 Gable Road
St. Helens, OR 97051

Mr. Hugh Fulton, Principoal
Illinois Valley High School
River Street & Laurel Road
Cave Junction, OR 97523

Mr. James Gadberry, Assistant Principal
Pendleton High School
1800 NW Carden
Pendleton, OR 97801

Mr. R. Gail, Vice Principal
Bonanza High School
PO Box 128
Bonanza, OR 97623

Mr. George Galati, Principal
Roosevelt High School
6941 North Central Street
Portland, OR 97203

Mr. Thomas Gallagher, Assistant Principal
Dayton Junior Senior High School
801 Ferry Street
Dayton, OR 97114

Mr. David Gardner, Vice Principal
Mt. View Senior High School
2755 NE 27th Street
Bend, OR 97701

Mr. Richard Gedrose, Principal
Jesuit High School
9000 SW Beaverton Highway
Portland, OR 97225

Mr. William Gehling, Principal
Elkton High School
PO Box 390
Elkton, OR 97436

Mr. Charles Geis, Principal
St. Paul School District
600 NW Main Street
St. Paul, OR 97137

Mr. William Gieber, Principal
Reedsport High School
2260 Longwood Drive
Reedsport, OR 97467

Mr. Keith Gillis, Principal
Central Linn High School
32433 Highway 228
Halsey, OR 97348

Mrs. Claudia Girod, Vice Principal
David Douglas High School
1500 SE 130th Avenue
Portland, OR 97233

Ms. Beverly Gladder, Principal
Aloha High School
PO Box 200
Beaverton, OR 97075

Ms. Shirley Glick, Principal
Portland School District
PO Box 3107
Portland, OR 97208

Mrs. Harriet Goglin, Vice Principal
Canby High School
721 SW 4th
Canby, OR 97013

Mr. Henry Golden, Principal
Corvallis High School
836 NW 11th Street
Corvallis, OR 97330

Mr. J. Goodrum, Principal
Rogue River High School
1898 E. Eveans Creek Road
Rogue River, OR 97537

Mr. Christopher Gorchels, Assistant Principal
Parkrose High School
11717 NE Shaver
Portland, OR 97220

Mr. Robert Griggs, Assistant Principal
Crescent Valley High School
4444 NW Highland
Corvallis, OR 97330

Mr. Doug Grimmus, Vice Principal
West Albany High School
1130 SW Queen Avenue
Albany, OR 97321

Mr. Glenn Gwynn, Principal
Sunset High School
PO Box 200
Beaverton, OR 97075

Mr. Ronald Hackbarth, Principal
McLoughlin High School
120 South Main Street
Milton Freewater, OR 97862

Mr. Robert Hammann II, Principal
Scappoose High School
PO Box 490
Scappoose, OR 97056

Ms. Kathleen Hanneman, Principal
McNary High School
505 Sandy Drive North
Salem, OR 97303

Mr. Vernon Hansen, Assistant Principal
Forest Grove High School
1341 West Pacific
Forest Grove, OR 97116

Mr. Richard Hanson, Assistant Principal
South Salem High School
1910 Cvhurch Street SE
Salem, OR 97302

Mr. William Haper, Principal
Seaside High School
1901 North Holladay
Seaside, OR 97138

Mr. Kenneth Harding, Assistant Principal
Clackamas High School
13801 SE Webster Road
Milwaukie, OR 97222

Mr. Robert Harland, Principal
Sam Barlow High School
5105 SE 302nd
Gresham, OR 97030

Mr. John Harrington, Vice Principal
David Douglas High School
1001 SE 135th Avenue
Portland, OR 97233

Mr. Jack Harris, Principal
Mt. View High School
2755 NE 27th Street
Bend, OR 97701

Mr. Lynn Harris, Vice Principal
Weston McEwen High School
PO Box 707
Athena, OR 97813

Mrs. JoAnne Harrison, Assistant Principal
North Valley High School
6741 Monument Drive
Grants Pass, OR 97526

Mr. Richard Harrison, Assistant Principal
Sandy Union High School
17100 bluff Road
Sandy, OR 97055

Ms. Maureen Haugen, Assistant Principal
Douglas High School
PO Box 288
Dillard, OR 97432

Ms. Nancy Hawk, Vice Principal
Tigard High School
9000 SW Durham Road
Tigard, OR 97224

Ms. Diane Hayes, Dean of Students
Crook County High School
100 North Knowledge Street
Prineville, OR 97754

Mr. Robert Hayes, Principal
Brookings-Harbor High School
PO Box 640
Brookings, OR 97415

Ms. Audrey Haynes, Vice Principal
Ernaklin High School
5405 SE Woodward Street
Portland, OR 97206

Mr. Harvey Hazen, Principal
Hood River Valley High School
1220 Indian Creek Road
Hood River, OR 97031

Mr. Lawrence Headden, Vice Principal
Klamath County School District
334 Main Street
Klamath Falls, OR 97601

Mr. Donald Hedrick, Principal
Tillamook High School
2605 12th Street
Tillamook, OR 97141

Mr. Eugene Heinle, Administrative Assistant
Springfield Senior High School
875 North 7th Street
Springfield, OR 97477

Mr. Hugo Hendrickson, Principal
Wynne Watts School
930 NE 162nd
Portland, OR 97230

Mr. Douglas Henry, Vice Principal
Crook County High School
1st and Knowledge Streets
Prineville, OR 97754

Mr. Wayne Hill, Assistant Principal
South Eugene High School
400 E. 19th
Eugene, OR 97401

Mr. Rick Hintz, Vice Principal
Hillsboro High School
3285 SW Rood Bridge Road
Hillsboro, OR 97123

Mr. Fred Holevas, Assistant Principal
Sam Barlow High School
5105 SE 302nd
Gresham, OR 97030

Ms. Merry Holland, Vice Principal
Hermiston High School
600 south First Street
Hermiston, OR 97838

Mr. Carl Holmes, Assistant Principal
Baker High School
2090 4th Street
Baker, OR 97814

Mr. Michael Hood, Assistant Principal
Willamette High School
1801 Echo Hollow road
Eugene, OR 97402

Mr. Donald Hopps, Activities Director
Madras Senior High School
Madras, OR 97741

Mr. Larry Howard, Administrative Assistant
Thurston High School
333 North 58th
Springfield, OR 97477

Mr. Michael Hryciw, Vice Principal
Beaverton High School
PO Box 200
Beaverton, OR 97075

Mr. Ronald Hudson, Vice Principal
Madison High School
2735 NE 82nd
Portland, OR 97220

Mr. Lynn Hurt, Principal
Dallas High School
901 SE Ash
Dallas, OR 97338

Mr. Earl Ingle Jr., Dean of Students
Lake Oswego High School
PO Box 310
Lake Oswego, OR 97034

Ms. Lois Irving, Vice Principal
Madison High School
2735 NE 82nd Avenue
Portland, OR 97220

Mr. Clark Irwin, Principal
Newberg High School
1421 Deborah
Newberg, OR 97132

Mr. Steven Iverson, Principal
Rosebury High School
547 West Chapman
Roseburg, OR 97470

Mr. Donald Jackson, Principal
South Eugene High School
400 East 19th Avenue
Eugene, OR 97401

Mr. Paul Jackson, Principal
Sutherlin High School
PO Box 1068
Sutherlin, OR 97479

Mr. Gil James, Assistant Principal
Sheldon High School
2455 Willakenzie Road
Eugene, OR 97401

Mr. James Jamieson, Assistant Principal
Sam Barlow High School
5105 SE 302nd Avenue
Gresham, OR 97030

Mr. Hal Janneck, Principal
Toledo High School
Olalla Road
Toledo, OR 97391

Mr. Lyle Jarvis, Principal
Sweet Home High School
1641 L Street
Sweet Home, OR 97386

Mr. Richard Jenkins, Vice Principal
Gilschrist High School
PO Box 668
Gilchrist, OR 97737

Ms. Linda Jessell, Vice Principal
Sunset High School
PO Box 200
Beaverton, OR 97075

Mr. Edward John, Assistant Principal
McKay High School
2440 Lancaster Drive NE
Salem, OR 97305

Mr. Daniel Johnson, Principal
SouthSalem High School
1910 Church Street SE
Salem, OR 97302

Mr. Larry Johnson, Vice Principal
Sweet Home High School
1641 Long Street
Sweet Home, OR 97386

Ms. Monita Johnson, Vice Principal
North Bend High School
14th & Pacific
North Bend, OR 97459

Mr. Stephen Johnson, Principal
Dayton High School
801 Ferry Street
Dayton, OR 97114

Ms. Stephanie Johnson, Assistant Principal
South Medford High School
815 South Oakdale
Medford, OR 97501

Ms. Velma Johnson, Vice Principal
Marshall High School
3905 SE 91st Avenue
Portland, OR 97266

Ms. Wanda Johnson, Assistant Principal
South Eugene High School
400 East 19th
Eugene, OR 97405

Mr. Richard Johnstone, Vice Principal
Brookings Harbor High School
PO Box 640
Brookings, OR 97415

Mr. David Jones, Principal
Wahtonka High School
3601 West 10th
The Dalles, OR 97058

Ms. Dorothy Jones, Vice Principal
Franklin High School
5405 SE Woodward
Portland, OR 97206

Mr. Nathan Jones, Principal
Jefferson High School
5210 N. Kerby
Portland, OR 97217

Mr. Robert Jones, Vice Principal
Lakeview High School
096 South Ord Street
Lakeview, OR 97630

Mr. Gerald Jorgensen, Vice Principal
Ontario High School
1115 West Idaho Avenue
Ontario, OR 97914

Mr. Paul Jorgensen, Assistant Principal
Churchill High School
1850 Bailey Hill Road
Eugene, OR 97405

Mr. Robert Kane, Vice Principal
West Linn High School
5464 West A Street
West Linn, OR 97068

Mr. Marvin Kautz, Asst. Principal
South Medford High School
815 S. Oakdale
Medford, OR 97501

Mr. John Kelly, Vice Principal
Sherwood High School
1155 Meinecke Road
Sherwood, OR 97140

Mr. Brad Kendall, Vice Principal
Redmond High School
675 SW Rimrock
Redmond, OR 97756

Mr. Douglas Killin, Assistant Principal
West Albany High School
1130 West Queen Street
Albany, OR 97321

Mr. Darrell Koeppan, Principal
Glide High School
18990 N Umpqua Hwy.
Glide, OR 97443

Mr. David Kohler, Vice Principal
J.F. Kennedy High School
390 E. Marquam
Mt. Angel, OR 97362

Ms. Barbara Kokich, Vice Principal
Beaverton High School
PO Box 200
Beaverton, OR 97075

Ms. Ann Korach, Asst. Principal
Parkrose High School
11717 NE Shaver
Portland, OR 97220

Mr. William Korach, Principal
Lake Oswego High School
PO Box 70
Lake Oswego, OR 97034

Mr. Gerry Kosanovic, Associate Principal
South Eugene High School
400 East 19th Avenue
Eugene, OR 97401

Ms. Patricia Kosderka, Vice Principal
Roosevelt High School
6941 N. Central Street
Portland, OR 97203

Mr. Wayne Kostur, Principal
Adrian Jr./Sr. High School
PO Box 108
Adrian, OR 97901

Mr. Richard Kromminga, Principal
Sam Barlow High School
5105 SE 302nd
Gresham, OR 97080

Mr. R. Krout, Asst. Principal
Pendleton High School
1800 NW Carden Ave.
Pendleton, OR 97801

Mr. Ron LaBreche, Asst. Principal
Newport High School
322 NE Eads Street
Newport, OR 97365

Mr. Donald Lacey, Assistant Principal
North Medford High School
1900 N. Keeneway
Medford, OR 97504

Ms. Judith Lachenmeier, Principal
Lincoln High School
1600 SW Salmon
Portland, OR 97205

Mr. John Lahley, Vice Principal
Central High School
1530 Monmouth St.
Monmouth, OR 97351

Mr. Paul Lambertsen, Vice Principal
Gladstone High School
18800 Portland Ave.
Gladstone, OR 97027

Mr. Maurice Latimer, Asst. Principal
North Eugene High School
200 Silver Lane
Eugene, OR 97404

Mr. Brian Lauchlan, Asst. Principal
Bend High School
230 NE 6th St.
Bend, OR 97701

Mr. Les Lauman, Student Activities
Milwaukie High School
1300 SE 23rd Ave.
Milwaukie, OR 97222

Mr. James Lehl, Adm. Assistant
Thurston High School
333 N. 58th St.
Springfield, OR 97477

Ms. Sandra Lehmann, Vice Principal
Reynolds High School
1200 NE 201st
Troutdale, OR 97060

Mr. Richard Lehnert, Principal
Pilot Rock High School
PO Box 88
Pilot Rock, OR 97868

Ms. Darlene Leighty, Vice Principal
Woodburn High School
1785 N. Front St.
Woodburn, OR 97071

Mr. Rodney Leland, Assistant Principal
Gervais Union High School
P.O. Box 195
Gervais, OR 97026

Mr. John Lewis, Principal
Hillsboro High School
3285 SW Road Bridge Road
Hillsboro, OR 97123

Ms. Maureen Liles, Vice Principal
West Albany High School
1130 SW Queen
Albany, OR 97321

Dr. Thomas Lindersmith, Principal
Lakeridge High School
PO Box 739
Lake Oswego, OR 97034

Mr. Paul Lindquist, Principal
North Valley High School
6741 Monument Drive
Grants Pass, OR 97526

Mr. Carl Lino, Principal
Grnat Union High School
PO Box 129
John Day, OR 97845

Ms. Jeanne Lough, Asst. Principal
Henley High School
8245 Hwy 39
Klamath Falls, OR 97603

Mr. Donald Lowrance, Principal
Clatskanie High School
P.O. Box 68
Clatskanie, OR 97016

Mr. Larry Lund, Asst. Principal
Mazama High School
3009 Summers Lane
Klamath Falls, OR 97601

Mr. Richard Lund, Asst. Principal
Centennial High School
3505 SE 182nd Ave.
Gresham, OR 97030

Mr. Ruston Lynde, Dean of Students
Dallas High School
901 SE Ast Street
Dallas, OR 97338

Ms. Lorna MacLeod, Principal
Farm Home Jr./Sr. High
4545 NE Highway 20
Corvallis, OR 97330

Mr. Ted Marr, Principal
Klamath Union High School
Monclair St.
Klamath Falls, OR 97601

Mr. Alan Martin, Principal
Alpha High School
PO Box 930
Gresham, OR 97080

Ms. Carol Matarazzo, Vice Principal
Benson High School
546 NE 12th
Portland, OR 97232

Mr. Robert Mathews, Principal
Riddle High School
PO Box 45
Riddle, OR 97469

Mr. Nick Mausen, Principal
Baker High School
2500 E Street
Baker, OR 97814

Mr. Leon Mayer, Asst. Principal
McMinnville High School
17th & Ford
McMinnville, OR 97128

Mr. William McCadden, Principal
Joseph High School
PO Box W
Joseph, OR 97846

Mr. Peter McCallum, Principal
Woodburn High School
1785 N. Front St.
Woodburn, OR 97071

Mr. Mike McClain, Principal
Crater High School
4410 N. Rogue Valley Blvd.
Central Point, OR 97502

Mr. Larry McClellan, Area Administrator
Corbett High School
35800 E. Crown Point Hwy.
Corbett, OR 97019

Mr. William McGovern, Principal
Parkrose High School
11717 NE Shaver St.
Portland, OR 97220

Ms. Patricia McGregor, Asst. Principal
McKay High School
2440 Lancaster Dr. NE
Salem, OR 97305

Mr. Silas McHenry, Principal
Glendale High School
PO Box E
Glendale, OR 97442

Mr. Randall McMichael, Principal
Hermiston High School
600 south First
Hermiston, OR 97838

Ms. Gayla McVey, Asst. Principal
Parkrose High School
11717 NE Shaver Street
Portland, OR 97220

Mr. Peter Miller, Asst. Principal
Mountain View High School
2755 NE Denner Road
Bend, OR 97701

Mr. Richard Miller, Asst. Principal
Centennial High School
3050 SE 182nd
Gresham, OR 97030

Mr. H. Mills, Asst. Principal
Forest Grove High School
1401 Nichols Lane
Forest Grove, OR 97116

Mr. John Miner, Vice Principal
Reynolds High School
1200 NE 201st Ave.
Troutdale, OR 97060

Ms. Linda Mitchell, Asst. Principal
Willamette High School
1801 Echo Hollow Road
Eugene, OR 97402

Ms. Janic Mix, Principal
Philomath High School
PO Box 71
Philomath, OR 97370

Mr. Theodore Moon, Vice Principal
South Albany High School
3705 S. Columbus
Albany, OR 97321

Mr. Chester Moran, Vice Principal
Lincoln High School
1600 SW Salmon St.
Portland, OR 97205

Mr. Allen Morris, Asst. Principal
Oakridge High School
47997 West 1st Street
Oakridge, OR 97463

Mr. John Morrison, Dean of Students
Silverton High School
802 Schalador St.
Silverton, OR 97381

Mr. Ronald Mullanix, Principal
Lost Rover High School
Star Route
Merrill, OR 97633

Mr. Bruce Mulvany, Principal
Union High School
PO Box 908
Union, OR 97883

Mr. John Musser, Principal
Bonanza School
PO Box 128
Bonanza, OR 97623

Mr. Ralph Nagel, Vice Principal
Sunset High School
PO Box 200
Beaverton, OR 97075

Mr. Rodger Nawrocki, Vice Principal
Rainier High School
28170 Old Rainier Road
Rainier, OR 97048

Mr. John Neal, Asst. Principal
McKay High School
2440 Lancaster Drive NE
Salem, OR 97305

Ms. Sandra Nelson, Vice Principal
Lakeridge High School
1235 SW Overlook Drive
Lake Oswego, OR 97034

Mr. James Nerdin, Principal
Helix School District
PO Box 398
Helix, OR 97835

Mr. Kenneth Noah, Vice Principal
Redmond High School
675 SW Rimrock Drive.
Redmond, OR 97756

Ms. Gaynelle Nolf, Vice Principal
Beaverton High School
PO Box 200
Beaverton, OR 97075

Mr. Dennis Newton, Vice Principal
Phoenix High School
PO Box 697
Phoenix, OR 97535

Mr. Roy Nickerson, Principal
West Union School District
Route 5 Box 230
Hillsboro, OR 97124

Mr. Robert O'Neill, Principal
Cleveland High School
3400 SE 26th Ave.
Portland, OR 97202

Mr. Carl Odin, Assistant Principal
Prairie High School
11500 NE 117th Ave.
Brush Prairie, OR 97606

Mr. David Ohm, Assistant Principal
Roseburg High School
5476 West Chapman
Roseburg, OR 97470

Mr. William Olund, Asst. Principal
Putnam High School
4950 SE Roethe Road
Milwaukie, OR 97267

Mr. Leif Ostmo, Area Administrator
Eagle Point High School
PO Box 198
Eagle Point, OR 97524

Mr. Robert Ostrom, Vice Principal
Brooks School District
9075 Pueblo Street
Brooks, OR 97305

Mr. Ed Otton, Principoal
Cottage Grove High School
1000 Taylor Ave.
Cottage Grove, OR 97424

Mr. Jerry Owen, Principal
Fremont/Hay Schools
500 I Street
Lakeview, OR 97630

Ms. Sandra Page, Vice Principal
Jefferson High School
5210 N. Kerby St.
Portland, OR 97217

Mr. Bill Parrish, Principal
Astoria High School
1001 West Marine Drive
Astoria, OR 97103

Mr. Ronald Parrish, Vice Principal
Canby High School
721 SW 4th Ave.
Canby, OR 97013

Mr. Thomas Parr, Principal
Benson High School
546 NE 12th
Portland, OR 97232

Ms. Rose Marie Perkin, Asst. Administrator
Putnam High School
4950 SE Roethe road
Milwaukie, OR 97222

Mr. Charles Peter, Asst. Principal
McNarry High School
505 Sandy Drive North
Salem, OR 97303

Mr. Dale Petersen, Principal
Douglas High School
PO Box 288
Dillard, OR 97432

Mr. Marven Petersen, Vice Principal
Harrisburg Union High School
400 South 9th
Harrisburg, OR 97446

Mr. John Peterson, Vice Principal
Scappoose High School
PO Box 490
Scappoose, OR 97056

Ms. Cynthis Phillips, Asst. Administrator
Milwaukie High School
11300 Se 23rd Ave.
Milwaukie, OR 97222

Mr. Tom Pickens, Principal
Sprague High School
2373 Kubler road South
Salem, OR 97302

Mr. Dean Pindell, Vice Principal
Glide High School
18990 N. Umpqua Hwy.
Glide, OR 97443

Mr. Michael Pisan, Principal
Mazama High School
3009 Summers Lane
Klamath Falls, OR 97603

Mr. Paul Poetsch, Vice Principal
Oregon City High School
PO Box 591
Oregon City, OR 97045

Mr. William Poppe, Dean of Students
North Bend High School
14th and Pacific
North Bend, OR 97459

Mr. Dennis Price, Asst. Principal
The Dalles High School
220 E. 10th St.
The Dalles, OR 97058

Mr. Robert Prichard, Principal
Santiam High School
265 SW Evergreen Street
Mill City, OR 97360-019

Ms. Teri Prochaska, Principal
Upper building
Salmon River Road
Welches, OR 97067

Mr. W. Proett, Principal
Schuebel School District
23931 S. Schuebel School Rd.
Beavercreek, OR 97704

Mr. Craig Prough, Vice Principal
South Albany High School
3705 SE Columbus Street
Albany, OR 97321

Mr. John Pugh, Asst. Principal
Corvallis High School
836 NW 11th
Corvallis, OR 97330

Mr. John Purcell, Asst. Principal
North Medford High School
1900 N. Keeneway
Medford, OR 97504

Mr. John Purcell, Asst. Principal
North Medford High School
1990 Keeneway Drive
Medford, OR 97504

Mr. Dan Purple, Asst. Administrator
Clackamas High School
13801 SE Webster Road
Milwaukie, OR 97267

Mr. Dennis Reber, Vice Principal
Sutherlin High School
PO Box 160
Sutherlin, OR 97479

Mr. Larry Reeser, Principal
LaPine High School
51633 Coach Road
LaPine, OR 97739

Mr. Richard Reiling, Principal
Lebanon Union High School
485 S. 5th St.
Lebanon, OR 97355

Mr. Bernie Rainbold, Vice Principal
Clatskanie High School
PO Box 68
Clatskanie, OR 97016

Mr. Truman Rennels, Student Services
Eagle Point High School
PO Box 198
Eagle Point, OR 97524

Mr. Bruch Richards, Vice Principal
Lincoln High School
1600 SW Salmon
Portland, OR 97205

Mrs. S. Richards, Principal
Centennial High School
3505 SE 182nd
Gresham, OR 97030

Mr. Allen Ricketts, Principal
Silverton High School
802 Schlador Street
Silverton, OR 97381

Mr. Lyle Rilling, Principal
Junction City High School
1135 W. 6th St.
Junction City, OR 97448

Mr. Charles Roberts, Asst. Principal
Madras High School
PO Box 649
Madras, OR 97741

Mr. Arnold Roblan, Vice Principal
Marshfield High School
PO Box 509
Coos Bay, OR 97420

Ms. Sharon Rodgers, Vice Principal
Oregon City High School
1306 12th Street
Oregon City, OR 97045

Mr. Joseph Rodriguez, Principal
Glencoe High School
2700 NW Glencoe Road
Hillsboro, OR 97124

Mr. James Roehm, Vice Principal
Glencoe High School
2700 NW Glencoe Road.
Hillsboro, OR 97124

Dr. Myra Rose, Principal
Grant High School
2245 NE 36th
Portland, OR 97212

Mr. Greg Ross, Principal
Grants Pass High School
522 NE Olive St.
Grants Pass, OR 97526

Mr. Gary Rosso, Student Personnel
Seaside High School
1901 N. Holladay
Seaside, OR 97138

Ms. Shirley Ross, Dean of Students
Marshfield High School
PO Box 509
Coos Bay, OR 97420

Mr. James Rotramel, Asst. Principal
Parkrose High School
11717 NE Shaver St.
Portland, OR 97220

Mr. Barry Rotrock, Principal
Oregon City High School
1306 12th St.
Oregon City, OR 97045

Ms. Pamela Rowland, Vice Principal
North Salem High School
765 14th NE
Salem, OR 97301

Mr. Richard Rumble, Vice Principal
Jefferson High School
5210 N. Kerby Ave.
Portland, OR 97217

Mr. R. Rumsey, Principal
Triangle Lake School
20264 Blachly Grange Road.
Blachly, OR 97412

Mr. Bill Russell, Asst. Principal
Crater High School
4410 N. Rogue Valley blvd.
Central Point, OR 97502

Mr. Otho Sanders, Principal
Elmira High School
88834 Territorial Rd.
Elmira, OR 97437

Mr. Joel Sappenfield, Vice Principal
Franklin High School
5405 SE Woodward
Portland, OR 97206

Mr. John Sappington, Asst. Principal
Sheldon High School
2455 Willakenzie Road
Eugene, OR 97401

Mr. Roger Sauer, Principal
Seaside High School
1091 N. Holladay Drive
Seaside, OR 97138

Mr. James Savard, Dean Student Activities
Grants Pass High School
522 NE Olive
Grants Pass, OR 97526

Mr. Brian Say, Principal
Echo High School
PO Box 359
Echo, OR 97826

Mr. Ronald Schiessl, Principal
Springfield High School
875 N. 7th St.
Springfield, OR 97477

Mr. Jeff Schlecht, Associate Principal
Ashland High School
201 S. Mountain Ave.
Ashland, OR 97520

Mr. Robert Schlegel, Principal
Banks High School
PO Box 36
Banks, OR 97106

Mr. Karl Schmidt, Principal
Coquille High School
499 W. Central
Coquille, OR 97423

Mr. Charles Schubert, Asst. Principal
Klamath Union High School
Monclaire St.
Klamath Falls, OR 97601

Mr. Edward Schumacher, Principal
Echo School District
PO Box 359
Echo, OR 97826

Mr. James Schweigert, Assistant Principal
Astoria High School
1001 Marine Drive
Astoria, OR 97103

Mr. Gary Seaney, Asst. Principal
Tillamook High School
2605 12th St.
Tillamook, OR 97141

Mr. Charles Sharps, Principal
Marshfield High School
PO Box 509
Coos Bay, OR 97420

Mr. Stephan Sharp, Vice Principal
South Umpqua High School
501 NW Chadwick Lane
Myrtle Creek, OR 97457

Mr. Bob Shields, Vice Principal
Oregon City High School
1306 12th St.
Oregon City, OR 97045

Mr. Michael Shields, Principal
Molalla High School
PO Box 188
Mollalla, OR 97038

Ms. Sue Shields, Asst. Administrator
Clackamas High School
13801 SE Webster Road
Milwaukie, OR 97222

Mr. Maynard Simenson, Principal
Monument High School
PO Box 127
Monument, OR 97864

Mr. Robert Simonson, Vice Principal
Klamath Union High School
Monclair Street
Klamath Falls, OR 97601

Mr. James Sipe, Principal
Jordan Valley High School
PO Box 163
Jordan Valley, OR 97910

Mr. Robert Sisk, Principal
Hidden Valley High School
651 Murphy Creek Rd.
Grants pass, OR 97527

Mr. Larry Sleeman, Assistant Principal
Philomath High School
PO Box 591
Philomath, OR 97370

Mr. Douglas Smith, Dean of Students
Roseburg High School
547 W. Chapman Drive
Roseburg, OR 97470

Ms. Linda Smith, Vice Principal
West Linn High School
5464 West A Street
West Linn, OR 97068

Mr. Ronald Smith, Assistant Principal
Lakeridge High School
2455 SW Country Club Rd.
Lake Oswego, OR 97034

Mr. Jack Snyder, Vice Principal
Beaverton High School
PO Box 200
Beaverton, OR 97075

Ms. Eda Soderquist, Asst. Principal
Corvallis High School
836 NW 11th
Corvallis, OR 97330

Mr. James Sorensen, Vice Principal
Pleasant Hill High School
36386 Hwy 58
Pleasant Hill, OR 97455

Mr. Elton Sorenson, Principal
Churchill High School
1850 Bailey Hill Rd.
Eugene, OR 97405

Mr. Galen Spillum, Principal
Putnam High School
4950 SE Roethe road
Milwaukie, OR 97222

Mr. Stanley Stanton, Vice Principal
Wilson High School
1151 SW Vermont
Portland, OR 97219

Ms. Sherry Steele, Student Services Director
Lebanon Union High School
485 South 5th
Lebanon, OR 97355

Mr. William Stempel, Principal
Taft High School
PO Box 123
Lincoln City, OR 973676

Ms. Joanne Stettler, Asst. Principal
Sprague High School
2373 Kubler Road S
Salem, OR 97302

Ms. Ellen Stevens, Principal
Forest Grove High School
1401 Nichols Lane
Forest Grove, OR 97116

Mr. Vern Steward, Principal
Gold Beach High School
757 S. Ellenburg
Gold Beach, OR 97444

Mr. Douglas Stewart, Asst. Principal
St. Helens High School
2375 Gable Road
St. Helens, OR 97051

Mr. Roger Stewart, Principal
Oakland High School
PO Box 898
Oakland, OR 97462

Mr. Gerald Stinnett, Principal
Phoenix High School
PO Box 697
Phoenix, OR 97535

Mr. Kenneth Stobie, Principal
North Bend High School
14th and Pacific
North Bend, OR 97459

Mr. Charles Stolsig, Principal
Churchill High School
1850 Bailey Hill Road
Eugene, OR 97405

Ms. Paricia Stone, Vice Principal
Gresham High School
1200 N. Main St.
Gresham, OR 97030

Mr. Robert Strode, Asst. Principal
Illinois Valley High School
River St. and Laurel road
Cave Junction, OR 97523

Mr. Ronald Sturtz, Asst. Principal
Roseburg High School
547 W. Chapman Dr.
Roseburg, OR 97470

Mr. Fred Sutherland, Principal
North Medford High School
1900 N. Keeneway
Medford, OR 97504

Mr. James Sutherland, Assistant Principal
Phoenix High School
PO box 697
Phoenix, OR 97535

Mr. Jerry Swartsley, Division Leader
Crater High School
4410 Rogue Valley blvd.
Central Point, OR 97502

Ms. Beverly Swink, Vice Principal
David Douglas High School
1001 SE 135th
Portland, OR 97233

Mr. Steve Swisher, Asst. Principal
Eagle Point High School
PO Box 198
Eagle Point, OR 97524

Mr. Glenn Syron, Principal
Lowell High School
PO Box 978
Lowell, OR 97452

Ms. Sue Tarrant-Berg, Vice Principal
Aloha High School
PO Box 200
Beaverton, OR 97075

Mr. Bud Tautfest, Vice Principal
Willamina High School
PO Box 67
Willamina, OR 97396

Ms. Dolores Taylor, Dean of Students
Grants Pass high School
522 NE Olive Street
Grants Pass, OR 97526

Mr. Jack Taylor, Vice Principal
Columbia High School
16988 SW Cherry Park Road
Troutdale, OR 97060

Ms. Judith Taylor, Vice Principal
Grants Pass High School
522 NE Olive St.
Grants Pass, OR 97526

Mr. Michael Taylor, PRincipal
La Grande High School
708 K Ave.
La Grande, OR 97850

Mr. Robery Taylor, Principal
The Dalles High School
10th and Washington
The Dalles, OR 97085

Mr. John Thomas, Asst. principal
Crescent Valley High School
4444 NW Highland Way
Corvallis, OR 97330

Mr. Nels Thompson, Principal
Culver High School
PO Box 228
Culver, OR 97734

Ms. Patricia Thompson, Asst. Principal
Waldport High School
PO Box 370
Waldport, OR 97394

Mr. William Tipton, Principal
Oakridge High School
47997 West 1st St.
Oakridge, OR 97463

Mr. Richard Togni, Asst. Principal
Sprague High School
2373 Kubler Road South
Salem, OR 97302

Mr. Robert Tone, Asst. Principal
Milwaukie High School
11300 SE 23rd
Milwaukie, OR 97222

Mr. Earl Torris, Principal
Ontario High School
1115 West Idaho Avenue
Ontario, OR 97914

Mr. Robert Tower, Principal
Umatilla High School
1300 7th St.
Umatilla, OR 97882

Mrs. Margaret Trachesel, Vice Principal
Yamhill-Carlton UHS
PO Box 68
Yamhill, OR 97148

Mr. Darrell Tucker, Vice Principal
Cleveland High School
3400 SE 26th
Portland, OR 97202

Mr. John Turchi, Asst. Principal
Lake Oswego High School
PO Box 210
Lake Oswego, OR 97034

Mr. Larry Turner, Activities Director
Corvallis High School
836 NW 11th
Corvallis, OR 97330

Mr. F. Utz, Principal
David Douglas High School
1001 SE 135th
Portland, OR 97233

Mr. Robert Valdez, Asst. Administrator
Springfield High School
875 North 7th Street
Springfield, OR 97477

Ms. Nancy Van Kannel, Evaluation Asst. Principal
Tigard High School
9000 SW Durham Road.
Tigard, OR 97224

Ms. Janet Van Matre, Asst. Principal
Hidden Valley High School
651 Murphy Creek Rd.
Grants Pass, OR 97526

Mr. M. VanGorder, Asst. Principal
Cottage Grove High School
1000 Taylor Ave.
Cottage Grove, OR 97424

Mr. Charles Vaughn, Principal
Eagle Point High School
PO Box 198
Eagle Point, OR 97524

Mr. Tom Vaught, Vice Principal
North Marion High School
10167 Grim Road NE
Aurora, OR 97002

Mr. Mel Victor, Principal
Enterprise High School
401 Leone
Enterprise, OR 97828

Ms. Dolores Vrooman, Principal
Columbia High School
1698 SW Cherry Park Rd.
Troutdale, OR 97060

Mr. Kent Waggoner, Activities Director
Pleasant Hill High School
36386 Hwy. 58
Pleasant Hill, OR 97401

Mr. Glenn Walker, Principal
Stanfield High School
PO Box 159
Stanfield, OR 97875

Mr. Harry Walker, Vice Principal
Cascade Union High School
10226 Marion Rd. SE
Turner, OR 97392

Ms. Rose Wallace, Asst. Principal
West Linn High School
5464 West A St.
West Linn, OR 97068

Ms. Judith Warren, Principal
Welches School District
24093 E. Salmon River Rd
Welches, OR 97067

Ms. Lois Washington, Vice Principal
Wilson High School
1151 SW Vermont St.
Portland, OR 97219

Dr. Terry Waters, Vice Principal
Columbia High School
1698 SW Cherry Park Rd.
Troutdale, OR 97060

Ms. Kathleen Weaver, Asst. Principal
Sam Barlow High School
5105 SE 302nd Ave.
Gresham, OR 97030

Dr. Bruce Weitzel, Principal
Beaverton High School
P.O. Box 200
Beaverton, OR 97075

Ms. Elaine Wells, Asst. Principal
South Albany High School
3705 S. Columbus
Albany, OR 97321

Mr. Bill Westphal, Principal
North Douglas High School
PO Box 488
Drain, OR 97435

Ms. Ruby Whalley, Principal
Waldport High School
PO Box 370
Waldport, OR 97394

Mr. Richard Whitmore, Principal
Siuslaw High School
H.C. 2 Box 4
Florence, OR 97439

Mr. Kent Wigle, Activities Director
South Umpqua High School
501 NW Chadwick
Myrtle Creek, OR 97457

Mr. William Willey, Principal
Sherwood High School
1155 SW Meinecke Road.
Sherwood, OR 97140

Mr. A. Williams, Vice Principal
Jefferson High School
5210 North Kerby Ave.
Portland, OR 97217

Mr. Jack Williams, Assitant Administrator
Neah-Kah-Nie High School
PO Box 28
Rockaway, OR 97136

Mr. Ron Williams, Asst. Principal
South Medford High School
815 South Oakdale Ave.
Medford, OR 97501

Mr. Stephen Williams, Principal
Santiam High School
PO Box 199
Mill City, OR 97360

Mr. Robert Wilson, Vice Principal
Marshall High School
3905 SE 91st Ave.
Portland, OR 97266

Mr. M. Winder, Principal
Clackamas High school
13801 SE Webster Rd.
Milwaukie, OR 97222

Mr. Michael Wittmayer, Principal
Estacada High School
PO Box 519
Estacada, OR 97023

Ms. Patricia Wixon, Asst. Principal
Ashland High School
201 S. Mountain Avenue
Ashland, OR 97520

Mr. Gary Wood, Vice Principal
Molalla High School
PO Box 189
Molalla, OR 97038

Mr. Jack Woodhead, Vice Principal
Grants Pass High School
522 NE Olive
Grants Pass, OR 97526

Mr. Larry Wright, Asst. Principal
Canby Union High School
721 SW 4th
Canby, OR 97013

Mr. Dale Wyatt, Principal
La Grande High School
708 K Ave.
La Grande, OR 97850

Mr. Chris Yaeger, Principal
Chiloquin High School
PO Box 397
Chiloquin, OR 97624

Mr. Don Yates, Vice Principal
Willamina High School
266 Washington St.
Willamina, OR 97396

Mr. David Youngbluth, Principal
Bend High School
230 NE 6th St.
Bend, OR 97701

Mr. Rob Younger, Vice Principal
Sweet Home High School
1641 Long St.
Sweet Home, OR 97386

Mr. Vincent Zanobelli, Principal
Bandon High School
PO Box 129
Bandon, OR 97411

Mr. Victor Zgorzelski, Asst. Principal
Sweet Home High School
1641 Long Street
Sweet Home, OR 97386

Mr. Al Zimmerman, Principal
Tigard High School
9000 SW Durham Rd.
Tigard, OR 97224

Mr. Gary Zosel, Principal
Colton High School
30205 S. Wall Street
Colton, OR 97017

APPENDIX E

POSTCARD SENT PRIOR TO QUESTIONNAIRE

APPENDIX F
QUESTIONNAIRE COVER LETTER

Dear Colleague:

You will soon be receiving a questionnaire that is part of a doctoral study entitled "An Analysis of the Role of the Assistant Principal in Obtaining Administrative Skills." Your input is extremely vital to the success of this study and I look forward to receiving your response.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Patricia A. Howell". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned above the printed name.

Patricia A. Howell
Doctoral Candidate
Portland State University

Portland State University

Portland, Oregon 97207-0751

October 26, 1987

Dear Colleague:

We are currently seeking to analyze the administrative skills of the Assistant Principal as perceived by assistant principals and principals in the state of Oregon. As a member of the Confederation of Oregon School Administrators, you have been selected to participate in this study.

We need your help to determine what effect the present on-site duties of an assistant principal have in obtaining the necessary skills for professional advancement. Please complete the questionnaire and return it by November 16, 1987, in the enclosed postage-paid envelope.

Your prompt response will help us complete this very important research project. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Patricia A. Howell
Doctoral Candidate
Portland State University

John D. Lind
Doctoral Advisor

PAH/JDL:mr
Enclosures

APPENDIX G
QUESTIONNAIRE

AN ANALYSIS OF THE ROLE OF THE
ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL
IN OBTAINING ADMINISTRATIVE SKILLS

by
Patricia A. Howell

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for
the Doctor of Education Degree
in Educational Leadership

School of Education
Portland State University
Portland, Oregon

October, 1987

QUESTIONNAIRE

An Analysis of the Role of the Assistant Principal
in Obtaining Administrative Skills

1. To what extent does the present job of an Assistant Principal at your high school prepare you for the role of a principal in the following areas: Please circle one response for each item.
	Not at all	Very Little	Little	Somewhat	Very	Extremely
A. discipline	0	1	2	3	4	5
B. curriculum development	0	1	2	3	4	5
C. budgetary processes	0	1	2	3	4	5
D. community relations	0	1	2	3	4	5
E. teacher supervision/evaluation	0	1	2	3	4	5
F. staff development	0	1	2	3	4	5
G. on-site building maintenance/operations	0	1	2	3	4	5
H. athletic supervision	0	1	2	3	4	5
I. activity supervision	0	1	2	3	4	5
J. school improvement	0	1	2	3	4	5
K. guidance and counseling	0	1	2	3	4	5
L. hiring/selection	0	1	2	3	4	5
M. special education	0	1	2	3	4	5
N. improvement of instruction	0	1	2	3	4	5
O. other _____	0	1	2	3	4	5

Comments _____

2. To what extent does there tend to be a stereotyping by sex as to the capability to perform assignments in the following roles. Please circle one response for each item.
	Not at all	Very Little	Little	Somewhat	Very	Extremely
A. discipline	0	1	2	3	4	5
B. curriculum development	0	1	2	3	4	5
C. budgetary processes	0	1	2	3	4	5
D. community relations	0	1	2	3	4	5
E. teacher supervision/evaluation	0	1	2	3	4	5
F. staff development	0	1	2	3	4	5
G. on-site building maintenance/operations	0	1	2	3	4	5
H. athletic supervision	0	1	2	3	4	5
I. activity supervision	0	1	2	3	4	5
J. school improvement	0	1	2	3	4	5
K. guidance and counseling	0	1	2	3	4	5
L. hiring/selection	0	1	2	3	4	5
M. special education	0	1	2	3	4	5
N. improvement of instruction	0	1	2	3	4	5
O. other _____	0	1	2	3	4	5

Comments _____

3. To what extent do teacher supervision/evaluation duties prepare the Assistant Principal to evaluate new personnel within the scope of district policies? Please circle one response

0 Not at all
1 Very Little
2 Little
3 Somewhat
4 Very
5 Extremely

Comments _____

4. To what degree does the job prepare the Assistant Principal to handle staff complaints and problems? Please circle one response.

0 Not at all
1 Very Little
2 Little
3 Somewhat
4 Very
5 Extremely

Comments _____

5. What effect does the size of the administrative staff have on the depth in which the Assistant Principal is able to understand the complexity of job assignments given to him/her? Please circle one response.

0 Not at all
1 Very Little
2 Little
3 Somewhat
4 Very
5 Extremely

Comments _____

6. To what extent do you feel there needs to be clarification as to the exact role of the Assistant Principal? Please circle one response.

0 Not at all
1 Very Little
2 Little
3 Somewhat
4 Very
5 Extremely

Comments _____

7. To what degree do you believe being an Assistant Principal in and of itself can be a satisfactory professional goal? Please circle one response.

0 Not at all
1 Very Little
2 Little
3 Somewhat
4 Very
5 Extremely

Comments _____

8. To what degree does the number of assignments given each Assistant Principal effect his/her ability to obtain administrative skills?
Please circle one response.

0 Not at all
1 Very Little
2 Little
3 Somewhat
4 Very
5 Extremely

Comments _____

9. To what degree does specialization in the job assignment of an Assistant Principal become a factor in his/her obtaining needed administrative skills for advancement?
Please circle one response.

0 Not at all
1 Very Little
2 Little
3 Somewhat
4 Very
5 Extremely

Comments _____

10. To what degree does an Assistant Principal have professional interaction with individuals that he/she would have to interact with as a principal?
Please circle one response.

0 Not at all
1 Very Little
2 Little
3 Somewhat
4 Very
5 Extremely

Comments _____

11. To what extent do the Assistant Principal and the Principal communicate with each other as to the value of the Assistant Principal's role in preparing to become a principal?
Please circle one response.

0 Not at all
1 Very Little
2 Little
3 Somewhat
4 Very
5 Extremely

Comments _____

12. To what extent do the experiences of an Assistant Principal provide adequate and appropriate preparation for a principalship?
Please circle one response.

0 Not at all
1 Very Little
2 Little
3 Somewhat
4 Very
5 Extremely

Comments _____

The following demographic questions will be used to ascertain the effects of independent factors on the central issue of the study.

A. Male ____ Female ____

B. Assistant Principal ____ Principal ____

C. Number of years of experience in present position:

0-3 ____ 4-7 ____ over 7 ____

D. If Principal, number of years of experience as an Assistant Principal before being promoted to Principal:

1-3 ____ 4-7 ____ over 7 ____ NA ____

E. Recommended number of years of experience as an Assistant Principal before being promoted to Principal:

0-3 ____ 4-7 ____ over 7 ____

F. Number of Assistant Principals in building:

0-1 ____ 2-3 ____ 4 or over ____

G. Please indicate the major job assignments in your position:

____ discipline	____ community relations
____ curriculum development	____ teacher supervision/evaluation
____ budgetary processes	____ staff development
____ athletic supervision	____ on-site building maintenance/operations
____ activity supervision	____ school improvement
____ guidance and counseling	____ hiring/selection
____ special education	____ improvement of instruction
____ other _____	

APPENDIX H
FOLLOW-UP POSTCARD

Dear Colleague:

Thank you for responding to the recent questionnaire concerning the analysis of the role of the assistant principal in obtaining administrative skills. I sincerely appreciate your time and interest in being a part of the study.

If you have not completed and returned the questionnaire, I would appreciate your timely response. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Patricia A. Howell
Doctoral Candidate
Portland State University