

AN ANALYSIS OF THE INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR  
OF SELECTED MIDDLE SCHOOL PRINCIPALS IN THE  
RICHMOND (VIRGINIA) METROPOLITAN AREA

by

Joseph Flanner Johnson

Dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the  
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of  
DOCTOR OF EDUCATION  
in  
Educational Administration

APPROVED:

~~Esther G. Davis, Co-Chairperson~~ ~~Wayne M. Worner, Co-Chairperson~~

~~Houston C. Conley~~

~~Jack A. Duncan~~

~~Lawrence M. McCluskey~~

~~Wayne H. White~~

May, 1981

Blacksburg, Virginia

## DEDICATION

This study is dedicated to my mother,  
and especially to  
my father, \_\_\_\_\_, who  
met his untimely death on May 4, 1978.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

As is usually the case, this endeavor represents the collective efforts of many individuals. Sincere appreciation is extended to my friends and colleagues for their support and encouragement throughout the doctoral program.

Deepest gratitude is expressed to Dr. Esther G. Davis and Dr. Wayne M. Worner, the co-chairpersons of the doctoral committee for their support, guidance, and contributions to my professional growth. The constructive criticisms and comments offered by Dr. Houston C. Conley, Dr. Jack A. Duncan, and Dr. Wayne H. White are deeply valued. Special thanks are expressed to Dr. Lawrence M. McCluskey for his untiring support and research expertise in directing the study.

Appreciation is expressed to the middle school principals and teachers who participated in the study and to my fellow doctoral students for their support and timely assistance. Warm thanks are expressed to \_\_\_\_\_ for her superb typing; to \_\_\_\_\_ for her editorial assistance; and for the spirit in which they performed the tasks.

Finally, a deep sense of love and appreciation is expressed to my wife \_\_\_\_\_ and our daughter \_\_\_\_\_. Their patience and unselfish support throughout the doctoral program made it all possible.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
DEDICATION . . . . .	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS . . . . .	iii
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	vi
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Purpose of the Study . . . . .	6
Statement of the Hypotheses . . . . .	8
Importance of the Study . . . . .	9
Definition of Terms . . . . .	11
Limitations of the Study . . . . .	13
Organization of the Study . . . . .	14
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE . . . . .	15
III. METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY . . . . .	37
Subjects . . . . .	37
Research Instrument . . . . .	39
Collection of Data . . . . .	44
Treatment of Data . . . . .	45
IV. RESULTS OF THE STUDY . . . . .	47
Description of the Subjects . . . . .	49
Scale Analysis of the SILB . . . . .	61
Findings . . . . .	63
Hypothesis 1 . . . . .	63
Hypothesis 2 . . . . .	64
Hypothesis 3 . . . . .	66
Hypothesis 4 . . . . .	67
Hypothesis 5 . . . . .	68
Discussion . . . . .	77

	Page
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	85
Summary . . . . .	85
Conclusions . . . . .	88
Recommendations . . . . .	94
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	97
APPENDICES . . . . .	
A. SURVEY OF INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR (SILB) - PRINCIPAL'S COPY . . . . .	102
B. SURVEY OF INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR (SILB) - TEACHER'S COPY . . . . .	108
C. LETTER TO SCHOOL DIVISIONS . . . . .	114
D. LETTER TO SCHOOL PRINCIPALS . . . . .	116
E. FREQUENCIES, MEANS, AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR EACH ITEM RESPONSE TO THE SILB FOR FULL-TIME MIDDLE SCHOOL TEACHERS . . . . .	118
F. FREQUENCIES, MEANS, AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR EACH ITEM RESPONSE TO THE SILB FOR MIDDLE SCHOOL PRINCIPALS . . . . .	121
VITA . . . . .	124
ABSTRACT	

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. A Comparison of the Number of Responses Made by the Middle School Principals and the Full-time Middle School Teachers Who Participated in the Study . . . . .	50
2. Demographic Data on the Middle School Principals and the Full-time Middle School Teachers Who Participated in the Study. . . . .	51
3. Means and Differences Between the Principals' and Full-time Teachers' Responses to the SILB ( $X_{Pa} - X_{Ta}$ ) and ( $X_{Pe} - X_{Te}$ ). . . . .	53
4. Means and Differences Between the Principals' and Full-time Teachers' Responses to the SILB ( $X_{Pe} - X_{Pa}$ ) and ( $X_{Te} - X_{Ta}$ ). . . . .	56
5. Summary of the Means, Standard Deviations, and Standard Error of the Means for All Item Responses to the Survey of Instructional Leadership Behavior (SILB) by School for the Full-time Middle School Teachers. . . . .	58
6. Summary of All Item Responses to the Survey of Instructional Leadership Behavior (SILB) for the Full-time Middle School Teachers . . . . .	59
7. Summary of All Item Responses to the Survey of Instructional Leadership Behavior (SILB) for the Middle School Principals . . . . .	60
8. An Analysis of Variance of the Demographic Data for Full-time Middle School Teachers' Responses to the SILB (Actual Behavior). . . . .	70
9. An Analysis of Variance of the Demographic Data for Full-time Middle School Teachers' Responses to the SILB (expected Behavior). . . . .	72
10. An Analysis of Variance of the Demographic Data for Middle School Principals' Responses to the SILB (Actual Behavior) . . . . .	75
11. An Analysis of Variance of the Demographic Data for Middle School Principals' Responses to the SILB (Expected Behavior) . . . . .	76
12. A Summary fo the Hypotheses Tested . . . . .	89

# Chapter I

## INTRODUCTION

The American public school principalship has increasingly become a focal point for school critics, university researchers, teacher groups, and central office administrators bent on understanding and improving the quality of educational programs in our nation's schools. Principals frequently take the brunt of multiple and usually conflicting expectations over issues ranging from student discipline to the problems of personnel administration, compliance with increasing numbers of state and federal policy mandates, and maintaining a "smooth-running" educational program that serves the needs of a school community that has become less and less homogeneous in the character of students' abilities and parents' aspirations for themselves and their children. Principals daily face pressures of competing images about what their role should be, and even the best have a difficult time maintaining an appropriate balance between the tasks of managing a smooth-running school and serving as a catalyst for and facilitator of instructional improvement.<sup>1</sup>

Current literature generally supports the premise that the school principal has emerged as one of the most important positions in all communities throughout the country.<sup>2</sup> More specifically, there is a general consensus among educators that the principal's primary function is to be an instructional leader. Accordingly, Hunter states:

---

<sup>1</sup>Arthur Blumberg and William Greenfield, The Effective Principal: Perspectives on School Leadership (Boston, Mass.: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1980) p. 9.

<sup>2</sup>Charles L. Wood, Everett W. Nicholson, and Dale G. Findley, The Secondary School Principal: Manager and Supervisor (Boston, Mass.: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1979) p. 33.

The product of the schools is learning, and the process for producing that product is instruction. All other functions in the schools exist to support and augment this basic purpose. Consequently, the principal's primary function is to be an instructional leader.<sup>3</sup>

Moreover, the Senate Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity provides the following statement in support of instructional leadership being the primary responsibility of the school principal.

In many ways the school principal is the most important and influential individual in any school. He is the person responsible for all of the activities that occur in and around the school building. It is his leadership that sets the tone of the school, the climate for learning, the level of professionalism and morale of teachers, and the degree of concern for what students may or may not become. He is the main link between the school and the community and the way he performs in that capacity largely determines the attitudes of students and parents about the school. If a school is a vibrant, innovative, child-centered place; if it has a reputation for excellence in teaching; if students are performing to the best of their ability one can almost point to the principal's leadership as the key to success.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup>Madeline Hunter, "What's Going On Around Here? Twelve Principals Talk About Preservice, Inservice, and Other Woes," in National Association of Elementary School Principals, The National Elementary Principal, 57:3 (March, 1978), p. 11.

<sup>4</sup>Senate Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity, Toward Equal Educational Opportunity: The Report of the Senate Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, February 19, 1970) p. 305, cited by Blumberg and Greenfield, op. cit., p.44.

From a historical perspective, Brain<sup>5</sup> points out that a certain amount of prestige has been associated with the position of school principal and that many persons have been willing to accept the leadership of the principal without question. He points out further that today the position does not assure the principal unquestioning followers unless the leadership is earned.<sup>6</sup> How to accomplish this leadership, especially for the effective improvement of instruction, is a most important challenge confronting many principals.

According to the 1977 study of the high school principalship by the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP), the three most time-consuming activities of the principal are (1) school management, (2) personnel management, and (3) student activities.<sup>7</sup> Because of the demands of such time-consuming activities, instructional leadership may receive little attention.

Roe and Drake state that there are numerous factors which tend to prevent the principal from spending his time on instructional leadership.

---

<sup>5</sup>George B. Brain, "Increasing Your Administrative Skills in Dealing with the Instructional Program," Handbook of Successful School Administration, ed. Prentice-Hall (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1974) p. 417.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., p. 417.

<sup>7</sup>David R. Byrne, Susan H. Hines, and Lloyd E. McCleary, The Senior High School Principalship - Volume One: The National Survey (Reston, Va.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1978)

1. The great majority of schools are so organized that the principal is the chief administrator of his building and is held responsible for all management details.
2. The central administration places priority on a "well-run" school with major considerations on smooth operation; i.e., getting reports in on time; good managing of supplies and equipment; minimizing personnel problems, community controversy, and discipline problems, etc.
3. If the community does not observe a well-run building, it loses confidence in other operations of the school.
4. There is greater prestige associated with being considered an executive who is "administratively in charge."
5. It is easier to evaluate and account for job activities when dealing with people and things than with instructional leadership and ideas.
6. "Safe," well-understood operational procedures, teaching methods, and instructional processes create less controversy and conflict.
7. Professional preparation programs for principals invariably are swallowed up by the overall administration program which has as its major emphasis the school superintendency.
8. Preparation programs for principals emphasize more management and administration than they do instruction, curriculum, program evaluation, supervision, and human relations.
9. The principalship is considered by the majority of professors in educational administration as a stepping-stone to a central office position or the superintendency rather than an important professional career position in its own right.

10. Many school principals themselves consider their positions a stepping-stone to the superintendency.
11. Rather than relating to the teachers as a colleague, master teacher, head teacher or principal teacher, the principal creates the image of administrator or chief executive.
12. Recent movements in teacher militancy, teacher contract negotiations, as well as efforts by school superintendents to encourage principals to side with them as part of their "management team," have tended to swing the principalship away from the idea of "principal teacher" to principal administrator.
13. The unprecedented growth in the school age population following World War II created so many logistical problems that communities had difficulty in establishing sufficient schools . . . .<sup>8</sup>

In response to the dominating aspects of the principal's administrative management responsibilities, Weldy asserts:

. . . the principal is indeed the instructional leader of the school. Principals already have no choice. In this period of declining student achievement, wavering public confidence in schools, and demands for financial accountability, principals must furnish instructional leadership whether they want to or not. If they don't know how, they must learn. If they don't have the time, they must find time.<sup>9</sup>

The need to seek ways in which school principals can accomplish the responsibility of instructional leadership

---

<sup>8</sup>William H. Roe and Thelbert L. Drake, The Principalship (New York, New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1974) pp. 11-12.

<sup>9</sup>Gilbert R. Weldy, "Principals Are Instructional Leaders: It's A Fact - Not A Myth," NASSP Bulletin, Vol. 63, No. 423 (January 1979) p. 72.

carries the presumption that they are not satisfying the instructional leadership responsibility commonly used to describe them. In an effort to provide pertinent information which will assist in establishing a better understanding of the principal as an instructional leader, this study examined the instructional leadership behavior of selected middle school principals in the metropolitan area of Richmond, Virginia.

### Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to analyze the instructional leadership behavior of the principal as perceived by middle school principals and full-time middle school teachers in the metropolitan area of Richmond, Virginia. More specifically, the objectives of the study were:

1. To determine the "actual" instructional leadership behavior of the principal as perceived by middle school principals and full-time middle school teachers in the metropolitan area of Richmond, Virginia.
2. To determine the "expected" instructional leadership behavior of the principal as perceived by middle school principals and full-time middle school teachers in the metropolitan area of Richmond, Virginia.

3. To determine if any significant difference exists between the "actual" instructional leadership behavior of the principal as perceived by middle school principals and full-time middle school teachers in the metropolitan area of Richmond, Virginia.
4. To determine if any significant difference exists between the "expected" instructional leadership behavior of the principal as perceived by middle school principals and full-time middle school teachers in the metropolitan area of Richmond, Virginia.
5. To determine if any significant difference exists between the "actual" instructional leadership behavior and the "expected" instructional leadership behavior of the principal as perceived by middle school principals in the metropolitan area of Richmond, Virginia.
6. To determine if significant differences exist between the "actual" instructional leadership behavior and the "expected" instructional leadership behavior of the principals as perceived by full-time middle school teachers in the metropolitan area of Richmond, Virginia.

An additional objective of the study was to examine demographic characteristics of the two respondent groups such as sex, race, age, annual income, and experience in order to determine if any significant relationships existed between the demographic characteristics of the respondents and their perceptions of the "actual" instructional leadership behavior and the "expected" instructional leadership behavior of the principal.

### Statement of the Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were developed to guide the study:

1. There is no significant difference between the "actual" instructional leadership behavior of the principal as perceived by middle school principals when compared to the perceptions of full-time middle school teachers in the metropolitan area of Richmond, Virginia.
2. There is no significant difference between the "expected" instructional leadership behavior of the principal as perceived by middle school principals when compared to the perceptions of full-time middle school teachers in the metropolitan area of Richmond, Virginia.

3. There is no significant difference between the "actual" instructional leadership behavior and the "expected" instructional leadership behavior of the principal as perceived by middle school principals in the metropolitan area of Richmond, Virginia.
4. There is no significant difference between the "actual" instructional leadership behavior and the "expected" instructional leadership behavior of the principal as perceived by full-time middle school teachers in the metropolitan area of Richmond, Virginia.
5. There is no significant relationship between each of the demographic characteristics of the respondents and their perceptions of the "actual" instructional leadership behavior and the "expected" instructional leadership behavior of the middle school principal in the metropolitan area of Richmond, Virginia.

#### Importance of the Study

The nature of the principal's position continues to change in response to changes in school and in society. Therefore, it is important that continuous information be provided relative to the overall role of the school

principal. According to the 1977 NASSP study,

. . . the principalship needs to be redefined if it is to return to a significant viability. A redefinition needs to be undertaken on both the conceptual and operational grounds. Such an undertaking should be identified as a major priority of the professional field since the nature of the principalship and those who fill this role, to a large extent, determine the character of secondary education in the future . . . .<sup>10</sup>

There have been several significant developments relative to middle school education in the State of Virginia:

1. The growth in the number of schools designated as middle schools in Virginia;
2. The appointment of a statewide advisory committee during 1979 to develop guidelines for middle schools in Virginia; and,
3. The proposed requirement for a middle school certification in Virginia.

In view of these developments and the importance of providing an appropriate and effective educational program for grades five through eight, the findings of this study should be of importance to school administrators and teachers.

The study reported here was undertaken to collect and analyze valuable information about the instructional

---

<sup>10</sup>Byrne, et al., op. cit., p. 63.

leadership behavior of the middle school principal. Through an analysis of whether significant differences exist between the instructional leadership behavior of the principal as perceived by middle school principals and full-time middle school teachers in the metropolitan area of Richmond, Virginia, this study provides descriptive data about the middle school principal as an instructional leader.

In addition, the results of this should provide valuable information for the Virginia Department of Education and agencies of higher education relative to their involvement in the preparation and training of individuals entering the middle school principalship, as well as the continuous evaluation of those currently in the position.

#### Definition of Terms

The following definitions were established in order to provide a consistent discussion of the study:

1. Instructional Leadership Behavior. The perceived "actual" and "expected" behaviors of the school principal as determined by the responses on the Survey of Instructional Leadership Behavior (SILB).
2. Middle School. That portion of the K-12 school organization which includes any combination of grades five through eight, with not less than 500 students nor more than 1500 students enrolled during the 1979-80 school year.

3. Middle School Principal. The administrative head of the middle school who is directly responsible to the superintendent. For the purpose of this study the middle school principal was completing a minimum of three years as the principal or as an administrator of the same school.
4. Middle School Teacher. A full-time professional staff member of the middle school who is officially in the school as an instructor of students.
5. Richmond SMSA. The local governmental units which are identified by the federal government's Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA).
6. Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA). The federal reporting system which identifies the local governments that constitute a metropolitan area. More specifically, an SMSA is a county or group of contiguous counties which contain at least one city of 50,000 inhabitants or more, whereas the counties are socially and economically integrated and the complete title of the SMSA identifies the central city.

7. Survey of Instructional Leadership Behavior (SILB). An instrument developed by this writer to analyze the instructional leadership behavior of the principal as perceived by the middle school principals and full-time middle school teachers in the metropolitan area of Richmond, Virginia.
8. Actual Behavior. The perceived frequency of how often the principal performs the instructional leadership behavior items listed on the SILB.
9. Expected Behavior. The perceived frequency of how often the principal is expected to perform the instructional leadership behavior items on the SILB.

#### Limitations of the Study

The following limitations were established for the study:

1. This study was limited to a selected group of middle schools located in the metropolitan area of Richmond, Virginia as determined by the SMSA.
2. Only those schools which were officially listed as middle schools in the 1979-80 Virginia Educational Directory and subsequently satisfied the criteria for a middle school as set forth in this study were considered.

3. This study was based on the responses of a group of middle school principals and full-time middle school teachers in the metropolitan area of Richmond, Virginia.

Given these limitations, the perceptions of the middle school principals and full-time middle school teachers in this major metropolitan area can be generalized only to areas of similar SMSA structure.

#### Organization of the Study

This study is presented in five chapters. This chapter has introduced the subject and purpose of the study. In addition, the chapter has presented the statement of the hypotheses, importance of the study, and the organization of the study.

Chapter II presents a review of related literature which serves as a general background for the subject investigated in this study. Chapter III describes, in detail, the methodology of the study including the subjects, research instrument, collection and treatment of data.

Chapter IV presents the results of the study and is designed to show if any significant differences existed between the perceptions of the instructional leadership behavior of the school principal as perceived by middle school principals when compared to the perceptions of full-time middle school teachers in the metropolitan area of Richmond, Virginia. Chapter V presents the summary, conclusions, and recommendations.

## Chapter II

### REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In order to provide a general background of pertinent information, this chapter is presented in four parts: (1) The Middle School: An Historical Sketch, (2) The School Principalship: Its Origin, (3) Perspectives On The Principal As An Instructional Leader, and (4) Summary. It is important to note that the terms instructional leadership and educational leadership were found to be prevalent in the literature. Sergiovanni, et al., for example, used the term educational leadership to make the following point:

Though many decry the emergence of managerial and political roles in education administration, . . . the 'bottom' line for educational administrators remains educational leadership. Management roles . . . exist only to support and complement educational leadership roles.<sup>11</sup>

As cited earlier, Hunter<sup>12</sup> makes the same point using the term instructional leadership. Therefore, this writer acknowledges that no constructive purpose is served in debating the use of one term (educational leadership) over the other (instructional leadership). The literature

---

<sup>11</sup>Thomas J. Sergiovanni, Martin Burlingame, Fred D. Coombs, and Paul W. Thurston, Educational Governance and Administration (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1980) p. 16.

<sup>12</sup>Hunter, loc. cit.

reviewed indicates that the terms tend to overlap and are used interchangeably.

The Middle School: An Historical Sketch

Alexander, et al., identify the middle school as any school which combines grades 5-8 or 6-8 in the same school unit.<sup>13</sup> They explain further that the middle school is defined as:

. . . a program planned for a range of older children, pre-adolescents, and early adolescents that builds upon the elementary school program for earlier childhood and in turn is built upon by the high school's program for adolescence.<sup>14</sup>

Any discussion of the historical developments of the middle school is generally preceded by an appropriate discussion of the junior high school. Lounsbury and Vars aptly point out that a full understanding of the current middle school cannot be achieved without an understanding of the development of the junior high school.<sup>15</sup> They state further that the two schools (middle and junior high) are bound together and, in fact, may be one in the same.<sup>16</sup> Therefore,

---

<sup>13</sup>William M. Alexander, et al., The Emergent Middle School (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1968) p.5.

<sup>14</sup>Ibid.

<sup>15</sup>John Lounsbury and Gordon Vars, A Curriculum For The Middle School Years (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1978) p. 14.

<sup>16</sup>Ibid.

a brief discussion of the junior high school is presented in this portion of the chapter.

There is some disagreement concerning the correct date for the establishment of the first junior high school. However, Richmond, Indiana is generally credited with having established the first junior high school in 1895.<sup>17</sup> Other claims for the establishment of the first junior high school in the United States include: Providence, Rhode Island (1898), Baltimore, Maryland (1902), Kalamazoo, Michigan (1902), New York, New York (1905-1907), Berkeley, California (1909-1910), and Columbus, Ohio (1909-1910).<sup>18</sup>

After 1910, the number of junior high schools established in the United States increased significantly and this growth in numbers has been well documented. Lounsbury and Vars report that while there are no recent data on the number of existing junior high schools, they estimate over 8000 as late as the mid-1970s.<sup>19</sup>

Several elements, especially in the earlier years of the establishment of the junior high school, account for the

---

<sup>17</sup>Wood, Nicholson, and Findley, op. cit., p. 5.

<sup>18</sup>Ibid.

<sup>19</sup>Lounsbury and Vars, op. cit., p. 18.

increase in number. Devita, et al., report the following:

1. The lack of implementation of the early findings of adolescent psychology.
2. The economic and program deficiencies of isolated and small grammar schools.
3. The elimination of pupils at the end of the eighth grade.
4. Lack of influence on the part of male and female teachers for early adolescents.
5. Elementary teaching methods too long continued and too suddenly changed.
6. Articulation with corresponding elimination at the end or during the ninth grade.
7. The inadequate provision for personal, social, educational and vocational guidance in the elementary and high schools.
8. The age of the students entering college was higher than thought reasonable by college administrators.<sup>20</sup>

Kindred, et al., offer the following reasons for the growth in the number of junior high schools:

1. Lack of adequate housing and heavy enrollments in both elementary and secondary schools in the construction of junior high schools.
2. The offering of a broad educational program on the junior high level not generally found traditionally in elementary schools.

---

<sup>20</sup> Joseph C. Devita, Philip Punerantaz, and Leighton B. Wilklow, The Effective Middle School (West Nyack, New York: Parker Publishing Co., 1970) p. 16.

3. The improved holding power of the school for students beyond the fifth grade.
4. An acknowledgment that the junior high school offered a program better fitted to the nature and the needs of young adolescents.<sup>21</sup>

Lounsbury and Vars state further that age distribution within student enrollments and the capacities of available buildings are also major determinants of how schools are organized.<sup>22</sup> The junior high, like most institutions, has its shortcomings; therefore, it is not void of criticisms. Such shortcomings and criticisms tend to catalyze the emergence of the middle school.

Kindred, et al., offer the following summary of the major criticisms of the junior high school:

1. The junior high school has tended, by and large, to pattern itself after the senior high school, despite the excellent theory behind it . . . . In fact, it has become a high school for junior pupils.
2. Recent pressures on the junior high school to place more emphasis upon academic subjects . . . have left less time for subjects such as fine arts, industrial arts, and homemaking . . . which are equally important in a general education program.
3. Study assignments and homework loads have increased considerably due to the thrust downward of senior high school subjects.

---

<sup>21</sup>Leslie W. Kindred, et al., The Intermediate Schools (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1968) p. 26.

<sup>22</sup>Lounsbury and Vars, loc. cit.

4. Traditional contention that the junior high school should get students ready for senior high school has meant mastery of content and skills in limited areas at the expense of a broad, exploratory program.
5. The complexity of the junior high school . . . has made it difficult for pupils to adjust and find the necessary satisfactions wanted in a school situation.
6. Junior high school programs today are badly out of line in many instances with the needs of the pre-adolescent and early adolescent youngster.
7. Quite often junior high school teachers are dissatisfied with their assignment, preferring instead to be on the senior high staff. They express this dissatisfaction in their relations with pupils . . . .
8. The junior high school is often housed in a former senior high school building or in an old elementary school building. Neither of these buildings are (sic) suitable for meeting the requirements of a modern junior high school program.
9. Since the ninth grade is closely tied to the senior high school with reference to subject offerings and units of credit for college admissions, the fundamental purposes and functions of the junior high school are divided; as well as the program; it is, in reality, two schools under one roof.
10. In six-year junior high schools, it is common to administer the entire six years as a single unit. There is, however, some separation of activities for the junior and senior high schools. But even where this is done, the danger persists that proportionately more attention may be given to pupils in the upper three grades and that pupils in the lower three grades may have more difficulty in acquiring the use of the facilities.

11. Two-year junior high schools leave much to be desired. They not only make it difficult for teachers to know pupils . . . but also require that pupils grow from the position of follower to that of a leader in a brief period of time.<sup>23</sup>

Lounsbury and Vars maintain that the impetus gained by the middle school movement is because of three major sources of strength.

1. The Concern For Academic Excellence And Specialization. This can be traced to the advent of the Sputnik area when there was an obsession with academic and post-high school education.
2. The Belief That Young People Are Maturing Earlier. There are those who believe that young people are maturing physically and socially much earlier than their counterparts did in the early 18th century.
3. The Dissatisfaction With The Typical Junior High School. The tendency of the junior high school to imitate the senior high school is a major point of dissatisfaction.<sup>24</sup>

Because of an increasing wave of criticisms and dissatisfaction with the junior high school, the current middle

---

<sup>23</sup>Kindred, et al., op. cit., pp. 29-30.

<sup>24</sup>Lounsbury and Vars, op. cit., p. 19.

schools began to develop. Several surveys indicate significant increases in the number of existing middle schools since the early 1960s.

Cuff, for the purpose of his study, defined middle school as having grades six and seven with no grades below four and no grades higher than eight and was able to find 499 middle schools operating in 446 public school systems in 29 states.<sup>25</sup> Gross reports finding 960 middle schools in 47 states and the District of Columbia.<sup>26</sup> Alexander's survey indicates that there were approximately 1,100 middle schools in 1967-68.<sup>27</sup> Kealy identifies 2,298 middle schools in 1970.<sup>28</sup> During the 1973-74 school year, Raymer identifies 1,906 middle schools having grade levels of 5-8, 6-8, and various combinations of 4-9.<sup>29</sup> Finally, Brooks reported finding 4,060 middle schools in 1977 with 66% organized in grades 6-8.<sup>30</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup>William A. Cuff, "Middle Schools on the March," NASSP Bulletin, Vol. 51 (February, 1967), p. 83.

<sup>26</sup>Bernard M. Gross, "An Analysis of the Present and Perceived Purposes Functions, and Characteristics of the Middle School," (Doctoral Dissertation, Temple University), 1972.

<sup>27</sup>Alexander, et al., The Emergent Middle School, p. 9.

<sup>28</sup>Ronald D. Kealy, "The Middle School Movement: 1960-1970," National Elementary Principal (November, 1971), p. 24.

<sup>29</sup>Joe T. Raymer, "A Study To Identify Middle Schools And To Determine The Current Level of Implementation of Eighteen Basic Middle School Characteristics In Selected United States and Michigan Schools," (Doctoral Dissertation, Michigan State University), 1974.

<sup>30</sup>Kenneth Brooks, "The Middle School: A National Survey," Middle School Journal (February, 1978), p. 6.

Although the junior high school was developed to bridge the gap between elementary and senior high school years, it is evident by the continued emergence of the middle school that it (junior high school) has not been an effective transition. Therefore, the middle school promises to be a viable alternative. Paramount in this thinking is the importance of the school principal, who is confronted with unparalleled opportunities to provide effective leadership with an emphasis on instruction.

#### The School Principalship: Its Origin

Goldman points out that the term, school principal, describes the results of a period of evolution lasting for more than a century.<sup>31</sup> Goldman continues:

In order to understand the principalship as it is today, it is important to know how the position evolved. It did not begin as a carefully planned, clearly defined position in education; rather it emerged in response to a multitude of factors, including increases in school enrollments, and numbers of teachers employed, and the proliferation of services provided by the school. As the means for dealing with these factors became more complex and more demanding of time, a distinctive role for the school principal began to emerge.<sup>32</sup>

---

<sup>31</sup>Samuel Goldman, The School Principal (New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1966) p. 1.

<sup>32</sup>Ibid., p. 2.

Goldman, citing Pierce<sup>33</sup> as a major source of information on the historical development of the school principalship aptly summarizes how the position of school principal began:

The modern public school principalship had its beginning in the early high schools about the middle of the 1800s. The high schools were closely patterned after European counterparts since they were designed to serve a few; therefore, the secondary school principal performed a multitude of duties. The high school principalship predates the elementary school principalship, but both developed in response to similar influences.<sup>34</sup>

The one-room schoolhouse characterized the typical early organization for education. As cities expanded and school enrollments increased, more teachers were added and schools expanded. With the development of grading practices and departmentalization, it became increasingly evident that someone in the school had to be responsible for its administration. Hence, the development of the principal teacher.<sup>35</sup> In what may be considered the first job description for the school principal, the Board of Education in Cincinnati, Ohio, outlined the following duties and responsibilities for the "principal teacher:"

---

<sup>33</sup>Paul R. Pierce, The Origin and Development of the Public School Principal (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1935) p. 1, in Samuel Goldman, op. cit., p. 3.

<sup>34</sup>Ibid.

<sup>35</sup>Goldman, op. cit., p. 3.

1. To function as the head of the school charged to his care;
2. To regulate the classes and course of instruction;
3. To discover any defects in the school and apply remedies;
4. To make defects known to the visitor of the ward or district if he were unable to remedy conditions;
5. To give necessary instruction to his assistants;
6. To classify pupils;
7. To safeguard the schoolhouse and furniture;
8. To keep the school clean;
9. To instruct assistants;
10. To refrain from impairing the standing of the assistants, especially in the eyes of students;
11. To require the cooperation of his assistants.<sup>36</sup>

As cities and towns continued to expand, local school committees expanded their school programs. Consequently, the inadequacy of the role of the principal teacher became evident. To remedy this situation, principal teachers were given released time and began to move toward establishing the principalship as an official staff position in the school's administration.

Goldman makes the following observation about the "birth" of the school principalship:

---

<sup>36</sup>Pierce, op. cit., in Goldman, p. 4.

Born in response to the many clerical tasks that became necessary as the educational enterprise expanded, the principalship has developed into an important position of leadership in American education.<sup>37</sup>

Goldman continues:

The early beginnings of the principalship were quite unimpressive. Concerned with the details and routine, content to serve as a transmitter of directives from the superintendent to teachers, afraid to experiment and to innovate, interested in security and self-preservation, the early school principal did little to establish himself as an educational leader.<sup>38</sup>

While the role of the school principal, as we know it today, can be traced from and bears some resemblance to that of the principal teacher in the middle 1800s, it has changed significantly. Many of the changes in the role of the school principal are attributed to a variety of forces that have significant impacts on education as a social institution. Wood, et al., note the following:

1. Continuing evolution of secondary education.
2. Urbanization
3. Population changes
4. School district reorganization
5. Technical advances
6. Student and teacher action to gain a voice in decision making.

---

<sup>37</sup>Goldman, op. cit., p. 1.

<sup>38</sup>Ibid., p. 5.

7. Changing societal values
8. Teacher collective bargaining
9. Changing political environments.<sup>39</sup>

Goldman points out further that the uniqueness of a local school alone can impact significantly on the role of the school principalship.<sup>40</sup> In spite of the growth and changes in the development of the school principal due to the uniqueness of individual school districts or to the impact of societal factors, two critical and enduring expectations of the school principal have been established. Blumberg and Greenfield explain:

The essential features of the principalship were established by the turn of the twentieth century and have not changed in any significant way since that time. While the duties and responsibilities have continued to grow and increase in complexity, the expectation that principals serve the twin functions of providing instructional leadership and managing school affairs have been rooted firmly in the minds of school superintendents and school board members in the early 1900s, particularly in America's large cities.<sup>41</sup>

The role of the school principal has undergone many changes since its inception; nevertheless, instructional leadership prevails as an important priority. The next

---

<sup>39</sup>Wood, et al., op. cit., p. 3.

<sup>40</sup>Goldman, The School Principal, p. 10.

<sup>41</sup>Blumberg and Greenfield, The Effective Principal, p. 10.

segment of this chapter presents a discussion of some perspectives on the school principal as an instructional leader.

Perspectives On The Principal As The Instructional Leader

After the establishment of the Department of Secondary School Principals and the Department of Elementary School Principals<sup>42</sup>, many concepts concerning the expectations held for the school principal by varied referent groups were formulated. Expectations for the school principal have been reported by Horowitz, et al<sup>43</sup>, Sergiovanni and Carver<sup>44</sup>, and Chase<sup>45</sup>, among others. Goldhammer et al<sup>46</sup>, present a convincing argument when they state that the position of school principal at all levels is uncertain and ambiguous.

---

<sup>42</sup>Paul B. Jacobson, James D. Logsdon, and Robert B. Weigman, The Principalship: New Perspectives (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1973) p. 34.

<sup>43</sup>Myer Horowitz, et al., "Divergent Views of the Principal's Role: Expectations Held by Principals, Teachers, and Superintendents," The Alberta Journal of Educational Research XV (December, 1969), p. 195.

<sup>44</sup>Thomas J. Sergiovanni and Fred D. Carver, The New School Executive (New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1973) pp. 175-176.

<sup>45</sup>Francis S. Chase, "How to Meet Teachers' Expectations of Leadership," Administrator's Notebook, Vol. 1 (July, 1953), pp. 2-3.

<sup>46</sup>Keith Goldhammer and Gerald L. Becker, "What Makes A Good Elementary School Principal?" American Education, Vol. 6, No. 3 (April, 1970)p. 11.

There are numerous conceptions of the school principal and the literature is mixed on the subject. However, the general concensus among educators is that the primary function of the principal is to be an instructional leader. Brieve makes the following point.

A principal is and must be an instructional leader. He is the single most important individual in influencing the instructional program in his school. Therefore, it seems appropriate to examine the concept of instructional leadership as it relates to a school principal.<sup>47</sup>

The basic tenet of Brieve's position is supported by Jenson<sup>48</sup>, McIntyre<sup>49</sup>, and Zechman<sup>50</sup>, among others. In addition, Morphet, et al., provide the following supporting argument.

---

<sup>47</sup>Fred J. Brieve, "Secondary Principals As Instructional Leaders," NASSP Bulletin, Vol. 56 (December, 1972) p. 11.

<sup>48</sup>Theodore J. Jenson et al., Elementary School Administration (Boston, Mass.: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1967)

<sup>49</sup>Kenneth E. McIntyre, "Administering and Improving the Instructional Program," in Performance Objectives for School Principals: Concepts and Instruments ed. J. A. Culbertson et al., (Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Co., 1974) p. 152.

<sup>50</sup>Harry T. Zechman, "Are Principals Competent in the Instructional Leadership Domain?" NASSP Bulletin, Vol. 61, (December, 1977) pp. 21-25.

It is much more than a truism to state that the most important task of the principal is to provide leadership for the development and implementation of the instructional program at his school. He is the executive in the line organization . . . . He is at the school center and has far greater opportunity to (make) change or to prevent change.<sup>51</sup>

Harris points out that the principal who wishes to be efficient and effective as an instructional leader should adhere to the following conceptual framework:

1. Leadership involves the pursuit of change. Without change as an essential focus or purpose, there is no need for leadership.
2. Leadership involves responsibility. Leaders assume responsibility above and beyond that of followers. One does not exercise just being involved in change processes.
3. Instructional leadership involves change that is uniquely instructional. Instructional changes can be clearly distinguished from other kinds of changes.<sup>52</sup>

Goldman, in his discussion of the functions of the principal, stated that the central functions of all administrative effort should be upon the development of a program that will provide rich educational opportunities for each

---

<sup>51</sup>Edgar L. Morphet, Roe L. Johns, and Theodore L. Reller, Educational Organization and Administration: Concepts, Practices, and Issues (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, inc., 1967) p. 346.

<sup>52</sup>Ben M. Harris, "Altering the Thrust of Supervision Through Creative Leadership," Educational Leadership (May, 1977) p. 568.

student.<sup>53</sup> Goldman states further that, in most cases, major responsibility . . . is vest in the school principal. It is his responsibility to insure that the educational program in his school is as good as available sources permit.<sup>54</sup> It is clearly the instructional leadership of the school principal that determines not only what programs are utilized for the effective education of the students.

Jacobson, Logsdon, and Weigman emphasize the need for principals to develop a strategy to accomplish the objectives of instructional leadership, especially in view of the variety of tasks they are required to perform.<sup>55</sup> Expanding this same thesis, Pendergrass and Wood provide a systematic instructional design model, Planned Instructional Emphasis (PIE), to accomplish the tasks.<sup>56</sup> Pendergrass and Wood state:

---

<sup>53</sup>Goldman, op. cit., p. 38.

<sup>54</sup>Ibid.

<sup>55</sup>Jacobson, et al., op. cit., p. 135.

<sup>56</sup>R. A. Pendergrass and Diane Wood, "Instructional Leadership and the Principal," NASSP Bulletin, Vol. 63, (March, 1979), p. 42.

. . . designing and delivery instruction is the purpose of the school. The principal must utilize a system of instructional design so that all tasks and activities revolve around the central focus, teaching and learning . . . .<sup>57</sup>

Roe and Drake, in their analysis of the job of the school principal, describe the responsibilities of the principal on the basis of dual-emphasis Administrative-Managerial and Educational and Instructional Leadership.<sup>58</sup> This concept is in keeping with the earlier expectations that principals serve a twin function of providing instructional leadership and managing school affairs.

The literature clearly indicates the prevailing attitude that the school principal is the instructional leader, and more importantly, should continue to assume the all-important responsibility of providing instructional improvement. However, there is a growing number of educators who simply do not subscribe to this notion. Roe and Drake, for example, in their description of the dual-emphasis of the principal's job, assert that the educational leadership emphasis is "the emphasis that most principals profess they dream about but can't achieve."<sup>59</sup>

---

<sup>57</sup>Ibid.

<sup>58</sup>Roe and Drake, op. cit., pp. 13-14.

<sup>59</sup>Ibid.

Lack of time tends to dominate the reasons for not satisfying the instructional leadership responsibility. Roe and Drake continue:

. . . it is virtually impossible to assume that the principal can be a real instructional leader and at the same time be held strictly accountable for the general operational and management detail required by the central office.<sup>60</sup>

Blumberg and Greenfield expand this point in their discussion of the school principal as follows:

School principals are, for the most part, managers; their work environment gives most of them little choice in the matter. While this situation does not prevent a few committed and talented individuals from achieving excellence as instructional leaders, most principals find themselves frustrated by their inability (be it skill, knowledge, or time allocation) to move beyond the management function inherent in the role of the principal as it has evolved during the past hundred years.<sup>61</sup>

Hoeh asserts that instructional leadership is an outdated role for the principal and that many principals are beginning to question the feasibility of directing primary employees toward instructional improvement.<sup>62</sup> Hoeh continues

---

<sup>60</sup>Ibid.

<sup>61</sup>Blumberg and Greenfield, op. cit., p. 46.

<sup>62</sup>James A. Hoeh, "Feeling Guilty For Not Being An Instructional Leader? Don't." NASSP Bulletin, Vol. 57, (November, 1973), p. 1-7.

his argument:

Proponents of the theory that the improvement of instruction should receive major attention from the principal, even in today's complex social institution, presumably rely heavily on the archaic supposition that the principal historically and even today derives his power from serving as principal teacher (and) . . . whereas the teaching staff at one time represented the primary group to whom the principal responded, the citizenry and student body now are competing for his energies and creativeness. This . . . has precluded emphasis on instructional improvement but has promoted a new, more fundamental<sup>63</sup> priority - the improvement of learning.

In support of this argument, Salley, McPherson, and Baehr state:

In our judgment there has been change to American education, but it has only been to solidify the bureaucratization and mechanization of American schools and school systems. Professional educators, as well as many adult clients of the schools, appear to be more obsessed with management than with education. Thus, the job of a principal is increasingly defined in terms of administrative rather than instructional functions. We doubt, perhaps cynically, that this pattern will be altered. If anything, the federal government, state departments of education, foundations, universities, local boards of education, and citizens-at-large are tending to increase the pressure on the principal to become a production manager. If this is so, we only ask that the principal be given a set of unambiguous expectations by these groups. In short, we may want to take the principal off the hooks marked "change agent" and "instructional leader."<sup>64</sup>

---

<sup>63</sup>Ibid.

<sup>64</sup>Columbus Salley, R. Bruce McPherson, and Mellany E. Baehr, "What Principals Do: A Preliminary Occupational Analysis," Handbook of Educational Supervision, eds. Sir James R. Marks, Emery Stoops, and Joyce King-Stoops (2nd ed.; Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1978), pp. 37-38.

Despite the growing number of educators who do not support the thesis that the principal is the instructional leader in the school, there is little disagreement regarding the principal's continuing to be one of the "most durable and critical positions in the administration of American schools."<sup>65</sup>

In their discussion of why the principal is considered the most important instructional resource in the school, DeRoche and Kaiser assert that it is the principal who knows the faculty - their strengths and weaknesses; has the best opportunity to help teachers; sets the climate in the school; is in the best position to create a support team for the teachers; has the greatest opportunity to interpret the school's goals and objectives and the school's programs to parents and the community; and finally, (the principal) is in the best position to organize, supervise and evaluate the school's programs and personnel.<sup>66</sup> In addition, DeRoche and Kaiser are quick to point out that instructional services in a school take time, effort, organization and coordination; and it must be the principal in each school who takes on the responsibility for delivery of these services.<sup>67</sup>

---

<sup>65</sup>Ibid., p. 22.

<sup>66</sup>Edward F. DeRoche and Jeffrey S. Kaiser, Complete Guide To Administering School Services (New York: Parker Publishing Company, Inc., 1980), p. 18.

<sup>67</sup>Ibid., p. 51.

### Summary

This chapter has reviewed related background literature in three areas: (1) The Middle School: An Historical Sketch, (2) The School Principalship: Its Origin, and (3) Perspectives on the Principal As an Instructional Leader. An emphasis on the instructional leadership responsibility of the school principal was the focus of the discussion.

It is apparent from the literature review that there are mixed views on the instructional leadership responsibility of the principal. Although there is a growing number of educators who do not think the principal is the instructional leader of the school, the literature indicates clearly that the principal not only is the instructional leader, but the principal should continue to assume the important responsibility of providing for the improvement of instruction. Regardless of the different views on the subject, it is consistently agreed that the principal is one of the most important positions in American education. In closing, Sarason's observations are pertinent:

I have yet to see any proposal for system change that did not assume the presence of a principal in a school. I have yet to see in any of these proposals the slightest recognition of the possibility that the principal, by virtue of role, preparation, and tradition, may not be a good implementer of change.<sup>68</sup>

---

<sup>68</sup> Seymour B. Sarason, The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971) p. III.

### CHAPTER III

#### METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

This study was a descriptive-analytical survey of middle school principals' and full-time middle school teachers' responses to the Survey of Instructional Leadership Behavior (SILB). The purpose of this study was to determine whether significant differences existed between the two respondent groups in terms of their perceptions of the "actual" instructional leadership behavior and "expected" instructional leadership behavior of middle school principals in the metropolitan area of Richmond, Virginia. This chapter describes, in detail, the methodology of the study including the subjects, research instrument, collection of data, and the statistical treatment of the data used in effecting the study.

#### Subjects

According to the Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA), eight governmental localities are included in the Richmond area. Since there were no middle schools located in four of the eight localities at the time the study was conducted, these four were excluded. One locality refused to grant the approval to conduct the study; therefore, the subjects for the study were identified from three governmental localities to make up a representative group of middle schools and principals, as well as full-time middle school teachers in the Richmond area. Anonymity was assured.

All middle schools included in this study were identified through the 1979-80 Virginia Educational Directory and the individual school divisions. Each middle school was limited to those having a student enrollment of not less than 500 nor more than 1,500 in any combination of grades five through eight and was headed by a principal who was completing a minimum of three years as the principal or as an administrator of the same school. Eleven schools were identified and the subjects consisted of eleven middle school principals and 380 full-time middle school teachers.

The building principal and the full-time teachers of each middle school served as the respondent groups. Each principal was endorsed as a secondary principal by the Virginia State Department of Education and verified to have been completing a minimum of three years as the principal or as an administrator of the same school. Each middle school teacher possessed a teaching certificate from the Virginia State Department of Education and was verified to have been employed on a full-time basis and to have been completing a minimum of one full year of teaching in the same school on any grade level, or a combination of grade levels between five and eight. Substitute teachers, part-time teachers, and full-time and part-time non-instructional staff members within the school were not included in the study.

## Research Instrument

The initial task of this study was to prepare a list of instructional leadership behaviors in a form convenient for middle school principals and full-time middle school teachers which described the "actual" instructional leadership behavior and "expected" instructional leadership behavior of the principal. To accomplish this task, the Survey of Instructional Leadership Behavior (SILB), an instrument consisting of 34 items, was developed and prepared in the following manner:

1. An extensive search of the literature was conducted for the purpose of identifying recommended examples of instructional leadership behavior for the school principal. Each example was recorded with an appropriate notation of its source. This resulted in a total of 93 items.
2. Each item was stated declaratively in the present tense to describe each instructional leadership behavior.
3. A total of 20 principals in the metropolitan area were consulted for the purpose of receiving additional examples of instructional leadership behavior other than those extracted from the literature. This resulted in the addition of 14 items.

4. The list of 107 items was shared subsequently with college professors of education, fellow doctoral students and colleagues. The purpose was to examine the clarity of each statement and to receive constructive criticisms which would improve upon the choices made and to eliminate repetition. This procedure resulted in a significant reduction of the total number of items to 34.
5. The 34 items of instructional leadership behavior were then classified into three categories as follows:
  - a. Administrative and Organization Supports
    - Item 1. The principal defines the goals and the objectives unique to the school.
    - Item 2. The principal allocates materials and equipment for instructional activities.
    - Item 8. The principal articulates the goals and the objectives of the school to all members of the staff.
    - Item 10. The principal formulates the instructional objectives for each grade level in the school.
    - Item 11. The principal inventories the changing needs for time and space to accomplish various instructional objectives.

- Item 15. The principal coordinates the arrangement of facilities to accomplish instructional objectives.
- Item 18. The principal determines the procedures and schedules for standardized testing within the school.
- Item 20. The principal coordinates all support services to accomplish instructional objectives.

b. Personnel Management and Supervision

- Item 4. The principal provides for the assignment of substitute instructional personnel.
- Item 5. The principal participates in the recruitment, and the selection of all instructional personnel.
- Item 6. The principal plans in-service training activities for instructional personnel.
- Item 7. The principal assigns or re-assigns instructional personnel within the school to maximize conditions for learning.
- Item 9. The principal visits classrooms to observe instructional techniques.
- Item 12. The principal collects and analyzes data concerning the performance of teachers.
- Item 14. The principal leads in-service training activities for instructional personnel.
- Item 17. The principal confers individually with instructional personnel about instructional matters.
- Item 19. The principal recommends all instructional personnel for re-employment, promotion or dismissal.

- Item 21. The principal provides for the demonstration of effective instructional techniques.
  - Item 26. The principal defines the job responsibilities of each staff member in accordance with the instructional philosophy of the school.
  - Item 29. The principal demonstrates a general knowledge of all fields of curriculum unique to the instructional objectives of the school.
  - Item 30. The principal provides for the establishment of a collection of professional resource material within the school.
  - Item 32. The principal participates in instructional team meetings.
  - Item 33. The principal conducts group conferences with instructional personnel experiencing similar problems in instruction.
- c. Student Growth and Development
- Item 3. The principal collects and analyzes data concerning the performance of students.
  - Item 13. The principal assigns students to the appropriate classes and time periods for instruction.
  - Item 16. The principal determines the promotion and retention of students.
  - Item 23. The principal provides for an appropriate system for reporting students' performances to parents and other schools.
  - Item 25. The principal relates the needs of the students within the school to the goals of the school system.

- Item 28. The principal meets the needs of the students within the school in accordance with legal requirements.
- Item 31. The principal coordinates and supervises student assemblies.
- Item 34. The principal coordinates student discipline.

To establish further the clarity of each item and to examine the reliability of the research instrument, the SILB was piloted in selected middle schools in Virginia which were not to be included in the actual study. A total of 70 full-time middle school teachers and two middle school principals participated in the pilot study of the research instrument by indicating their responses to the "actual" instructional leadership behavior and "expected" instructional leadership behavior of the principal. On these responses, a Cronbach Alpha was computed and yielded a coefficient of 0.922.

No attempt was made to include all of the many examples of instructional leadership behavior in the initial and, more importantly, the final development of the SILB. It was important for the purpose of this study that the principals and teachers recognized clearly the instructional leadership behavior described by each item. Scoring of the SILB was accomplished by assigning a numerical value to each of the items as follows:

Always . . . . .	5
Very Often . . . . .	4
Sometimes. . . . .	3
Rarely . . . . .	2
Never. . . . .	1
(No Response). . . . .	0

### Collection of Data

Administrative approval to conduct with study was obtained from each of the school divisions selected for the study. The middle schools which did not satisfy the criteria set forth in this study were eliminated from further consideration.

The middle school principal of each of the 11 middle schools included in the study was asked also to give up approval to conduct the study. Once full administrative approval was obtained, each participating middle school principal was contacted for an initial conference and was given a brief description of the purpose and methodology of the study. Each principal was advised that the approximate time necessary to collect the data was 20 minutes. Complete anonymity was assured.

In May, 1980, the SILB was distributed to each of the 11 middle school principals and the entire staff of the middle schools which participated in the study. The SILB was administered separately to each school, but to both

respondent groups at the same time.

In the presence of the principal, a brief description and explanation of the purpose and methodology of the study were given. This was supported further by a cover sheet which accompanied the SILB. All participants were instructed not to write their names on the SILB and were told that all responses would remain anonymous since only group responses were important to this study and would serve as the basis for data analysis. In that there were no identifications made on the SILB, complete anonymity was achieved.

Once the SILB was completed by each participant, personal data such as sex, age, years of experience, educational background, number of years assigned to the school, and ethnic group were collected and used for analysis. Since only the responses of the building principals and full-time teachers that satisfied the criteria set forth in the study were important, all other responses were determined inappropriate and subsequently discarded.

#### Treatment of Data

To accomplish the purpose of the study, responses to the SILB were collected and determined usable from 11 middle school principals and 380 full-time middle school teachers in the metropolitan area of Richmond, Virginia. These responses along with the demographic characteristics of each respondent were hand-scored and keypunched individually onto IBM data cards. Each hypothesis presented in

this study was tested at the .05 level of significance to determine which should be retained and which should be rejected.

Hypotheses 1 and 2 were tested using independent t-test values. Hypotheses 3 and 4 were tested using dependent t-test values. Hypothesis 5 was tested by conducting a multi-way analysis of variance using all demographic data as independent variables.

All data were analyzed by employing the Statistical Analysis System (SAS). The computer centers of Virginia Commonwealth University (Richmond, Virginia), and Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University (Blacksburg, Virginia) were used to run all data.

## Chapter IV

### RESULTS OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to analyze the instructional leadership behavior of the principal as perceived by middle school principals when compared to the perceptions of full-time middle school teachers in the metropolitan area of Richmond, Virginia. Responses to the Survey of Instructional Leadership Behavior (SILB) were collected in order to accomplish the following objectives.

1. To determine the "actual" instructional leadership behavior of the principal as perceived by middle school principals and full-time middle school teachers in the metropolitan area of Richmond, Virginia.
2. To determine the "expected" instructional leadership behavior of the principal as perceived by middle school principals and full-time middle school teachers in the metropolitan area of Richmond, Virginia.
3. To determine if any significant difference exists between the "actual" instructional leadership behavior of the principal as perceived by middle school principals and full-time middle school teachers in the metropolitan area of Richmond, Virginia.

4. To determine if any significant difference exists between the "expected" instructional leadership behavior of the principal as perceived by middle school principals and full-time middle school teachers in the metropolitan area of Richmond, Virginia.
5. To determine if any significant difference exists between the "actual" instructional leadership behavior and the "expected" instructional leadership behavior of the principal as perceived by full-time middle school teachers in the metropolitan area of Richmond, Virginia.
6. To determine if any significant difference exists between the "actual" instructional leadership behavior and the "expected" instructional leadership behavior of the principal as perceived by middle school principals in the metropolitan area of Richmond, Virginia.

An additional objective of the study was to examine selected demographic data of the respondents (sex, age, race, annual income, education, and experience), and their relationships to the "actual" instructional leadership behavior and the "expected" instructional leadership behavior of the middle school principals in the metropolitan area of Richmond, Virginia.

This chapter reports the results of the study including a description of the subjects, a scale analysis of the SILB, findings, and discussion. Each hypothesis reported in the findings was tested at the .05 level of significance.

### Description of the Subjects

As pointed out in Chapter III, eight governmental localities were included in the Richmond SMSA when this study was conducted (May, 1980). Four of the eight localities did not have any middle schools at the time of the study. One of the remaining four localities refused to grant permission to conduct the study. Therefore, the subjects for this study were identified from three localities to make up a group of middle schools and principals, as well as full-time middle school teachers in the Richmond SMSA. Of the 532 who participated in the study, 391 (73%) of the returned responses were usable. Of this number, 11 were middle school principals and 380 were full-time middle school teachers.

Table 1 provides a comparison of the number of responses made by the principals and full-time middle school teachers who participated in the study. As shown in this table, each school was well represented in the number of usable responses. Demographic data (sex, age, race, experience, education, and annual income) on the principals and full-time teachers who participated in the study are contained in Table 2.

The mean scores for each response to the items on the

Table 1

A Comparison of the Number of Responses  
 Made by the Middle School Principals and  
 the Full-time Middle School Teachers Who  
 Participated in the Study

SCHOOL	PRINCIPALS			TEACHERS		
	Number Participated	Usable Responses	Percent	Number Participated	Usable Responses	Percent
A	1	1	100	35	26	74.29
B	1	1	100	50	35	70.00
C	1	1	100	48	26	54.17
D	1	1	100	40	26	65.00
E	1	1	100	81	66	81.48
F	1	1	100	32	29	90.62
G	1	1	100	46	24	52.17
H	1	1	100	31	26	83.87
I	1	1	100	51	34	66.67
J	1	1	100	53	39	73.58
K	1	1	100	65	49	75.38
	11	11	100	532	380	71.43

Table 2  
 Demographic Data on the Middle School  
 Principals and the Full-time Middle  
 School Teachers Who Participated in  
 the Study

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA	PRINCIPALS		TEACHERS	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Sex				
Male	10	91.00	128	33.68
Female	1	9.00	252	66.32
Age				
30 or under	-	-	118	31.05
31 - 40	5	45.45	151	39.74
41 and over	6	54.55	111	29.21
Race*				
White	5	45.45	131	34.47
Non-White	6	54.55	249	65.53
Experience				
4 years or under	3	27.27	99	26.05
5 - 9 years	4	36.36	133	35.00
10 years or more	4	36.36	148	38.95
Education				
Less than Bachelor	-	-	5	1.32
Bachelor	-	-	242	63.68
Masters or Beyond	11	100.00	133	35.00
Annual Income				
Under \$10,000	-	-	16	4.21
\$10,000 - \$14,999	-	-	238	62.63
\$15,000 and over	11	100.00	126	33.16

\* Note: This category originally had six ethnic identifications (Black, White, Chicano/Hispanic, American Indian, Asian, and Other). Because the number of respondents who identified with the last four were negligible, the category was changed.

SILB as perceived by the full-time teachers ranged from 2.82 - 4.45 for "actual" instructional leadership behavior and 3.27 - 4.82 for "expected" instructional leadership behavior. In addition, standard deviation values ranged from 0.48 - 1.58 for "actual" instructional leadership behavior and 0.50 - 1.62 for "expected" instructional leadership behavior (see Appendix E).

The mean scores for each response to the items on the SILB as perceived by the middle school principals ranged from 2.47 - 4.43 for "actual" instructional leadership behavior and 2.77 - 4.62 for "expected" instructional leadership behavior. In addition, standard deviation values ranged from 0.87 - 1.48 for "actual" instructional leadership behavior and 0.50 - 1.62 for "expected" instructional leadership behavior (see Appendix F).

Table 3 contains the means and the differences between the means of the principals' and teachers' responses to the SILB. As shown in this table, the differences between the means for the principals' perceptions of their actual behavior ( $\bar{X}_{Pa}$ ) and the teachers' perceptions of their principals' actual behavior ( $\bar{X}_{Ta}$ ) ranged from -0.06 to 1.18. In addition, the differences between the means for the principals' perceptions of their expected behavior ( $\bar{X}_{Pe}$ ) and the teachers' perceptions of the principals' expected behavior ( $\bar{X}_{Te}$ ) ranged from -0.31 to 0.89.

Table 4 contains the means and the differences between

Table 3  
Means and Differences of the Principals' and  
Full-time Teachers' Responses to the SILB  
( $\bar{X}_{Pa} - \bar{X}_{Ta}$ ) and ( $\bar{X}_{Pe} - \bar{X}_{Te}$ )

Item Number	Descriptor	$\bar{X}_{Pa}$	$\bar{X}_{Ta}$	$\bar{X}_{Pa} - \bar{X}_{Ta}$	$\bar{X}_{Pe}$	$\bar{X}_{Te}$	$\bar{X}_{Pe} - \bar{X}_{Te}$
1	Defines goals	4.09	4.03	0.06	4.45	4.39	0.06
2	Allocates materials	4.45	3.27	1.18	4.55	3.66	0.89
3	Collects student data	3.27	3.09	0.18	4.18	3.68	0.50
4	Provides substitutes	3.18	3.17	0.01	3.45	3.47	-0.02
5	Participates in recruitment	4.40	4.42	-0.02	4.64	4.62	0.02
6	Plans training	3.27	3.13	0.14	3.91	3.55	0.36
7	Assigns personnel	4.36	3.74	0.62	4.73	4.24	0.45
8	Articulates goals	4.18	4.02	0.16	4.55	4.46	0.09
9	Visits classrooms	3.73	3.15	0.58	4.36	3.93	0.43
10	Formulates objectives	2.82	2.69	0.13	3.45	3.25	0.20
11	Inventories needs	3.73	3.44	0.29	4.36	4.06	0.30
12	Analyzes teacher data	4.17	3.89	0.28	4.73	4.30	0.43
13	Assigns students	3.00	2.47	0.53	3.27	2.77	0.50
14	Leads training activities	3.00	2.49	0.51	3.45	3.14	0.31
15	Coordinates facilities	3.73	3.51	0.22	4.09	3.83	0.26

$\bar{X}_{Pa}$  = Principals' perceptions of their actual behavior

$\bar{X}_{Pe}$  = Principals' perceptions of their expected behavior

$\bar{X}_{Ta}$  = Teachers' perceptions of the principals' actual behavior

$\bar{X}_{Te}$  = Teachers' perceptions of the principals' expected behavior

Table 3 (cont'd)

Item Number	Descriptor	$\bar{X}_{Pa}$	$\bar{X}_{Ta}$	$\bar{X}_{Pa} - \bar{X}_{Ta}$	$\bar{X}_{Pe}$	$\bar{X}_{Te}$	$\bar{X}_{Pe} - \bar{X}_{Te}$
16	Determines student promotion	2.82	2.88	-0.06	3.20	2.80	0.40
17	Confers with personnel	3.91	3.27	0.64	4.36	3.88	0.48
18	Determines testing	3.18	2.82	0.36	3.82	3.23	0.59
19	Recommends personnel	4.45	4.43	0.02	4.73	4.39	0.34
20	Coordinates services	3.64	3.38	0.26	4.18	3.92	0.26
21	Provides demonstration	2.91	2.97	-0.06	4.09	3.67	0.42
22	Assesses effectiveness	3.30	3.10	0.20	4.36	3.85	0.51
23	Provides reporting system	4.27	3.82	0.45	4.45	4.22	0.23
24	Directs development	2.91	2.58	0.33	3.63	3.43	0.20
25	Relates needs/goals	4.18	3.73	0.45	4.60	4.30	0.30
26	Defines responsibilities	4.36	4.09	0.27	4.82	4.44	0.38
27	Directs identification	3.64	3.37	0.27	4.09	3.73	0.36
28	Meets legal needs	4.45	4.03	0.42	4.55	4.46	0.09
29	Demonstrates knowledge	3.72	3.67	0.05	4.18	4.29	-0.09
30	Provides resource materials	3.82	3.41	0.41	4.27	3.88	0.39
31	Supervises assemblies	3.73	3.31	0.42	3.55	3.86	-0.31
32	Participates in meetings	3.27	3.07	0.20	3.82	3.69	0.13
33	Conducts conferences	3.18	2.92	0.36	4.09	3.82	0.27
34	Coordinates discipline	4.70	3.90	0.80	4.50	4.42	0.08

$\bar{X}_{Pa}$  = Principals' perceptions of their actual behavior

$\bar{X}_{Pe}$  = Principals' perceptions of their expected behavior

$\bar{X}_{Ta}$  = Teachers' perceptions of the principals' actual behavior

$\bar{X}_{Te}$  = Teachers' perceptions of the principals' expected behavior

Table 4

Means and Differences of the Principals' and  
Full-time Teachers' Responses to the SILB  
( $\bar{X}_{Pe} - \bar{X}_{Pa}$ ) and ( $\bar{X}_{Te} - \bar{X}_{Ta}$ )

Item Number	Descriptor	$\bar{X}_{Pa}$	$\bar{X}_{Pe}$	$\bar{X}_{Pe} - \bar{X}_{Pa}$	$\bar{X}_{Ta}$	$\bar{X}_{Te}$	$\bar{X}_{Te} - \bar{X}_{Ta}$
1	Defines goals	4.09	4.45	0.36	4.03	4.39	0.36
2	Allocates materials	4.45	4.55	0.10	3.27	3.66	0.39
3	Collects student data	3.27	4.18	0.91	3.09	3.68	0.59
4	Provides substitutes	3.18	3.45	0.27	3.17	3.47	0.30
5	Participates in recruitment	4.40	4.64	0.24	4.42	4.62	0.20
6	Plans training	3.27	3.91	0.64	3.13	3.55	0.42
7	Assigns personnel	4.36	4.73	0.37	3.74	4.24	0.50
8	Articulates goals	4.18	4.55	0.37	4.02	4.46	0.44
9	Visits classrooms	3.73	4.36	0.63	3.15	3.93	0.78
10	Formulates objectives	2.82	3.45	0.63	2.69	3.25	0.56
11	Inventories needs	3.73	4.36	0.63	3.44	4.06	0.62
12	Analyzes teacher data	4.17	4.73	0.56	3.89	4.30	0.41
13	Assigns students	3.00	3.27	0.27	2.47	2.77	0.30
14	Leads training activities	3.00	3.45	0.45	2.49	3.14	0.65
15	Coordinates facilities	3.73	4.09	0.36	3.51	3.83	0.32

$\bar{X}_{Pa}$  = Principals' perceptions of their actual behavior

$\bar{X}_{Pe}$  = Principals' perceptions of their expected behavior

$\bar{X}_{Ta}$  = Teachers' perceptions of the principals' actual behavior

$\bar{X}_{Te}$  = Teachers' perceptions of the principals' expected behavior

Table 4 (cont'd)

Item Number	Descriptor	$\bar{X}_{Pa}$	$\bar{X}_{Pe}$	$\bar{X}_{Pe} - \bar{X}_{Pa}$	$\bar{X}_{Ta}$	$\bar{X}_{Te}$	$\bar{X}_{Te} - \bar{X}_{Ta}$
16	Determines student promotion	2.82	3.20	0.38	2.88	2.80	-0.08
17	Confers with personnel	3.91	4.36	0.45	3.27	3.88	0.61
18	Determines testing	3.18	3.82	0.64	2.82	3.23	0.41
19	Recommends personnel	4.45	4.73	0.28	4.43	4.39	-0.04
20	Coordinates services	3.64	4.18	0.54	3.38	3.92	0.54
21	Provides demonstration	2.91	4.09	1.18	2.97	3.67	0.70
22	Assesses effectiveness	3.30	4.36	1.06	3.10	3.85	0.75
23	Provides reporting system	4.27	4.45	0.18	3.82	4.22	0.40
24	Directs development	2.91	3.63	0.72	2.58	3.43	0.85
25	Relates needs/goals	4.18	4.60	0.42	3.73	4.30	0.57
26	Defines responsibilities	4.36	4.82	0.46	4.09	4.44	0.35
27	Directs identification	3.64	4.09	0.45	3.37	3.73	0.36
28	Meets legal needs	4.45	4.55	0.10	4.03	4.46	0.43
29	Demonstrates knowledge	3.72	4.18	0.46	3.67	4.29	0.62
30	Provides resource materials	3.82	4.27	0.45	3.41	3.88	0.47
31	Supervises assemblies	3.73	3.55	-0.18	3.31	3.86	0.55
32	Participates in meetings	3.27	3.82	0.55	3.07	3.69	0.62
33	Conducts conferences	3.18	4.09	0.91	2.92	3.82	0.90
34	Coordinates discipline	4.70	4.50	-0.20	3.90	4.42	0.52

$\bar{X}_{Pa}$  = Principals' perceptions of their actual behavior

$\bar{X}_{Pe}$  = Principals' perceptions of their expected behavior

$\bar{X}_{Ta}$  = Teachers' perceptions of the principals' actual behavior

$\bar{X}_{Te}$  = Teachers' perceptions of the principals' expected behavior

the means of the principals' and teachers' responses to the SILB. As shown in this table, the differences between the means for the principals perceptions of their expected behavior ( $\bar{X}_{Pe}$ ) and actual behavior ( $\bar{X}_{Pa}$ ) ranged from -0.20 to 1.18. In addition, the differences between the means for the teachers' perceptions of their principals' expected behavior ( $\bar{X}_{Te}$ ) and actual behavior ( $\bar{X}_{Ta}$ ) ranged from -0.08 to 0.90. A discussion of the means and difference between the means provided in Tables 3 and 4 is presented later in this chapter.

Table 5 provides a summary of all item responses by school to the "actual" instructional leadership behavior and "expected" instructional leadership behavior as perceived by full-time middle school teachers. As shown in this table, the mean scores ranged from 2.75 - 3.73 for the teachers perceptions of their principals' actual behavior and 3.43 - 3.94 for the teachers' perceptions of their principals' expected behavior. In addition, standard deviation values ranged from 0.52 - 0.80 for actual behavior and 0.50 - 1.04 for expected behavior. Since there was only one principal per school, a summary of all items by school was statistically impractical.

Tables 6 and 7 provide summaries of all item responses to the SILB as perceived by the full-time middle school teachers and middle school principals respectively. Accordingly, the mean score for the full-time teachers' perceptions of their principals' actual behavior was 3.28 and the mean score for the full-time teachers perceptions of their

Table 5

Summary of the Means, Standard Deviations, and Standard Error of the Means for All Item Responses to the Survey of Instructional Leadership Behavior (SILB) by School for the Full-time Middle-School Teachers

SCHOOL (N)	ACTUAL BEHAVIOR			EXPECTED BEHAVIOR		
	$\bar{x}$	STD	SE	$\bar{x}$	STD	SE
A (26)	3.08	0.73	0.14	3.43	0.89	0.18
B (35)	2.75	0.88	0.15	3.69	0.62	0.10
C (26)	3.38	0.72	0.14	3.66	0.50	0.10
D (26)	2.98	0.86	0.17	3.52	1.04	0.20
E (66)	3.67	0.64	0.08	3.87	0.60	0.07
F (29)	3.73	0.52	0.10	3.64	0.85	0.16
F (24)	3.14	0.88	0.18	3.45	0.87	0.18
H (26)	3.34	0.67	0.13	3.81	0.61	0.12
I (34)	3.22	0.88	0.15	3.94	0.61	0.11
J (39)	3.33	0.57	0.09	3.85	0.66	0.11
K (49)	3.12	0.78	0.11	3.71	0.76	0.11

STD = Standard Deviation

SE = Standard Error of Mean

Table 6  
 SUMMARY OF ALL ITEM RESPONSES TO THE  
 SURVEY OF INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR (SILB)  
 FOR FULL-TIME MIDDLE SCHOOL TEACHERS

	N	$\bar{x}$	STD	Minimum Value	Maximum Value	SE
Actual Behavior	380	3.28	.78	1.00	5.00	.04
Expected Behavior	380	3.72	.73	1.00	5.00	.04

STD = Standard Deviation

SE = Standard Error of Mean

Table 7

SUMMARY OF ALL ITEM RESPONSES TO THE  
SURVEY OF INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR (SILB)  
FOR MIDDLE SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

	N	$\bar{x}$	STD	Minimum Value	Maximum Value	SE
Actual Behavior	11	3.66	.60	1.00	5.00	.18
Expected Behavior	11	4.13	.32	1.00	5.00	.10

STD = Standard Deviation

SE = Standard Error of Mean

principals' expected behavior was 3.72. The mean score for the middle school principals' perceptions of their actual behavior was 3.66 and the mean score for the middle school principals' perceptions of their expected behavior was 4.13.

The total number of responses possible for the SILB was 68 (34 items for "actual" instructional leadership behavior and 34 items for "expected" instructional leadership behavior). However, certain parts of the data were missing on some of the responses from middle school principals and full-time middle school teachers. For the principals, the highest number of missing responses for any item on the SILB was 1 for both actual and expected behaviors. For the teachers, the missing responses ranged from 4 to 24 for actual behavior and from 9 to 21 for expected behavior. There were no missing responses for any of the demographic data for neither group. The missing responses were not considered to be randomly distributed among the respondents; therefore, the missing responses were not included in any statistical treatment of the data.

#### Scale Analysis of the SILB

A principal axis factor analysis with varimax rotation was performed on the item responses to the SILB for middle school principals and teachers (N=391). Two separate analyses were performed. One analysis was performed on the "actual" instructional leadership behavior items and another was performed on the "expected" instructional leadership

behavior items. As noted in Chapter III, it was hoped that the items on the SILB would cluster into three groupings with a relatively even distribution. The results of the factor analysis with a three-factor limitation revealed this was not the case. The principals' and teachers' perceptions of the "actual" instructional leadership behavior items and "expected" instructional leadership behavior items on the SILB can be explained quite well by a single dimension.

The results of the factor analysis on the "actual" items indicated that a single factor accounted for the majority of the variance within the scale. One factor accounted for over 72% of the variance within the scale and the second and third factors accounted for 8% and 6% respectively. Similarly, 4 of the 11 items had the highest loading on the category, Administrative and Organizational Support; 8 of the items had the highest loading on the category, Personnel Management and Supervision; and 3 of the 8 items had the highest loading on the category, Student Growth and Development if the three factors were used.

A similar picture emerged when examining the principals' and teachers' perceptions of the "expected" instructional leadership behavior items on the SILB. The first factor accounted for 59% of the variance within the scale. Second and third factors accounted for 14% and 7% respectively. If the three factors were used, only 4 of the 11 in the category, Administrative and Organizational Support loaded high. In addition, 7 of the 15 "expected" items in the category,

Personnel Management and Supervision, and 3 of the 8 items on the category, Student Growth and Development loaded high.

The conclusion drawn from this analysis is that the primary factor was so dominate to suggest clearly the feasibility of using the entire scale for scoring purposes. Therefore, only the mean scores for the 34 items were used to analyze the principals' and teachers' perceptions of the "actual" instructional leadership behavior and the "expected" instructional leadership behavior of the middle school principals in the metropolitan area of Richmond, Virginia.

### Findings

Five hypotheses were tested in this study. Hypotheses 1 and 2 were tested using independent t-test values. Hypotheses 3 and 4 were tested using dependent t-test values. Hypothesis 5 was tested by conducting a multiway analysis of variance using all demographic data as independent variables.

Hypothesis 1. There is no significant difference between the "actual" instructional leadership behavior of the principal as perceived by middle school principals when compared to the perceptions of full-time middle school teachers in the metropolitan area of Richmond, Virginia.

To test this hypothesis, the subjects were divided into two groups, full-time middle school teachers and middle school principals according to their perceptions of the "actual" instructional leadership behavior of the middle

school principals in the metropolitan area of Richmond, Virginia. The overall mean score of each group's response to the SILB for "actual" behavior was used. Accordingly, the mean score for the full-time middle school teachers was 3.28 and the mean score for the middle school principals was 3.66 (see Tables 6 and 7). Since the method of scoring the responses to the SILB ranged from 1 for "Never" to 5 for "Always," Table 6 indicates that the mean score reported for full-time middle school teachers tends to lean toward the "Sometimes" response for "actual" behavior. On the other hand, Table 7 indicates that the mean score reported for middle school principals tends to lean toward the "Very Often" response for "actual" behavior. The mean difference between the two groups was .41 or two-thirds of one standard deviation.

An independent t-test was conducted ( $t=2.05$ ,  $p = .06$ ). Since the p value was not less than the .05 level of significance, the hypothesis was accepted. Therefore, there was no significant difference between the "actual" instructional leadership behavior of the principal as perceived by middle school principals and full-time middle school teachers in the metropolitan area of Richmond, Virginia.

Hypothesis 2. There is no significant difference between the "expected" instructional leadership behavior of the principal as perceived by middle school principals and full-time middle school teachers in the metropolitan area of Richmond, Virginia.

To test Hypothesis 2, the subjects were divided into two groups, full-time middle school teachers and middle school principals, according to their perceptions of the "expected" instructional leadership behavior of the middle school principals in the metropolitan area of Richmond, Virginia. The overall mean score of each group's responses to the SILB for "expected" behavior was used. Accordingly, the mean score for the full-time middle school teachers was 3.72 and the mean score for the middle school principals was 4.13 (see Tables 6 and 7). Since the method of scoring the SILB ranged from 1 for "Never" to 5 for "Always," Table 6 indicates that the mean score reported for full-time middle school teachers tends to lean more than half above the "Sometimes" response. On the other hand, Table 7 indicates that the mean score reported for middle school principals tends to lean strongly toward the "Very Often" response for "expected" behavior. The mean difference between the teachers and principals was .44 or approximately one standard deviation.

An independent t-test was conducted ( $t = 4.03$ ,  $p = .0010$ ). Since the p value was less than the .05 level of significance, Hypothesis 2 was rejected. Therefore, the results show that there is a significant difference between the "expected" instructional leadership behavior of the principal as perceived by middle school principals and full-time middle school teachers in the metropolitan area of Richmond, Virginia.

Hypothesis 3. There is no significant difference between the "actual" instructional leadership behavior and the "expected" instructional leadership behavior of the principal as perceived by middle school principals in the metropolitan area of Richmond, Virginia.

Hypothesis 3 was tested using the middle school principals' perceptions of the "actual" instructional leadership behavior and "expected" instructional leadership behavior in accordance with their responses to the SILB. The mean score for the middle school principals' perception of the "actual" instructional leadership behavior was 3.66 and the mean score for their perception of the "expected" instructional leadership behavior was 4.13 (see Table 7). Since the method of scoring the SILB ranged from 1 for "Never" and 5 for "Always," Table 7 indicates that the mean score reported for the middle school principals on "actual" behavior tends to lean slightly above the "Sometimes" response and the mean score reported for the middle school principals on "expected" behavior tends to lean strongly toward the "Very Often" response. The mean difference between the middle school principals' perceptions of their "actual" instructional leadership behavior and their "expected" instructional leadership behavior was .47 or one-half of a standard deviation.

A dependent t-test was conducted ( $t = 2.48, p = .04$ ). Since the p value was less than the .05 level of significance, Hypothesis 3 was rejected. Therefore, the results showed that there was a significant difference between the

"actual" instructional leadership behavior and the "expected" instructional leadership behavior of the principal as perceived by middle school principals in the metropolitan area of Richmond, Virginia.

Hypothesis 4. There is no significant difference between the "actual" instructional leadership behavior and the "expected" instructional leadership behavior of the principal as perceived by full-time middle school teachers in the metropolitan area of Richmond, Virginia.

Hypothesis 4 was tested using the full-time middle school teachers' perceptions of the "actual" instructional leadership behavior and "expected" instructional leadership behavior of the principal in accordance with their (full-time middle school teachers) responses to the SILB. The mean score for the full-time middle school teachers' perceptions of the "actual" instructional leadership behavior was 3.28 and the mean score for their perceptions of the "expected" instructional leadership behavior of the principal was 3.72 (see Table 6). Since the method of scoring the SILB ranged from 1 for "Never" to 5 for "Always," Table 6 indicates that the mean score reported for the full-time middle school teachers on "actual" behavior tends to lean slightly above the "Sometimes" response and the mean score reported for full-time middle school teachers on "expected" behavior tends to lean more than half above the "Sometimes" response. The mean difference between the full-time middle school teachers' perceptions of the "actual" instructional leadership behavior and "expected" instructional

leadership behavior of the principal was .44 or approximately one standard deviation.

A dependent t test was conducted ( $t = 5.27$ ,  $p = .0004$ ). Since the p value was less than the .05 level of significance, Hypothesis 4 was rejected. Therefore, the results showed that there was a significant difference between the "actual" instructional leadership behavior and the "expected" instructional leadership behavior of the principal as perceived by full-time middle school teachers in the metropolitan area of Richmond, Virginia.

Hypothesis 5. There is no significant relationship between each of the demographic characteristics of the respondents and their perceptions of the "actual" instructional leadership behavior and the "expected" instructional leadership behavior of the middle school principal in the metropolitan area of Richmond, Virginia.

To test Hypothesis 5, the subjects were divided into two groups, full-time middle school teachers and middle school principals. The overall mean score of each group's responses to the SILB was used to test if any significant relationship existed between each of the demographic data of the respondents and their perceptions of the "actual" instructional leadership behavior and the "expected" instructional leadership behavior of the middle school principal in the metropolitan area of Richmond, Virginia.

An analysis of variance on the full-time teachers' and middle school principals' perceptions for "actual" behavior and "expected" behavior and the demographic data for

each group was computed as shown in Tables 8 through 11. All demographic data (sex, age, ethnic group, number of years assigned to the school, experience, degrees, and annual salary) were used as independent variables.

The data presented in Table 8 indicate there was no significant relationship between the sex, age, experience, degrees held, or the annual salary of the full-time middle school teachers in terms of their perceptions of the "actual" instructional leadership behavior of the middle school principals in the metropolitan area of Richmond, Virginia. The obtained p values for these variables were not less than the .05 level of significance; therefore, this portion of the hypothesis was retained. That is, both males and females had the same perceptions of their principals' "actual" instructional leadership behavior. The same held true for the age, experience, degrees held, and annual salary of the middle school teachers. On the other hand, the obtained p value ( $F=5.56$ ,  $p .0190$ ) for ethnic group indicated a significant relationship between the ethnic group of the teachers in terms of their perceptions of the principals' "actual" instructional leadership behavior. Non-white middle school teachers' perceptions of their principals' "actual" instructional leadership behavior were higher than the perceptions of white middle school teachers. The mean score for non-white teachers' perceptions of the principals' actual behavior was 3.35 and the mean score for white teach-

Table 8  
 An Analysis of Variance of the Demographic  
 Data for Full-time Middle School Teachers'  
 Responses to the SILB (Actual Behavior)

Demographic Data	df	SS	F	p
SEX	1	1.58	2.68	0.1025
AGE	3	0.35	0.29	0.7451
ETHNIC	1	3.28	5.56	0.0190*
YRSEXP	2	1.13	0.96	0.3848
SCHASSD	2	1.38	1.17	0.3110
DEGREES	1	0.42	2.40	0.1226
SALARY	2	0.16	0.14	0.8711
SEX*AGE	2	3.15	2.67	0.0710
SEX*ETHNIC	1	1.31	2.22	0.1372
SEX*YRSEXP	2	0.13	0.11	0.8959
SEX*SCHASSD	2	0.86	0.07	0.9299
SEX*DEGREES	1	0.20	0.33	0.5659
SEX*SALARY	2	0.04	0.04	0.9688
AGE*ETHNIC	2	0.75	0.64	0.5304
AGE*YRSEXP	4	3.95	1.67	0.1564
AGE*SCHASSD	4	2.76	1.17	0.3248
AGE*DEGREES	2	0.70	0.59	0.5536
AGE*SALARY	4	0.27	0.12	0.9770
ETHNIC*YRSEXP	2	1.44	1.22	0.2957
ETHNIC*SCHASSD	2	0.48	0.41	0.6650
ETHNIC*DEGREES	1	1.98	3.35	0.0682
ETHNIC*SALARY	2	2.60	2.20	0.1123
YRSEXP*SCHASSD	4	1.03	0.44	0.7820
YRSEXP*DEGREES	2	3.28	2.78	0.0638
YRSEXP*SALARY	3	1.72	0.97	0.4073
SCHASSD*DEGREES	2	5.35	4.53	0.0115*
SCHASSD*SALARY	3	0.47	0.27	0.8505
DEGREES*SALARY	1	0.21	0.35	0.5526

\*  $p < .05$  for significance

ers' perceptions of the principals' actual behavior was 3.15. More specifically, the mean score for non-white female teachers' perceptions of the principals' actual behavior was 3.28 and the mean score for white female teachers' perceptions was 3.17. Therefore, non-white female teachers had slightly higher perceptions of the principals' "actual" instructional leadership behavior. The mean score for non-white male teachers' perceptions of the principals' actual behavior was 3.49 and the mean score for white male teachers' perceptions was 3.10. Therefore, non-white male teachers had higher perceptions of the principals' "actual" instructional leadership behavior. As a result of conducting two-way interactions of the demographic data, the number of years the teachers were assigned to the school and the degrees held ( $F=4.53$ ,  $p=.0115$ ) appeared to have had a significant relationship on the teachers' perceptions of the principals' "actual" instructional leadership behavior. The findings suggested that the longer teachers with additional educational preparation were assigned to a school, the lower their perceptions of the "actual" instructional leadership behavior.

The data presented in Table 9 indicate there was no significant relationship between the sex, age, ethnic group, number of years assigned to the school, degrees held, and annual salary of the full-time middle school teachers and perceptions of the "expected" instructional leadership behavior of the middle school principals in the metropolitan

Table 9

An Analysis of Variance of the Demographic  
Data for Full-time Middle School Teachers'  
Responses to the SILB (Expected Behavior)

Demographic Data	df	SS	F	p
SEX	1	0.11	0.21	0.6462
AGE	2	0.69	0.66	0.5188
ETHNIC	1	0.75	0.14	0.7051
YRSEXP	2	3.99	3.83	0.0227*
SCHASSD	2	0.14	0.13	0.8743
DEGREES	1	0.01	0.03	0.8610
SALARY	2	0.81	0.78	0.4588
SEX*AGE	2	1.49	1.43	0.2420
SEX*ETHNIC	1	0.76	1.46	0.2275
SEX*YRSEXP	2	0.00	0.00	0.9992
SEX*SCHASSD	2	2.58	2.47	0.0862
SEX*DEGREES	1	0.24	0.46	0.5002
SEX*SALARY	2	0.40	0.38	0.6819
AGE*ETHNIC	2	1.64	1.58	0.2084
AGE*YRSEXP	4	2.11	1.01	0.4025
AGE*SCHASSD	4	.2.13	1.02	0.3972
AGE*DEGREES	2	1.65	1.58	0.2068
AGE*SALARY	4	0.69	0.33	0.8581
ETHNIC*YRSEXP	2	2.27	2.18	0.1147
ETHNIC*SCHASSD	2	0.38	0.36	0.6947
ETHNIC*DEGREES	1	4.81	9.23	0.0026*
ETHNIC*SALARY	2	0.04	0.04	0.9628
YRSEXP*SCHASSD	4	2.47	1.18	0.3182
YRSEXP*DEGREES	2	1.50	1.44	0.2387
YRSEXP*SALARY	3	0.60	0.38	0.7693
SCHASSD*DEGREES	2	0.15	0.15	0.8642
SCHASSD*SALARY	3	0.522	0.33	0.8028
DEGREES*SALARY	1	0.56	1.08	0.2997

\*  $p < .05$  for significance

area of Richmond, Virginia. The obtained p values for these variables were not less than the .05 level of significance; therefore, this portion of the hypothesis was retained. That is, both males and females had the same perceptions of the principals' "expected" instructional leadership behavior. The same held true for the age, ethnic group, number of years assigned to the school, and the annual salary of the middle school teachers. On the other hand, the obtained p value for years of experience ( $F=3.83$ ,  $p = .0227$ ) indicated there was a significant relationship between the teaching experience of the middle school teachers and their perceptions of the "expected" instructional leadership behavior of the middle school principals. The findings suggested that the more experience a teacher had, the higher their perceptions of the "expected" instructional leadership behavior of the principal. More specifically, the mean score for the perceptions of teachers with 10 or more years of experience was 3.79. The mean score for the perceptions of teachers with 5 to 9 years of experience was 3.78 and the mean score for the perceptions of teachers with 4 or less years of experience was 3.60. As a result of conducting two-way interactions of the demographic data, the ethnic group of the teachers and the number of degrees held appeared to have had a significant relationship on the middle school teachers' perceptions of the "expected" instructional leadership behavior. The findings suggested that white teachers with bachelor degrees had

higher perceptions of the principals' expected behavior than non-white teachers' perceptions of the principals' expected behavior. On the other hand, non-white teachers with masters degrees had higher perceptions of the principals' expected behavior than white teachers with masters degrees. More specifically, the mean score for the perceptions of white teachers with bachelor degrees was 3.85. The mean score for the perceptions of non-white teachers with bachelor degrees was 3.64. The mean score for the perceptions of non-white teachers with masters degrees on expected behavior was 3.83 and the mean score for the perceptions of white teachers with masters degrees on expected behavior was 3.56.

Tables 10 and 11 provide data on the relationship of each of the demographic data (sex, age, ethnic group, experience, number of years assigned to the school, degrees, and annual salary) of the middle school principals and the perceptions of their "actual" instructional leadership behavior and "expected" instructional leadership behavior. Since none of the obtained p values for the demographic data was less than the .05 level of significance, this portion of the hypothesis was retained. Middle school principals of different ethnic groups had the same perceptions of their actual and expected behaviors. The same held true for the sex, age, experience, number of years assigned to the school, degrees, and the annual salary of the principals. Therefore, there was no significant relationship between each of the demographic data and the principals' perceptions of their

Table 10

An Analysis of Variance of the Demographic  
Data for Middle School Principals' Responses  
to the SILB (Actual Behavior)

Demographic Data	df	SS	F	p
SEX	1	0.23	0.56	0.4953
AGE	1	0.36	0.86	0.4053
ETHNIC	1	0.13	0.33	0.5986
YRSEXP	2	0.89	1.08	0.4217
SCHASSD	1	0.35	0.85	0.4217
DEGREES	0	0.00	.	.
SALARY	0	0.00	.	.

$p < .05$  for significance

Table 11  
 An Analysis of Variance of the Demographic  
 Data for Middle School Principals' Responses  
 to the SILB (Expected Behavior)

Demographic Data	df	SS	F	p
SEX	2	0.32	3.85	0.1213
AGE	1	0.01	0.11	0.7545
ETHNIC	1	0.00	0.05	0.8309
YRSEXP	2	0.49	0.29	0.7600
SCHASSD	1	0.29	3.46	0.1300
DEGREES	0	0.00	.	.
SALARY	0	0.00	.	.

$p < .05$  for significance

"actual" instructional leadership behavior and "expected" instructional leadership behavior.

### Discussion

The results of the study have presented findings that reveal significant data relative to how principals and teachers perceive the "actual" instructional leadership behavior and the "expected" instructional leadership behavior of the middle school principals in the metropolitan area of Richmond, Virginia. As stated in Chapter I, the findings of this study can be generalized only to areas of similar SMSA structure.

This writer hastens to point out that all hypotheses presented in this study were not retained. Of the five hypotheses presented, one was retained (Hypothesis 1), three were rejected (Hypotheses 2, 3, and 4), and one was retained in part (Hypothesis 5).

Hypothesis 1, when tested, yielded a p value sufficient to retain it. Middle school principals and teachers were in general agreement about their overall perceptions of the "actual" instructional leadership behavior of middle school principals in the metropolitan area of Richmond, Virginia. Although congruency existed between the middle school principals' and teachers' perceptions on actual behavior, the data indicated that the principals' overall perceptions of their actual behavior were higher than the teachers' perceptions. More specifically, principals and teachers differed significantly in their responses to the following instructional leadership behavior items for actual behavior:

- Item 2. The principal allocates material and equipment for instructional activities.
- Item 17. The principal confers individually with instructional personnel about instructional matters.
- Item 34. The principal coordinates student discipline.

It is interesting to point out that although the principals' overall perceptions of their "actual" instructional leadership behavior were higher than the teachers' overall perceptions, the teachers believed their principals were performing the instructional leadership behaviors described by the following items:

- Item 5. The principal participates in the recruitment and the selection of all instructional personnel.
- Item 16. The principal determines the promotion and retention of students.
- Item 21. The principal provides for the demonstration of effective instructional techniques.

This would tend to suggest that the teachers have a higher perception the "actual" instructional leadership behavior described by these items.

Hypothesis 2, when tested, yielded a p value significantly strong enough to reject this hypothesis. Middle school principals' perceptions of their "expected" instructional leadership behavior were clearly incongruent with the perceptions of the teachers for expected behavior. Furthermore, middle school principals' overall perceptions of their "expected" instructional leadership behavior were

higher than the teachers' perceptions. Principals and teachers differed greatly in their responses to the following instructional leadership behavior items for expected behavior:

- Item 2. The principal allocates material and equipment for instructional activities.
- Item 3. The principal collects and analyzes data concerning the performance of students.
- Item 7. The principal assigns or reassigns instructional personnel within the school to maximize conditions for learning.
- Item 13. The principal assigns students to the appropriate classes and time periods for instruction.
- Item 17. The principal confers individually with instructional personnel about instructional matters.
- Item 18. The principal determines the procedures and schedules for standardized testing within the school.
- Item 19. The principal recommends all instructional personnel for re-employment, promotion, or dismissal.
- Item 22. The principal assesses the effectiveness of the school's inservice training program.
- Item 26. The principal defines the job responsibilities of each staff member in accordance with the instructional philosophy of the school.

The principals clearly felt they were expected to perform the instructional leadership behavior described by these items more often than they were actually performing them.

These incongruencies indicated that the principals placed high levels of importance on the following area of instructional leadership: (1) Instructional materials and equipment; (2) Student performance; and (3) Personnel Supervision. Although the principals' overall perceptions of their expected behavior were higher, teachers' expectations of their expected behavior were higher for the following instructional leadership behavior items:

- Item 4. The principal provides for the assignment of substitute instructional personnel.
- Item 29. The principal demonstrates a general knowledge of all fields of curriculum unique to the instructional objectives of the school.
- Item 31. The principal coordinates and supervises student assemblies.

The  $p$  value obtained as a result of testing Hypothesis 3 was barely sufficient to reject the hypothesis. However, the data indicated clearly that middle school principals' perceptions of their "expected" instructional leadership behavior were significantly higher than the middle school principals' perceptions of their "actual" instructional leadership behavior. This incongruence suggested that middle school principals were not satisfied with how often they were providing instructional leadership as described by the items on the SILB. This finding supported the contentions of many educators who feel the principal is unable to fulfill the responsibility of providing instructional leadership in the school.

The following instructional leadership behavior items

showed those areas in which the principals felt they were expected to perform more often:

- Item 3. The principal collects and analyzes data concerning the performance of students.
- Item 6. The principal plans inservice training activities for instructional personnel.
- Item 9. The principal visits classrooms to observe instructional techniques.
- Item 10. The principal formulates the instructional objectives for each grade level in the school.
- Item 11. The principal inventories the changing needs for time and space to accomplish various instructional objectives.
- Item 18. The principal determines the procedures and schedules for standardized testing within the school.
- Item 21. The principal provides for the demonstration of effective instructional techniques.
- Item 22. The principal assesses the effectiveness of the school's inservice training program.

Therefore, the findings indicated the principals in the metropolitan area of Richmond, Virginia felt the need to become more involved in the following areas of instructional leadership: (1) Student performance; (2) Plant utilization and time management; (3) Classroom observation and teaching; and (4) Inservice program evaluations. The principals felt also that the need for the greatest improvement was in the area of providing for the demonstration of effective techniques.

On the other hand, the findings indicated that the principals were satisfied with their performance of the following instructional leadership behavior items:

- Item 31. The principal coordinates and supervises student assemblies.
- Item 34. The principal coordinates student discipline.

Hypothesis 4, when tested, yielded a p value sufficient to reject the hypothesis. Middle school teachers' perceptions of their principals' "expected" instructional leadership behavior were significantly higher than their perceptions of their principals' "actual" instructional leadership behavior. This incongruence suggested that although the teachers' perceptions of their principals' actual behavior were lower, they clearly expected the principals to expand their instructional leadership in the schools. Furthermore, the teachers felt their principals needed to become more involved in 32 of the 34 instructional leadership behavior items on the SILB. The two items teachers expected the principals to spend equal or lesser amounts of time were the following:

- Item 16. The principal determines the promotion and retention of students.
- Item 19. The principal recommends all instructional personnel for re-employment, promotion, or dismissal.

As stated earlier, the teachers felt their principals needed to become more involved in 32 of the 34 instructional leader-

ship behavior items on the SILB. The greatest needs for more involvement from the principals were indicated by the following instructional leadership behavior:

- Item 9. The principal visits classrooms to observe instructional techniques.
- Item 21. The principal provides for the demonstration of effective instructional techniques.
- Item 22. The principal assesses the effectiveness of the school's inservice training program.
- Item 24. The principal directs the development or the modification of instructional materials that are not available commercially.
- Item 33. The principal conducts group conferences with instructional personnel experiencing similar problems in instruction.

Finally, there was no indication that sex, age, ethnic group, number of years assigned to the school, degrees, or salary had any statistically significant relationship as to how the principals perceived their "actual" instructional leadership behavior or "expected" instructional leadership behavior. Although statistical significance was not evident, it was interesting to find that non-white principals' perceptions of their actual and expected behaviors were higher than white principals' perceptions. In addition, the male principals' perceptions of their actual and expected behaviors were higher than the female's perception of her actual and expected behaviors.

This was not the case for the middle school teachers.

The ethnic group of the middle school teachers had a significant influence on their perceptions of the principals' "actual" instructional leadership behavior. Non-white teachers' perceptions of the actual behavior of their principals were higher than the perceptions of white teachers. The number of years the teachers were assigned to the school, in conjunction with the degrees held, also had a significant influence on the teachers' perceptions of their principals' "actual" instructional leadership behavior. The findings suggested that the longer teachers with additional educational preparation were assigned to a school, the lower their perceptions of the principals' "actual" instructional leadership behavior. In addition, the total number of years of experience the teachers had, influenced their perceptions of the principals' "expected" instructional leadership behavior. The more experience the teachers had, the higher their perceptions of the principals "expected" instructional leadership behavior. The data indicated also that ethnic group, in conjunction with the degrees held, had a significant influence on the teachers' perception of the principals expected behavior. Non-white teachers with additional educational preparation had higher perceptions of their principals' "expected" instructional leadership behavior white teachers with additional educational preparation.

## Chapter V

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This final chapter is presented in three parts. First, a summary of the study is provided. Included in this summary is a discussion of the purpose of the study, the hypotheses, the subjects, the methodology and treatment of data. The conclusions derived from the results of the study and recommendations for further study are presented also.

#### Summary

This study was a descriptive-analytical survey of middle school principals' and full-time middle school teachers' responses to the Survey of Instructional Leadership Behavior (SILB). The study was undertaken to determine whether significant differences existed between the respondents in terms of their perceptions of the "actual" instructional leadership behavior and the "expected" instructional leadership behavior of middle school principals in the metropolitan area of Richmond, Virginia. Attention was given also to examining the relationship between selected demographic characteristics such as the sex, age, ethnic group, experience, educational background, and annual salary of the respondents and their perceptions of the middle school principals' instructional leadership behavior.

Five main hypotheses were developed and tested in order to guide the study:

1. There is no significant difference between the "actual" instructional leadership behavior of the principal as perceived by middle school principals when compared to the perceptions of full-time middle school teachers in the metropolitan area of Richmond, Virginia.
2. There is no significant difference between the "expected" instructional leadership behavior of the principal as perceived by middle school principals when compared to the perceptions of full-time middle school teachers in the metropolitan area of Richmond, Virginia.
3. There is no significant difference between the "actual" instructional leadership behavior and the "expected" instructional leadership behavior of the principal as perceived by middle school principals in the metropolitan area of Richmond, Virginia.
4. There is no significant difference between the "actual" instructional leadership behavior and the "expected" instructional leadership behavior of the principal as perceived by full-time middle school teachers in the metropolitan area of Richmond, Virginia.

5. There is no significant difference between each of the demographic characteristics of the respondents and their perceptions of the "actual" instructional leadership behavior and the "expected" instructional leadership behavior of the middle school principals in the metropolitan area of Richmond, Virginia.

The subjects for this study were identified from three governmental localities to make up a representative group of middle school principals, as well as full-time middle school teachers in the Richmond Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA). Of the 532 who actively participated in the study, 391 (73%) were determined usable responses. Of this number, 11 were middle school principals and 380 were full-time middle school teachers.

To accomplish the objectives of the study, the Survey of Instructional Leadership Behavior (SILB) was developed, piloted and administered to 11 middle school principals and their staffs in May, 1980. The SILB consisted of 34 instructional leadership behavior items with a five-point Likert response format, ranging from 1 for "Never" to 5 for "Always" (see Appendices A and B). Respondents were instructed to circle the response that best indicated their perceptions of the "actual" instructional leadership behavior and the "expected" instructional leadership behavior of the middle school principals in the metropolitan area of

Richmond, Virginia. Lastly, the respondents were instructed to provide information about themselves such as their sex, age, ethnic group, experience, educational background, and annual salary. All responses to the SILB and demographic data were hand-scored, compiled, and converted for computer application.

Each hypothesis presented in this study was tested at the .05 level of significance to determine which should be accepted and which should be rejected. Hypotheses 1 and 2 were tested using independent t-test values. Hypotheses 3 and 4 were tested using dependent t-test values. Hypothesis 5 was tested by conducting a multiway analysis of variance using all demographic data as independent variables. Table 12 provides a summary of the hypotheses tested in this study. Of the five hypotheses presented, one was accepted (Hypothesis 1), three were rejected (Hypotheses 2, 3, and 4), and one was rejected in part (Hypothesis 5).

### Conclusions

The following conclusions are based on the findings of the study:

1. Middle school principals and teachers were in general agreement relative to their perceptions of the "actual" instructional leadership behavior of middle school principals in the metropolitan area of Richmond, Virginia. Although there was agreement, middle school principals' overall perceptions

Table 12

A Summary of the Hypotheses Tested

Statement of the Hypotheses	Results
<p>1. There is no significant difference between the "actual" instructional leadership behavior of the principal as perceived by middle school principals when compared to the perceptions of full-time middle school teachers in the metropolitan area of Richmond, Virginia.</p>	<p>The results of an independent t-test (<math>t=2.05</math>, <math>p=.06</math>) indicated that the obtained p value was not less than the .05 level of significance. Therefore, the hypothesis was accepted.</p>
<p>2. There is no significant difference between the "expected" instructional leadership behavior of the principal as perceived by middle school principals when compared to the perceptions of full-time middle school teachers in the metropolitan area of Richmond, Virginia.</p>	<p>The results of an independent t-test (<math>t=4.03</math>, <math>p=.0010</math>) indicated that the obtained p value was less than the .05 level of significance. Therefore, the hypothesis was rejected.</p>
<p>3. There is no significant difference between the "actual" instructional leadership behavior and the "expected" instructional leadership behavior of the principal as perceived by middle school principals in the metropolitan area of Richmond, Virginia.</p>	<p>The results of a dependent t-test (<math>t=2.48</math>, <math>p=.04</math>) indicated that the obtained p value was less than the .05 level of significance. Therefore, the hypothesis was rejected.</p>

Table 12 (cont'd)

Statement of the Hypotheses	Results
<p>4. There is no significant difference between the "actual" instructional leadership behavior and the "expected" instructional leadership behavior of the principal as perceived by full-time middle school teachers in the metropolitan area of Richmond, Virginia.</p>	<p>The results of a dependent t-test (<math>t=5.27</math>, <math>p = .0004</math>) indicated that the obtained p value was less than the .05 level of significance. Therefore, the hypothesis was rejected.</p>
<p>5. There is no significant difference between each of the demographic characteristics of the respondents and their perceptions of the "actual" instructional leadership behavior and the "expected" instructional leadership behavior of the middle school principals in the metropolitan area of Richmond, Virginia.</p>	<p>The results of an analysis of variance indicated that the obtained p values for the sex, age, number of years assigned to the school, experience, and annual salary of the full-time middle school teachers were not less than the .05 level of significance. Therefore, this portion of the hypothesis was accepted. There were no significant relationships between the sex, age, number of years assigned to the school, experience, and annual salary of the full-time middle school teachers and their perceptions of the "actual" instructional leadership behavior of the middle school principals. However, the obtained p value (<math>F=5.56</math>, <math>p = .0190</math>) for ethnic group indicated a significant relationship between the ethnic group of the full-time middle school teachers and their perceptions of the "actual" instructional leadership behavior of the principal. The results of conducting two-way interactions of the</p>

Table 12 (cont'd)

Statement of the Hypotheses	Results
5. (continued)	<p>demographic data indicated that the number of years teachers are assigned to the school and the degrees held (<math>F=4.53</math>, <math>p = .0115</math>) have a significant relationship on the full-time middle school teachers' perceptions of the "actual" instructional leadership behavior of the middle school principal.</p> <p>The obtained p values for the sex, age, ethnic group, number of years assigned to the school, degrees held, and annual salary of the full-time middle school teachers on "expected" behavior were not less than the .05 level of significance. Therefore, this portion of the hypothesis was accepted also. However, the obtained p value (<math>F=3.83</math>, <math>p = .0227</math>) for experience indicated a significant relationship between the teaching experience of the full-time middle school teachers and their perceptions of the "expected" instructional leadership behavior of the middle school principal. The results of conducting two-way interactions of the demographic data indicated that the ethnic background and degrees held (<math>F=9.23</math>, <math>p = .0026</math>) have a significant relationship on the full-time teachers' perceptions of the "expected" instructional leadership behavior of the middle school principal.</p>

Table 12 (cont'd)

Statement of the Hypotheses	Results
5. (continued)	<p>The results of the analysis of variance indicated that the sex, age, ethnic group, experience, number of years assigned to the school, degrees, and annual salary of the middle school principals has no influence on the perceptions of their "actual" nor "expected" instructional leadership behavior. The p values obtained were not less than the .05 level of significance. Therefore this portion of the hypothesis was accepted.</p>

- of their actual behavior were higher than the teachers' perceptions.
2. Middle school principals' perceptions of their "expected" instructional leadership behavior were significantly higher than the teachers perceptions of how the principals were expected to behave.
  3. Middle school principals' perceptions of their "expected" instructional leadership behavior were significantly higher than the middle school principals' perceptions of their "actual" instructional leadership behavior.
  4. Middle school teachers' perceptions of their principals' "expected" instructional leadership behavior were significantly higher than their perceptions of the principals' "actual" instructional leadership behavior.
  5. Sex, age, ethnic group, experience, number of years assigned to the school, degrees, and annual salary had no influence on the middle school principals' perceptions of their "actual" instructional leadership behavior nor their "expected" instructional leadership behavior.

6. Although sex, age, number of years assigned to the school, experience, and annual salary had no influence on middle school teachers' perceptions of the principals' "actual" instructional leadership behavior, the ethnic background tended to have some influence. Furthermore, the specific interaction between the number of years teachers were assigned to the school and the degrees held tended to influence their perceptions of the principals' actual behavior.
7. Although sex, age, ethnic group, number of years assigned to the school, degrees, and annual salary had no influence on middle school teachers' perceptions of the principals' "expected" instructional leadership behavior, the experience of the teacher tended to have significant influence. Furthermore, the specific interaction between the ethnic background of the teachers and the degrees held had a significant influence on their perceptions of the principals' expected behavior.

### Recommendations

Based on the findings and conclusions of the study, the following recommendations are made:

1. Since this study was limited to a selected group of middle school principals and full-time middle school teachers in the Richmond SMSA, it is recommended that a study of the same scope be conducted using a representative number of all the middle school principals and full-time teachers in the United States.
2. It is recommended that this study be replicated to include the perceptions of teachers and principals at the elementary, middle, and high school levels relative to the determining the congruencies and incongruencies between the teachers and principals. An additional focus could be to examine the difference in perceptions between and among the school levels.
3. Further research is needed to investigate the relationship between the ethnic background of teachers and how they perceive the instructional leadership behavior of the school principal.
4. Further research is needed to investigate the relationship between the teachers years of experience and how they perceive the instructional leadership behavior of the school principal.

5. The results of this study has provided descriptive data about the middle school principal as an instructional leader. Therefore, it is recommended that the results be used by the Virginia Department of Education and other agencies involved in the preparation and training of individuals entering the principalship, as well as the continuous evaluation of those currently in the position.

It was clearly indicated in this study that principals and teachers differed in their perceptions of the instructional leadership behavior of middle school principals in the metropolitan area of Richmond, Virginia. These differences varied with some resulting in statistical significance at the .05 level. The lack of statistical significance for some of the differences in no way lessened the importance of reporting the results. Such results provided valuable descriptive data about the instructional leadership behavior of the principal.

As stated earlier in the study, the nature of the principalship continues to change and it is important that continuous information be provided relative to the role of the principal. Therefore, it is strongly suggested that research instrument such as the Survey of Instructional Leadership Behavior (SILB) be utilized routinely to provide current information about the school principal.

## SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alexander, William, et. al. The Emergent Middle School. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1968.
- Allport, Gordon W. "The Use of Personal Documents in Psychological Science." Bulletin No. 49, Social Science Research Council, New York: 1942.
- Barbie, Earl R. The Practice of Social Research. Belmont, Calif.: Wadsworth Publishing Co., Inc., 1979.
- Barnard, Chester I. The Functions of the Executive. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1962.
- Blumberg, Arthur, and Greenfield, William. The Effective Principal: Perspectives on School Leadership. Boston, Mass.: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1980.
- Borg, Walter R. and Gall, Meredith D. Educational Research: An Introduction. New York: David McKay Co., Inc., 1971.
- Brain, George B. "Increasing Your Administrative Skills in Dealing with the Instructional Program," Handbook of Successful School Administration. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1974.
- Brieve, Fred J. "Secondary Principals As Instructional Leaders." NASSP Bulletin. 56 (December, 1972): 11-5.
- Brooks, Kenneth. "The Middle School: A National Survey," Middle School Journal, February, 1978, 6-
- Byrne, David R., Hines, Susan A., and McCleary, Lloyd E. The Senior High School Principalship - Volume One: The National Survey. Reston, Va.: The National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1978.
- Campbell, Samuel Henry. "A Study of Teachers' and Principals' Perceptions of the Secondary Principals' Instructional Leadership." Ed. D. Dissertation, George Washington University, 1977.
- Carruthers, Snowden Clyde. "A Study of the Instructional Leadership Role of Secondary Principals as Perceived by Selected Secondary School Principals and Teachers" Ed.D. Dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1977.

- Carver, Fred D., and Sergiovanni, Thomas J. Organizations and Human Behavior: Focus on Schools. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1969.
- Chase, Francis S. "How to Meet Teachers' Expectations of Leadership," Administrator's Notebook, Vol. 1, July, 1953, pp. 2-3.
- Cuff, William A. "Middle Schools on the March," NASSP Bulletin. 51 (February, 1967)
- Culbertson, Jack A., Henson, Curtis, and Morrison, Ruel. Performance Objectives for Principals. California: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1974.
- DeRoche, Edward F. and Kaiser, Jeffrey S. Complete Guide to Administering School Services. West Nyack, New York: Parker Publishing Co., Inc., 1980.
- Devita, Joseph C. et al. The Effective Middle School. West Nyack, New York: Parker Publishing Co., 1970.
- Erickson, Donald A. and Reller, Theodore L. The Principal in Metropolitan Schools. Berkeley, Calif.: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1979.
- Goldhammer, Keith and Becher, Gerald L. "What Makes A Good Elementary School Principal?" American Education. Vol. 6, No. 3, April, 1970, p. II.
- Goldman, Samuel. The School Principal. New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1966.
- Gross, Bernard M. "An Analysis of the Present and Perceived Purposes, Functions, and Characteristics of the Middle School," Doctoral Dissertation, Temple University, 1972.
- Guilford, J. P. Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education. 4th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1965.
- Harris, Ben M. "Altering the Thrust of Supervision Through Creative Leadership," Educational Leadership May, 1977 p. 568.
- Hoeh, James A. "Feeling Guilty For Not Being An Instructional Leader? - Don't" NASSP Bulletin. 57 (November, 1973): 1-7.

- Horowitz, Myer et al. "Divergent Views of the Principal's Role: Expectations Held by Principals, Teachers, and Superintendents," The Alberta Journal of Educational Research XV, December, 1969, p. 195.
- Jacobson, Paul B., Logsdon, James D., and Wiegman, Robert R. The Principalship: New Perspectives. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1973.
- Jenson, Theodore J. et al. Elementary School Administration, Boston, Mass.: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1967.
- Kealy, Ronald D. "The Middle School Movement: 1960-1970," National Elementary Principal, November 1971.
- Kindred, Leslie W. et al. The Intermediate Schools, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1968.
- Lipham, James M., and Hoeh, James A. The Principalship: Foundations and Functions. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1974.
- Lounsbury, John and Vars, Gordon. A Curriculum For The Middle School Years. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1973.
- Marks, Sir James R., Stoops, Emery and King-Stoops. Handbook of Educational Supervision. 2nd ed., Boston, Mass.: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1978.
- Meyer, Calvin Floyd. "A Study of the Performance Skills of Selected Middle School Principals." Ed.D. Dissertation, University of South Carolina, 1979.
- Morphet, Edgar L., Johns, Roe L., and Reller, Theodore L. Educational Organization and Administration: Concepts, Practices, and Issues. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1967.
- Patterson, John Patch. "A Descriptive Analysis of the Instructional Leadership Activities of Elementary Principals." Ed.D. Dissertation, University of Oregon, 1977.
- Pendergrass, R. A. and Wood, Diane. "Instructional Leadership and the Principal." NASSP Bulletin, Vol. 63, March, 1979, p. 42.

- Raymer, Joe T. "A Study To Identify Middle Schools And To Determine The Current Level of Implementation of Eighteen Basic Middle School Characteristics in Selected United States and Michigan Schools," Doctoral Dissertation, Michigan State University, 1974.
- Roe, William H., and Drake, Thelbert L. The Principalship. New York: MacMillan Publishing Company, Inc. 1974.
- Sarason, Seymour B. The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1971.
- Sergiovanni, Thomas J. and Carver, Fred D. The New School Executive. New York: Dodd, Mead and Co., 1973.
- Sergiovanni, Thomas J. et al., Educational Governance and Administration. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1980.
- Sergiovanni, Thomas J. and Elliott, David L. Educational and Organizational Leadership in the Elementary Schools. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1975.
- Sergiovanni, Thomas J., and Starratt, Robert J. Emerging Patterns of Supervision: Human Perspectives. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1971.
- Simon, Herbert A., and Barnard, Chester I. Administrative Behavior. New York: The MacMillan Company, 1951.
- Stone, Thomas B. "The Elementary School Principalship - Toward the Twenty-First Century." Washington, D.C.: Department of Elementary School Principals, National Education Association, 1968.
- The National Association of Elementary School Principals. See Madeline Hunter in "What's Going On Around Here? - Twelve Principals Talk about Preservice, Inservice and Other Woes." The National Elementary Principal 57:3 (March, 1978): 11.
- Walter, Geraldine Jane. "A Comparative Study of Instructional Leadership Competencies of a Selected Group of Elementary, Middle, and Secondary School Principals." Ed.D. Dissertation, State University of New York, Buffalo, 1979.
- Weldy, Gilbert R. "Principals Are Instructional Leaders, It's A Fact - Not A Myth." NASSP Bulletin. 63 January, 1979): 71-76.

Wood, Charles L., Nicholson, Everett W., and Findley, Dale G. The Secondary School Principal: Manager and Supervisor. Boston, Mass.: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1979.

Zechman, Harry Thomas. "Critical Instructional Leadership Competencies of the Secondary School Principal as Perceived by Subordinates, Incumbents, and Superordinates," Ed.D. Dissertation, Temple University, 1976.

Zechman, Harry T. "Are Principals Competent in the Instructional Leadership Domain?" NASSP Bulletin. 61 (December, 1977): 21-25.

APPENDIX A

SURVEY OF INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR (SILB)  
(PRINCIPAL'S COPY)

## SURVEY OF INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR (SILB)

### Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this survey is to make it possible for you to describe your instructional leadership behavior. This survey consists of a list of 34 items which will be used to describe instructional leadership behavior. Please note that each item describes a specific type of instructional leadership behavior; therefore, each should be considered separately.

This survey has been designed in two parts. In one part, your responses are based on how you describe your **actual** behavior. Your responses in the second part are based on how you describe your **expected** behavior; that is, how you expect you should behave. All responses can range from "Always" to "Never." Please think carefully about your instructional leadership behavior before recording your responses. All responses will remain anonymous since only group responses are important to this study.

### Directions

Please follow the directions below when completing this survey:

1. **READ** each item carefully.
2. **CONSIDER** how often you **actually** perform the instructional leadership behavior described by the item.
3. **RECORD** your response by circling one of the five numbers (5, 4, 3, 2, or 1) for the instructional leadership behavior described by the item (see example below).  
(Note: You are asked to respond to all 34 items on the basis of your **actual behavior** according to the following scheme:

Always  
 5      4      3      2      1  
           Very Often      Sometimes      Rarely      Never

When you have completed recording your **actual behavior**, return to Item 1 and proceed to the next step.)

4. **CONSIDER** how often you are **expected** to perform the instructional leadership behavior described by the item.
5. **RECORD** your response by circling one of the five numbers (5, 4, 3, 2, or 1) for the instructional leadership behavior described by the item (see example below).  
(Note: The same scheme used to record your **actual behavior** will be used to record your **expected behavior**. When you have completed recording your **expected behavior**, answer the eight questions at the end of the survey.)

### ACTUAL BEHAVIOR

Always  
 5      4      3      2      1  
           Very Often      Sometimes      Rarely      Never

### (Example)

The principal determines the extracurricular activity each student will participate in during the school year.

### EXPECTED BEHAVIOR

Always  
 5      4      3      2      1  
           Very Often      Sometimes      Rarely      Never

**SURVEY OF INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR  
(SILB)**

**ACTUAL BEHAVIOR**

	<i>Always</i>	<i>Very Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
5	4	3	2	1	

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

1. The principal defines the goals and the objectives unique to the school.

2. The principal allocates materials and equipment for instructional activities.

3. The principal collects and analyzes data concerning the performance of students.

4. The principal provides for the assignment of substitute instructional personnel.

5. The principal participates in the recruitment and the selection of all instructional personnel.

6. The principal plans inservice training activities for instructional personnel.

7. The principal assigns or reassigns instructional personnel within the school to maximize conditions for learning.

8. The principal articulates the goals and the objectives of the school to all members of the staff.

9. The principal visits classrooms to observe instructional techniques.

10. The principal formulates the instructional objectives for each grade level in the school.

**EXPECTED BEHAVIOR**

	<i>Always</i>	<i>Very Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
5	4	3	2	1	

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

## ACTUAL BEHAVIOR

	<i>Always</i>	<i>Very Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
5	4	3	2	1	

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

11. The principal inventories the changing needs for time and space to accomplish various instructional objectives.

12. The principal collects and analyzes data concerning the performance of teachers.

13. The principal assigns students to the appropriate classes and time periods for instruction.

14. The principal leads inservice training activities for instructional personnel.

15. The principal coordinates the arrangement of facilities to accomplish instructional objectives.

16. The principal determines the promotion and retention of students.

17. The principal confers individually with instructional personnel about instructional matters.

18. The principal determines the procedures and schedules for standardized testing within the school.

19. The principal recommends all instructional personnel for re-employment, promotion, or dismissal.

20. The principal coordinates all support services to accomplish instructional objectives.

21. The principal provides for the demonstration of effective instructional techniques.

22. The principal assesses the effectiveness of the school's inservice training program.

## EXPECTED BEHAVIOR

	<i>Always</i>	<i>Very Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
5	4	3	2	1	

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

## ACTUAL BEHAVIOR

	<i>Always</i>	<i>Very Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
--	---------------	-------------------	------------------	---------------	--------------

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

23. The principal provides for an appropriate system for reporting students' performances to parents and other schools.

24. The principal directs the development or the modification of instructional materials that are not available commercially.

25. The principal relates the needs of the students within the school to the goals of the school system.

26. The principal defines the job responsibilities of each staff member in accordance with the instructional philosophy of the school.

27. The principal directs the identification and selection of needed materials, equipment, and facilities for instruction.

28. The principal meets the needs of the students within the school in accordance with legal requirements.

29. The principal demonstrates a general knowledge of all fields of curriculum unique to the instructional objectives of the school.

30. The principal provides for the establishment of a collection of professional resource material within the school.

31. The principal coordinates and supervises student assemblies.

32. The principal participates in instructional team meetings.

33. The principal conducts group conferences with instructional personnel experiencing similar problems in instruction.

34. The principal coordinates student discipline.

## EXPECTED BEHAVIOR

	<i>Always</i>	<i>Very Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
--	---------------	-------------------	------------------	---------------	--------------

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---

Now that you have completed the survey, please provide the following information about you as an individual. All information will remain anonymous. No one will be able to identify any person who completes this survey. Please check only one box in response to each question.

1. What is your sex?
 

<input type="checkbox"/> Male	<input type="checkbox"/> Female
-------------------------------	---------------------------------
2. What is your age?
 

<input type="checkbox"/> 20 or under	<input type="checkbox"/> 31-40	<input type="checkbox"/> 51-60
<input type="checkbox"/> 21-30	<input type="checkbox"/> 41-50	<input type="checkbox"/> over 60
3. With what ethnic group do you identify yourself?
 

<input type="checkbox"/> Black	<input type="checkbox"/> Chicano/Hispanic	<input type="checkbox"/> Asian
<input type="checkbox"/> White	<input type="checkbox"/> American Indian	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify)
4. What position do you presently hold?
 

<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher	<input type="checkbox"/> Principal	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify)
----------------------------------	------------------------------------	--
5. How many years of experience have you had in this position?
 

<input type="checkbox"/> Less than 1 year	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 years	<input type="checkbox"/> 10-14 years
<input type="checkbox"/> 1 year	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 years	<input type="checkbox"/> 15-19 years
<input type="checkbox"/> 2 years	<input type="checkbox"/> 5-9 years	<input type="checkbox"/> 20 years or more
6. How many years have you been assigned to this school in your current position?
 

<input type="checkbox"/> Less than 1 year	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 years	<input type="checkbox"/> 10-14 years
<input type="checkbox"/> 1 year	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 years	<input type="checkbox"/> 15-19 years
<input type="checkbox"/> 2 years	<input type="checkbox"/> 5-9 years	<input type="checkbox"/> 20 years or more
7. Which degree(s) do you hold?
 

<input type="checkbox"/> No degree	<input type="checkbox"/> Bachelor degree plus additional graduate work	<input type="checkbox"/> Educational Specialist
<input type="checkbox"/> Associate degree	<input type="checkbox"/> Masters degree	<input type="checkbox"/> Doctorate
<input type="checkbox"/> Bachelor degree	<input type="checkbox"/> Masters degree plus additional graduate work	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify)
8. What is your annual salary for the 1979 - 80 school year?
 

<input type="checkbox"/> Under 10,000	<input type="checkbox"/> 15,000 - 19,999	<input type="checkbox"/> 25,000 - 29,999
<input type="checkbox"/> 10,000 - 14,999	<input type="checkbox"/> 20,000 - 24,999	<input type="checkbox"/> 30,000 or over

APPENDIX B

SURVEY OF INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR (SILB)  
(TEACHER'S COPY)

## SURVEY OF INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR (SILB)

### Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this survey is to make it possible for you to describe the instructional leadership behavior of your principal. This survey consists of a list of 34 items which will be used to describe his or her instructional leadership behavior. Please note that each item describes a specific type of instructional leadership behavior; therefore, each should be considered separately.

This survey has been designed in two parts. In one part, your responses are based on how you describe your principal's actual behavior. Your responses in the second part are based on how you describe your principal's expected behavior, that is, how you expect your principal should behave. All responses can range from "Always" to "Never." Please think carefully about the instructional leadership behavior of your principal before recording your responses. All responses will remain anonymous since only group responses are important to this study.

### Directions

Please follow the directions below when completing this survey:

1. **READ** each item carefully.
2. **CONSIDER** how often the principal actually performs the instructional leadership behavior described by the item.
3. **RECORD** your response by circling one of the five numbers (5, 4, 3, 2, or 1) for the instructional leadership behavior described by the item (see example below).  
(Note: You are asked to respond to all 34 items on the basis of the principal's actual behavior according to the following scheme:

Always  
 5      4      3      2      1  
          Very Often  
          Sometimes  
          Rarely  
          Never

When you have completed recording your principal's actual behavior, return to Item 1 and proceed to the next step.)

4. **CONSIDER** how often you expect the principal to perform the instructional leadership behavior described by the item.
5. **RECORD** your response by circling one of the five numbers (5, 4, 3, 2, or 1) for the instructional leadership behavior described by the item (see example below).  
(Note: The same scheme used to record the principal's actual behavior will be used to record the principal's expected behavior. When you have completed recording your principal's expected behavior, answer the eight questions at the end of the survey.)

### ACTUAL BEHAVIOR

Always  
 5      4      3      2      1  
          Very Often  
          Sometimes  
          Rarely  
          Never

### (Example)

The principal determines the extracurricular activity each student will participate in during the school year.

### EXPECTED BEHAVIOR

Always  
 5      4      3      2      1  
          Very Often  
          Sometimes  
          Rarely  
          Never

**SURVEY OF INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR  
(SILB)**

**ACTUAL BEHAVIOR**

	<i>Always</i>	<i>Very Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
5	4	3	2	1	

5	4	3	2	1	
---	---	---	---	---	--

5	4	3	2	1	
---	---	---	---	---	--

5	4	3	2	1	
---	---	---	---	---	--

5	4	3	2	1	
---	---	---	---	---	--

5	4	3	2	1	
---	---	---	---	---	--

5	4	3	2	1	
---	---	---	---	---	--

5	4	3	2	1	
---	---	---	---	---	--

5	4	3	2	1	
---	---	---	---	---	--

5	4	3	2	1	
---	---	---	---	---	--

1. The principal defines the goals and the objectives unique to the school.

2. The principal allocates materials and equipment for instructional activities.

3. The principal collects and analyzes data concerning the performance of students.

4. The principal provides for the assignment of substitute instructional personnel.

5. The principal participates in the recruitment and the selection of all instructional personnel.

6. The principal plans inservice training activities for instructional personnel.

7. The principal assigns or reassigns instructional personnel within the school to maximize conditions for learning.

8. The principal articulates the goals and the objectives of the school to all members of the staff.

9. The principal visits classrooms to observe instructional techniques.

10. The principal formulates the instructional objectives for each grade level in the school.

**EXPECTED BEHAVIOR**

	<i>Always</i>	<i>Very Often</i>	<i>Sometimes</i>	<i>Rarely</i>	<i>Never</i>
5	4	3	2	1	

5	4	3	2	1	
---	---	---	---	---	--

5	4	3	2	1	
---	---	---	---	---	--

5	4	3	2	1	
---	---	---	---	---	--

5	4	3	2	1	
---	---	---	---	---	--

5	4	3	2	1	
---	---	---	---	---	--

5	4	3	2	1	
---	---	---	---	---	--

5	4	3	2	1	
---	---	---	---	---	--

5	4	3	2	1	
---	---	---	---	---	--

5	4	3	2	1	
---	---	---	---	---	--





Now that you have completed the survey, please provide the following information about you as an individual. All information will remain anonymous. No one will be able to identify any person who completes this survey. Please check only one box in response to each question.

1. What is your sex?
 

<input type="checkbox"/> Male	<input type="checkbox"/> Female
-------------------------------	---------------------------------
  
2. What is your age?
 

<input type="checkbox"/> 20 or under	<input type="checkbox"/> 31-40	<input type="checkbox"/> 51-60
<input type="checkbox"/> 21-30	<input type="checkbox"/> 41-50	<input type="checkbox"/> over 60
  
3. With what ethnic group do you identify yourself?
 

<input type="checkbox"/> Black	<input type="checkbox"/> Chicano/Hispanic	<input type="checkbox"/> Asian
<input type="checkbox"/> White	<input type="checkbox"/> American Indian	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify)
  
4. What position do you presently hold?
 

<input type="checkbox"/> Teacher	<input type="checkbox"/> Principal	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify)
----------------------------------	------------------------------------	--
  
5. How many years of experience have you had in this position?
 

<input type="checkbox"/> Less than 1 year	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 years	<input type="checkbox"/> 10-14 years
<input type="checkbox"/> 1 year	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 years	<input type="checkbox"/> 15-19 years
<input type="checkbox"/> 2 years	<input type="checkbox"/> 5-9 years	<input type="checkbox"/> 20 years or more
  
6. How many years have you been assigned to this school in your current position?
 

<input type="checkbox"/> Less than 1 year	<input type="checkbox"/> 3 years	<input type="checkbox"/> 10-14 years
<input type="checkbox"/> 1 year	<input type="checkbox"/> 4 years	<input type="checkbox"/> 15-19 years
<input type="checkbox"/> 2 years	<input type="checkbox"/> 5-9 years	<input type="checkbox"/> 20 years or more
  
7. Which degree(s) do you hold?
 

<input type="checkbox"/> No degree	<input type="checkbox"/> Bachelor degree plus additional graduate work	<input type="checkbox"/> Educational Specialist
<input type="checkbox"/> Associate degree	<input type="checkbox"/> Masters degree	<input type="checkbox"/> Doctorate
<input type="checkbox"/> Bachelor degree	<input type="checkbox"/> Masters degree plus additional graduate work	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (specify)
  
8. What is your annual salary for the 1979 - 80 school year?
 

<input type="checkbox"/> Under 10,000	<input type="checkbox"/> 15,000 - 19,999	<input type="checkbox"/> 25,000 - 29,999
<input type="checkbox"/> 10,000 - 14,999	<input type="checkbox"/> 20,000 - 24,999	<input type="checkbox"/> 30,000 or over

APPENDIX C

LETTER TO SCHOOL DIVISION

April 4, 1980

Dear Sir:

I am a doctoral candidate in Educational Administration at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University and I am conducting a study of selected middle school principals in the Richmond Metropolitan Area. More specifically, the study is concerned with analyzing the instructional leadership behavior of the school principal as perceived by middle school principals and their full-time teaching staff. This study will serve as the basis for my dissertation.

The purpose of this letter is to request your approval to permit the principal and full-time teaching staff of Middle School to participate in the study by responding to the enclosed survey instrument. The instrument has been tested for reliability and requires an average of twenty (20) minutes to complete. Please be assured that all responses will remain anonymous and that the data collected from the study will be reported as a group. I have also enclosed a copy of the study proposal for your review.

I sincerely hope you will respond favorably to this request and I will call you in the very near future for your response.

Thank you for your attention and cooperation.

Respectfully,

Joseph F. Johnson  
Researcher

JFJ:bc

Enclosures

cc: Principal

APPENDIX D

LETTER TO MIDDLE SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

April 4, 1980

Dear

This letter is a follow-up to our recent telephone conversation relative to my conducting a study of selected middle school principals in the Richmond Metropolitan Area. As discussed, this study is concerned with analyzing the instructional leadership behavior of the principal as perceived by selected middle school principals and their full-time teaching staff and will serve as the basis for my dissertation.

A copy of the study proposal has been enclosed for you to review. The survey instrument to be used in this study has been tested for reliability and requires an average of twenty (20) minutes to complete. Please be assured that all responses will remain anonymous and that the data collected from the study will be reported as a group. In addition, your school will be provided a copy of the results of this study.

I am most appreciative of the time you have taken from your busy schedule to assist me in this research study. I look forward to meeting with you and will contact you to set up an appointment at a mutually convenient time.

Thank you for your attention.

Respectfully,

Joseph F. Johnson  
Researcher

JFJ:bc

Enclosure

APPENDIX E

FREQUENCIES, MEANS, AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS  
FOR EACH ITEM RESPONSE TO THE SURVEY OF  
INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR (SILB)  
FOR FULL-TIME MIDDLE SCHOOL TEACHERS

Frequencies, Means, and Standard Deviations  
for Each Item Response to the Survey of  
Instructional Leadership Behavior (SILB)  
for Full-time Middle School Teachers

RESPONSES

Item Number	ACTUAL BEHAVIOR								EXPECTED BEHAVIOR							
	Always 5	Very Often 4	Some- times 3	Rarely 2	Never 1	Miss- ing	$\bar{X}$	Std.	Always 5	Very Often 4	Some- times 3	Rarely 2	Never 1	Miss- ing	$\bar{X}$	Std.
1	145	132	68	17	11	7	4.03	1.01	214	110	33	7	7	9	4.39	0.87
2	79	97	87	52	52	13	3.27	1.33	116	118	56	38	36	16	3.66	1.29
3	59	83	97	87	40	14	3.09	1.24	87	140	93	25	20	15	3.68	1.08
4	105	61	68	69	69	8	3.17	1.48	124	71	80	38	54	13	3.47	1.42
5	226	82	41	11	3	17	4.42	0.87	263	74	23	4	2	14	4.62	0.70
6	61	80	114	65	45	15	3.13	1.24	71	130	118	24	23	14	3.55	1.07
7	121	105	80	44	16	14	3.74	1.17	174	126	60	5	5	10	4.24	0.87
8	169	99	66	22	17	7	4.02	1.13	230	98	26	8	6	12	4.46	0.85
9	61	72	132	81	28	6	3.15	1.16	115	131	112	8	4	10	3.93	0.89
10	41	56	91	106	72	14	2.69	1.26	68	90	109	65	35	13	3.25	1.22
11	69	116	110	63	14	8	3.44	1.09	126	153	68	16	1	16	4.06	0.86
12	128	123	82	28	10	9	3.89	1.04	194	108	51	4	8	15	4.30	0.91
13	36	46	72	115	98	13	2.47	1.28	55	56	87	93	79	10	2.77	1.34
14	25	45	109	92	93	16	2.49	1.19	41	74	170	45	31	19	3.14	1.05
15	86	117	91	48	26	12	3.51	1.19	118	120	89	27	12	14	3.83	1.06
16	55	54	107	86	61	17	2.88	1.29	53	52	95	97	66	17	2.80	1.30
17	66	97	112	66	21	7	3.27	1.19	110	141	89	20	9	11	3.88	0.98
18	55	56	94	88	72	15	2.82	1.33	77	80	93	65	44	21	3.23	1.31

RESPONSES

Item Number	ACTUAL BEHAVIOR								EXPECTED BEHAVIOR							
	Always 5	Very Often 4	Some- times 3	Rarely 2	Never 1	Miss- ing	$\bar{X}$	Std.	Always 5	Very Often 4	Some- times 3	Rarely 2	Never 1	Miss- ing	$\bar{X}$	Std.
19	233	86	29	16	4	12	4.43	0.89	214	94	50	6	3	13	4.39	0.84
20	74	96	106	67	19	18	3.38	1.16	113	141	82	22	5	17	3.92	0.95
21	45	84	99	86	50	16	2.97	1.23	83	128	121	21	13	14	3.67	1.00
22	54	70	127	68	37	24	3.10	1.18	105	133	95	19	9	19	3.85	0.98
23	126	118	69	29	22	16	3.82	1.17	169	124	49	11	6	21	4.22	0.91
24	31	44	103	106	76	20	2.58	1.20	70	107	112	49	22	20	3.43	1.13
25	112	123	73	38	20	14	3.73	1.16	181	132	37	9	5	16	4.30	0.85
26	178	105	46	28	14	9	4.09	1.11	221	98	36	7	3	15	4.44	0.81
27	85	79	123	55	28	10	3.37	1.20	109	111	101	31	15	13	3.73	1.10
28	158	115	63	24	12	8	4.03	1.07	230	100	23	9	7	11	4.46	0.87
29	116	89	96	48	14	17	3.67	1.17	185	114	50	10	3	18	4.29	0.87
30	92	100	78	62	35	13	3.41	1.29	119	129	76	21	15	20	3.88	1.07
31	82	89	102	62	38	7	3.31	1.27	124	113	93	25	11	14	3.86	1.06
32	61	64	123	79	40	13	3.07	1.22	79	127	130	24	5	15	3.69	0.93
33	62	58	92	89	61	18	2.92	1.32	99	134	100	15	11	21	3.82	0.98
34	146	103	82	33	12	4	3.90	1.11	219	99	40	8	3	11	4.42	0.83

APPENDIX F

FREQUENCIES, MEANS, AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS  
FOR EACH ITEM RESPONSE TO THE SURVEY OF  
INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP BEHAVIOR (SILB)  
FOR MIDDLE SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

Frequencies, Means, and Standard Deviations  
for Each Item Response to the Survey of  
Instructional Leadership Behavior (SILB)  
for Middle School Principals

Item Number	RESPONSES															
	ACTUAL BEHAVIOR								EXPECTED BEHAVIOR							
	Always 5	Very Often 4	Some- times 3	Rarely 2	Never 1	Miss- ing	$\bar{X}$	Std.	Always 5	Very Often 4	Some- times 3	Rarely 2	Never 1	Miss- ing	$\bar{X}$	Std.
1	3	6	2	-	-	-	4.09	0.70	6	4	1	-	-	-	4.45	0.69
2	7	2	2	-	-	-	4.45	0.82	7	3	1	-	-	-	4.55	0.69
3	1	3	5	2	-	-	3.27	0.90	3	7	1	-	-	-	4.18	0.60
4	2	2	4	2	1	-	3.18	1.25	3	1	5	2	-	-	3.45	1.13
5	7	1	1	1	-	1	4.40	1.07	9	2	-	-	-	-	4.64	0.81
6	1	3	5	2	-	-	3.27	0.90	2	6	3	-	-	-	3.91	0.70
7	7	2	1	1	-	-	4.36	1.03	8	3	-	-	-	-	4.73	0.47
8	5	3	3	-	-	-	4.18	0.87	7	3	1	-	-	-	4.55	0.69
9	2	5	3	1	-	-	3.73	0.90	6	3	2	-	-	-	4.36	0.81
10	2	-	4	4	1	-	2.82	1.25	3	3	2	2	1	-	3.45	1.37
11	2	4	5	-	-	-	3.73	0.79	5	5	1	-	-	-	4.36	0.67
12	6	1	4	-	-	-	4.17	0.98	9	1	1	-	-	-	4.73	0.65
13	2	2	1	4	1	1	3.00	1.41	2	2	4	3	-	-	3.27	1.10
14	1	4	1	4	1	-	3.00	1.26	1	5	3	2	-	-	3.45	0.93
15	1	7	2	1	-	-	3.73	0.79	3	6	2	-	-	-	4.09	0.70
16	1	3	2	3	2	-	2.82	1.33	3	2	1	2	2	1	3.20	1.62
17	2	7	1	1	-	-	3.91	0.83	4	7	-	-	-	-	4.36	0.50
18	3	2	2	2	2	-	3.18	1.54	3	3	5	-	-	-	3.82	0.87

RESPONSES

Item Number	ACTUAL BEHAVIOR								EXPECTED BEHAVIOR							
	Always 5	Very Often 4	Some- times 3	Rarely 2	Never 1	Miss- ing	$\bar{X}$	Std.	Always 5	Very Often 4	Some- times 3	Rarely 2	Never 1	Miss- ing	$\bar{X}$	Std.
19	7	2	2	-	-	-	4.45	0.82	8	3	-	-	-	-	4.73	0.47
20	3	2	5	1	-	-	3.64	1.03	4	5	2	-	-	-	4.18	0.74
21	2	3	1	2	3	-	2.91	1.58	3	6	2	-	-	-	4.09	0.70
22	3	2	1	3	1	1	3.30	1.49	6	3	2	-	-	-	4.36	0.81
23	6	3	1	1	-	-	4.27	1.01	7	2	2	-	-	-	4.45	0.82
24	-	4	3	3	1	-	2.91	1.04	2	3	6	-	-	-	3.63	0.81
25	4	5	2	-	-	-	4.18	0.75	6	4	1	-	-	-	4.60	0.52
26	7	1	3	-	-	-	4.36	0.92	9	2	-	-	-	-	4.82	0.40
27	1	7	1	2	-	-	3.64	0.92	3	6	2	-	-	-	4.09	0.70
28	6	4	1	-	-	-	4.45	0.69	8	1	2	-	-	-	4.55	0.82
29	4	2	3	2	-	-	3.72	1.19	6	3	1	-	1	-	4.18	1.25
30	3	5	1	2	-	-	3.82	1.08	5	4	2	-	-	-	4.27	0.79
31	3	3	4	1	-	-	3.73	1.01	2	4	3	2	-	-	3.55	1.04
32	2	3	3	2	1	-	3.27	1.27	9	2	-	-	-	-	3.82	0.40
33	2	2	4	2	1	-	3.18	1.25	3	6	2	-	-	-	4.09	0.70
34	7	3	-	-	-	1	4.70	0.48	5	5	-	-	-	1	4.50	0.53

**The vita has been removed from  
the scanned document**

AN ANALYSIS OF THE INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP  
BEHAVIOR OF SELECTED MIDDLE SCHOOL  
PRINCIPALS IN THE RICHMOND (VIRGINIA)  
METROPOLITAN AREA

by

Joseph Flanner Johnson

(Abstract)

This study was a descriptive-analytical survey of middle school principals' and full-time middle school teachers' responses to the Survey of Instructional Leadership Behavior (SILB). The study was undertaken to determine whether significant differences existed between the respondents in terms of their perceptions of the "actual" instructional leadership behavior and the "expected" instructional leadership behavior of middle school principals in the metropolitan area of Richmond, Virginia. Attention was given also to examining the relationship between selected demographic characteristics such as the sex, age, ethnic group, experience, educational background, and annual salary on the respondents and their perceptions of the middle school principals' instructional leadership behavior.

The subjects for this study were identified from three governmental localities to make up a representative group of middle school principals, as well as full-time middle school teachers in the Richmond (Virginia) Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA). Of the 532 who participated in the study, 391 (73%) were determined usable responses. Of this number, 11 of the responses were middle school principals

and 380 were full-time middle school teachers.

Five main hypotheses were developed and tested in order to guide the study: (1) There is no significant difference between the "actual" instructional leadership behavior of the principal as perceived by middle school principals when compared to the perceptions of full-time middle school teachers in the metropolitan area of Richmond, Virginia; (2) There is no significant difference between the "expected" instructional leadership behavior of the principal as perceived by middle school principals when compared to the perceptions of full-time middle school teachers in the metropolitan area of Richmond, Virginia; (3) There is no significant difference between the "actual" instructional leadership behavior and the "expected" instructional leadership behavior of the principal as perceived by middle school principals in the metropolitan area of Richmond, Virginia; (4) There is no significant difference between the "actual" instructional leadership behavior and the "expected" instructional leadership behavior of the principal as perceived by full-time middle school teachers in the metropolitan area of Richmond, Virginia; and (5) There is no significant relationship between each of the demographic characteristics of the respondents and their perceptions of the "actual" instructional leadership behavior and the "expected" instructional leadership behavior of the middle school principals in the metropolitan area of Richmond, Virginia.

Each hypothesis presented in this study was tested at the .05 level of significance to determine which should be accepted and which should be rejected. Hypotheses 1 and 2 were tested using independent t-test values. Hypotheses 3 and 4 were tested using dependent t-test values. Hypothesis 5 was tested by conducting a multiway analysis of variance using all demographic data as independent variables. Of the five hypotheses presented, one was accepted (Hypothesis 1), three were rejected (Hypotheses 2, 3, and 4), and one was rejected in part (Hypothesis 5).

The following conclusions are based on the findings of the study: (1) Middle school principals and teachers were in general agreement relative to their perceptions of the "actual" instructional leadership behavior of middle school principals in the metropolitan area of Richmond, Virginia. Although there was agreement, middle school principals' perceptions of their actual behavior are higher than the teachers' perceptions; (2) Middle school principals' perceptions of their "expected" instructional leadership behavior were significantly higher than the teachers' perceptions of how the principals were expected to behave; (3) Middle school principals' perceptions of their "expected" instructional leadership behavior were significantly higher than the middle school principals' perceptions of their "actual" instructional leadership behavior; (4) Middle school teachers' perceptions of their principals' "expected"

instructional leadership behavior were significantly higher than their perceptions of the principals' "actual" instructional leadership behavior; (5) Sex, age, ethnic group, experience, number of years assigned to the school, degrees, and annual salary had no influence on the middle school principals' perceptions of their "actual" instructional leadership behavior nor their "expected" instructional leadership behavior; (6) Although sex, age, number of years assigned to the school, experience, and annual salary had no influence on middle school teachers' perceptions of the principals' "actual" instructional leadership behavior, the ethnic background tends to have some influence. Furthermore, the specific interaction between the number of years teachers were assigned to the school and the degrees held tended to influence their perceptions of the principals' actual behavior; and (7) Although sex, age, ethnic group, number of years assigned to the school, degrees and annual salary had no influence on middle school teachers' perceptions of the principals' "expected" instructional leadership behavior, the experience of the teacher tends to have significant influence. Furthermore, the specific interaction between the ethnic background of the teachers and the degrees held had a significant influence on their perceptions of the principals' expected behavior.