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The problem of this study was the investigation of the development of H.B. 235 and its impact upon the role of the high school principal in Texas, as perceived by high school principals, superintendents, and selected professors of educational administration. The purpose of the study was two-fold. First, it analyzed the development and provisions of H.B. 235, and second, it tried to determine the impact of its implementation upon the role of the high school principal in Texas. There were twelve basic questions to which the study sought answers.

The collection of data for the first purpose was accomplished by interviewing the legislative and educational leaders who were instrumental in the development and passage of the legislation and by examining records and documents related to H.B. 235. A survey instrument was used to gain the data for the second part. The survey instrument was developed and validated by an advisory panel and a jury panel, each composed of nine members. The significance of responses was established by using a five-member panel of educational
experts. The populations to be sampled consisted of principals, superintendents, and professors of educational administration. A stratified random sample technique was used to identify the samples, and a reasonable number of contacts was made with the samples to achieve a satisfactory percentage of returns.

Data from the survey were tabulated and recorded in forms of percentages. Other data were summarized and related appropriately to one of the purposes of the study.

The findings related to these data indicated that the legislation intended to provide the principal with the legal authority to carry out the duties that were associated with the role of the principal. It also intended to cause an emphasis on specific duties and still provide the flexibility for each district to meet its individual needs.

The reports from educators indicated that the legislation had added to the prestige of the high school principal, strengthened the legal position of the school executive, focused attention on instructional leadership, facilitated executive management, and assisted the provision for performance accountability.

Educators did not perceive that the principal's relationship with superiors, staff, students, and citizens had been improved. The limiting factors were related to lack of public understanding, forcefulness, and administrative emphasis, according to the respondents.
It was concluded that the state legislature continues to fulfill its responsibility for public education and responds to the influences of professional organizations which seek to improve the procedures of educational administration. As a partial result of the legislation, the position of high school principal has become more desirable and competes with other professions for qualified personnel. Satisfactory procedures for developing position specifications and evaluating job performance would compliment the legislation.

It was also concluded that the educational program will benefit from the legislation. Attention has been focused upon instructional leadership, and reduced conflicts related to the responsibility for school management should allow for a restructuring of priorities.

It was recommended that information sources be developed to assist the general public in understanding both the intent and scope of the legislation. It was also recommended that other educational positions work to utilize similar provisions to assist in performance of duties. Methods for evaluating the principal's fulfillment of the duties and responsibilities were recommended, and further study at a later date also seemed appropriate.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The high school principal is closely identified with the pressures and influences associated with the high school's attempt to meet the educational needs of the youth it serves. The complexity and ambiguity of his role are partially the results of varied societal forces that have made their presence known (3).

Nolan Estes (1, p. 69) observes that in the decade of the 'sixties a rising rebellion against authority affected education as well as other elements that make up our society. The principal's authority slipped away as other powers developed within the school community. Examples of these powers are teacher power, parent power, student power, black power, and flower power. He feels that challenges to the established order were conspicuous manifestations of discord in an unhappy society (1, p. 75).

Watson (8, p. 1) recognizes that the changes rapidly occurring in the American society have implications for the educational picture of the present and the future. The influence of these changes is recognizable in organizational patterns, curricula content, and role definition of the principal as important facets of high school operation.
Many principals feel that they are being trapped by forces within the school organization, as well as forces from within the community. When teachers and their representatives on the one side, and the board and the superintendent on the other, enter into professional consultations, the principal's position is not clear (6, p. 24).

George (2, p. 144) reports that the legal status and identity of the high school principal is more than ever a matter of concern, partially because of the higher frequency of lawsuits involving principals. He also feels that the principal should have a clearly defined position where collective bargaining is concerned.

Gorman (4, p. 93) quotes an educator in 1964 as stating that no other job had so many publics to satisfy. These publics are represented by teachers, superintendents, boards of trustees, voters, taxpayers, staff members, community members, and students. These publics represent many different, if not conflicting, demands for the principal's attention.

With added responsibilities, increasing demands, conflicting roles, and changing authority, the high school principal faces an assignment that appears to an outsider to be an impossible task (4, p. 93). Principals and their professional organizations have sought solutions to the dilemma.

Since the fundamental authority for education is the state, and this authority is specifically lodged in the state legislature, it appears that legislative action could provide
at least partial solutions to the problems involved in the administration of the high school. The legislature has plenary control over education and grants specified powers for school operation to local agencies (5, p. 66).

The Sixty-Second Legislature for the State of Texas (7, p. 82) recognized that challenges to the authority of school principals created an emergency and an imperative public necessity for immediate action. The action resulting from the recognized dilemma is a statute that defines the legal duties and responsibilities of school principals. This statute was designated as House Bill 235 and is recorded in the Texas Education Code (7) as Section 16:08.

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study is the investigation of the development of H.B. 235 and its impact on the role of the high school principal in Texas as perceived by high school principals, superintendents, and selected professors of educational administration.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is twofold. First, it analyzes the development and provisions of H.B. 235, and second, it tries to determine the impact of its implementation upon the role of the high school principal in Texas.

This study attempts to investigate the development, implementation, limitations, and weaknesses of the legislation.
The study examines the effect of the legislation upon the role of the high school principal by seeking answers to the following questions:

I. What was the ultimate intent of the legislature and the educational leaders who were instrumental in writing and proposing the legislation?

II. Has the legislation resulted in added prestige to the high school principal?

III. Has the morale of the principal been improved as a result of the legislation?

IV. Has the legislation provided support for the legal position of the high school principal?

V. Has the legislation caused greater attention to be focused on instructional leadership?

VI. Has the executive management operation been facilitated by H.B. 235?

VII. Has accountability for job performance by the principal been assisted by the legislation?

VIII. Has the legislation improved the principal's relationship with the superintendent and the board of trustees?

IX. Has the legislation improved the principal's relationship with the building staff?

X. Has the legislation improved the principal's relationship with the students?
XI. Has the legislation improved the principal's relationship with the parents and citizens?

XII. What are some of the major weaknesses and limitations of the legislation which are apparent to the respondents?

Background and Significance of the Study

A great deal has been written and recorded concerning the role that high school principals should fulfill. A review of related literature indicates that the position has evolved from a simple beginning to a role for the principal so complex that educators can neither agree on all the things he should be doing nor provide concise directions on how he should accomplish the tasks that have become associated with his role.

The difficulties and challenges associated with the high school principalship have been the subject of much concern and considerable investigation for solutions to the problems. The demands for change, accountability, negotiation, and involvement have focused the attention of many agencies, including the legislature, toward the provision of acceptable solutions to the dilemma of high school principals.

House Bill 235 represents landmark legislation as the first attempt on the part of the legislature to establish job definitions for public school administrators. This legislation came partially as the result of a proposal from
the Texas Association of Secondary School Principals to pro-
vide legal authority to principals to do the things generally
expected, and to carry out the assignments of the superin-
tendent and board of trustees.

Even though the state is responsible for providing edu-
cational opportunities for all children, some writers have
pointed to the difficulties of solving the administrative
problems through legislation (2, p. 145). The public does
not always look favorably upon legislative action. Some
superintendents and teachers are skeptical concerning the
authority bestowed upon the principals by the legislature.
Even some principals, failing to view the statute as a pan-
acea for their problems, doubt that it is an ultimate solu-
tion.

In view of the need (7, p. 82) to provide assistance to
school principals, it appeared important to evaluate H.B. 235
to determine its influence on the role of the high school
principal. The questions answered by the study should also
answer questions related to the appropriateness of legisla-
tion for establishing administrative responsibility, and
provide guidelines for applying it to other educational
positions.

Interviews with the executive secretary of the Texas
Association of Secondary School Principals and with the
legislative sponsors of the statute indicated that there was
a desire to have the statute evaluated in terms of its impact
on the role of the school principals and the extent that it has fulfilled the intentions of the Texas Legislature. It was important that the educators affected the most by H.B. 235 express their perceptions of its impact. If proven successful, this legislation could have important implications as a pattern for legislative action influencing other school personnel and their role definitions.

**Definition of Terms**

The following definitions were formulated to provide a clearer understanding of the terms used in this study:

**High school**—an accredited school containing grade twelve.

**Principal**—a certified educator who has the title and the responsibility as the school district's chief administrator of the building serving a particular attendance area or zone.

**High school principal**—the principal assigned as the executive of the building serving an attendance zone containing grade twelve.

**Legislation**—a statute or resolution passed by the legislative branch of the state government. The term is often used as a specific reference to H.B. 235 in this study.

**Role**—the distinctive traits or qualities of an individual or position which reflect the functions that are either assumed or designated to the individual or the position.
Influence—to affect the nature or status of persons, roles, or events.

Morale—the mental condition of an individual with respect to courage, discipline, satisfaction, and confidence in himself and his ability to perform in a satisfactory manner.

Prestige—the reputation of an individual or a position based on achievement, character, and the power to command esteem.

Limitations

The study is limited to H.B. 235 and its impact on the role of the high school principals in Texas. No attempt is made to compare this legislation with that in other states. The study is limited to the effects of the legislation for approximately one year succeeding its enactment in 1971.

Basic Assumptions

It is assumed that adequate time has elapsed since April 1, 1971, for this legislation to be fully implemented. It is also assumed that the educators would respond honestly to the survey and that their responses would consider the impact of the legislation. It is further assumed that the validated survey instrument would gather the information needed.
Formulation of the Survey Instrument

The survey instrument was developed to provide information needed for the study. Each item for the instrument was chosen on the basis of its relationship to the role of the principal and its relevance to the legislation. An advisory panel, chosen as a cross section of the many qualified educators and approved by the doctoral committee chairman, assisted in the selection of appropriate items. This panel, consisting of three principals, three superintendents, two university professors, and the president of the Texas Association of Secondary School Principals recommended changes and improvements in the questionnaire that was submitted to them for refinement. After being revised, the questionnaire was submitted to a jury composed of three principals, three superintendents, and three professors for final approval and validation. This jury was approved by the committee, according to guidelines that indicated that jury members would be able to contribute to the study. Jury members were asked to approve each item of the survey instrument on the basis of its appropriateness, clarity, and usefulness for collecting the information needed. The knowledge and experience of the panel members assisted in the study, as the instrument was validated before it was mailed to the selected samples.
Procedures for Collection of Data

The following procedures were used for collection of data:

1. A review of related literature assisted in the examination of the role of the high school principal and the environment in which he functions.

2. A review of related literature, documents, transcripts, and records was used to investigate the development and passage of H.B. 235 and determine the intent of this legislation. Interviews and communications with the president of the Texas Association of Secondary School Principals, the executive secretary of the Texas Association of Secondary School Principals, the Texas state senator and the Texas state representative who proposed the legislation to the Texas Legislature were used to gain information for the study.

3. A survey of high school principals, superintendents, and selected university professors in Texas provided the additional information needed. The following procedures were used to conduct the survey:

   a. School districts were divided into these four categories, based on pupil accounting for 1971:

      Group I: 10,000 or more average daily attendance;
Group II: 1,000 to 9,999 average daily attendance;
Group III: 500 to 999 average daily attendance;
Group IV: less than 500 average daily attendance.

b. The high schools and their principals and superintendents were identified for each district, and a stratified random sample was selected for each category. A table of random numbers was used to select a sample equal to 15 percent of each category.

c. Professors of educational administration were selected from the Texas colleges and universities identified by either the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education or the Texas Education Agency as being accredited to certify secondary school principals. These professors were selected because they teach a course in secondary school administration. They were identified by the Dean of Education of the college or university. Each school certifying principals was surveyed.

d. The principals and superintendents of the selected high schools and the professors were asked to complete and return a detailed questionnaire
that was mailed to them. Identical questions were answered by principals, superintendents, and university professors of educational administration.

e. A return of at least two-thirds of the survey questionnaires was considered sufficient to support the objectives of this study; however, a second and third letter were used to obtain additional questionnaires to increase the validity of the information.

Procedures for Analysis of Data

The data provided by the survey instrument were compiled, tabulated, and reported to illustrate the frequency of responses to each survey item. The responses were recorded in percentage form and reported according to the four categories for high school principals, four categories for superintendents, and the one category for professors. Comparisons were made among the group responses of the principals, superintendents, and professors. Because computational procedures did not allow for the determination of discrete values, the totals reported were not always equal to 100 percent.

The data collected by procedures other than the survey instrument were summarized, related appropriately to one of the purposes of the study, and reported as a portion of the findings. These data resulted primarily from the
investigation of the development of the legislation and the basic intentions of the legislature.

The data collected from all sources and reported as findings provided information concerning the development of H.B. 235 and its impact on the role of the high school principal. This information was used to draw conclusions about the present status of the influence of this legislation. It was also used to describe inferences and make specific recommendations regarding the effectiveness of this statute, and possible future legislation, as it could influence the role of the high school principal and the roles of other public school personnel.

Summary

The purpose of Chapter I is to provide introduction, description, and explanation for the content and arrangement of the remainder of the study. The introduction and delineation of the problem are contained in the beginning sections of Chapter I. These are followed by the discussion of the background and significance of the study in an attempt to illustrate the appropriateness and relevance of this investigation. The remaining sections of Chapter I provide a brief description of the procedures followed in conducting the investigation and completing the study.
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CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The purposes for the data collected in the review of related literature are (1) to provide assistance in the investigation of the environment in which the high school principal functions, (2) to provide assistance in establishing items for the questionnaire that will provide data appropriate to the study, (3) to assist in establishing the relevance of the legislation to the duties and responsibilities of the high school principal.

In order to study H.B. 235 and the impact that it has upon the role of the high school principal, it is important to understand the environment in which the principal functions. The review of related literature provides data concerning the evolvement of the principalship, its present status, and some predictions regarding its future. This portion of the study is divided into eleven sections. The sections will be titled as follows: (1) "Role Definitions of the High School Principal," (2) "Prestige of the High School Principal," (3) "Morale of the High School Principal," (4) "The Legal Status of the High School Principal," (5) "The Principal as an Instructional Leader," (6) "The Principal and Executive Management," (7) "The Principal and Accountability," (8) "The Principal and the Superintendent
and Board of Trustees," (9) "The Principal and His Staff," (10) "The Principal and the Students," and (11) "The Principal and the Parents and Citizens."

Role Definition of the High School Principal

The development of the public high school for the education of all children is certainly one of this country's great contributions to the field of education. It was accompanied by another development of singular importance—that of the principalship. Coming upon the educational scene by practical necessity but of little importance, it is now a position of high prestige and one which calls for the best performance of well qualified educational leaders (5, p. 7).

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 increase 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 (28, p. 2).

According to Jacobson (36, p. 491), the high school principalship is the oldest administrative position in
American education. It antedates both the superintendency and the elementary principalship. The duties of the early principal clearly indicate that it was not the professional position which is conceived by progressive school systems today. It developed from the position of teacher to head teacher or principal teacher. As administrative duties increased, the word "teacher" was dropped from the title.

Studies by Williams (73, p. 519) have revealed that the role is continuing to change, and evidence indicates that no single image will appear for the present or future high school principal. The functions performed by the principal will be the basis for identifying his role.

There are numerous areas in which the principal exercises functions which are essential to the well-being of the school. According to Shaver (58, p. 1), the many managerial duties associated with the principalship involving the student personnel activities, business and finance, and auxiliary services are important adjuncts to the teaching-learning process. Successful accomplishment of these managerial duties is necessary to the success of the educational function of the principalship and the school. Shaver (58, pp. 1-2) elaborates that the area of personnel management, which includes the recruitment, selection, evaluation, in-service development, and recommendation of staff members, is a vital part of the principal's role. Alvin C. Eurich (18, p. 214) reports that while many persons will determine
whether the high school makes better use of its resources, no one will be more influential in the school than its principal, especially as he is held more accountable for the distribution of resources in terms of goals to be accomplished. Roald Campbell (7, p. 22) suggested that the activities of the principal could be organized into three basic categories as follows: the principal helps the organization clarify its purpose, the principal coordinates the activities of the organization, and the principal assists in obtaining the resources which will permit the organization to fulfill its objectives.

The managerial duties should occupy only a small portion of the principal's time, according to Lloyd Trump (67). Many modern educators feel that the principal must become more of an educational leader and less a manager of the school's day-to-day activities. Acceptance of this philosophy requires that the principal organize his staff, allocate his time, and direct his emphasis in such a manner that the instructional leadership role can be facilitated.

Establishing role definition is an important activity. The manner in which the principal views his role is most likely to determine the way he functions within the school. If he considers his role to be the school's instructional leader, instruction will be considered the primary importance by teachers and students as well as by the principal. If he encourages the faculty to initiate and try more imaginative
ways to make teaching and learning effective, this school will take on the characteristic of being innovative. In contrast, the principal who views his role as that of a manager will concentrate his time and emphasis in that direction (66, p. 2).

Watson (71) concluded from his study of conflicting roles of the principalship that Lloyd Trump agreed with the American Association of School Administrators that it would be unrealistic today to assume that one man can be all things to all people and perform all functions dispatched. A more realistic appraisal should evaluate the responsibilities of the principal in terms of functions that can and should be performed.

Professional associations are in a position to render leadership in the area of role definition. Colleges and universities should be prepared to provide consultant service in order to meet the varied responsibilities which are commonly associated with the high school principalship, and to meet the challenges of the role in which the principal is being placed. It is important to provide guidelines which will assist the fulfillment of this role (46, p. 99).

The Prestige of the High School Principal

Schools of today are what they are due to decisions that were made in the past. Schools of the future will assume certain roles, provide certain programs, and follow
certain procedures as a result of the decisions which are being made today. It is important that those who organize and administer education in Texas have the proper view of the high school principalship. The way in which the principal views his role will set the tone for the entire school (66, p. 2).

In a survey conducted by the National Association of Secondary School Principals, certain concepts of the role of the principal as perceived by principals became evident (28, pp. 75-76). Principals reported that, in general, they viewed themselves as being in the middle or upper-middle class socially and professionally. About one third of the principals felt that they were not accorded the status and prestige to which they were entitled by virtue of the education, the training and the nature of the work being done. When questioned as to whether the job of high school principal should provide considerable or very much prestige in the community, 72 percent of the principals felt this to be true. Somewhat noticeable is the fact that 28 percent felt that the position of principal should not be afforded status and prestige within the community. This statistic is important to the understanding of the way in which principals view their positions.

Burrup (5, p. 28) observed the principalship as an assignment which has evolved since its beginning. Born as a position of little importance, and the first school
administrative position to emerge, it continues to become more complex.

The high school principalship is rapidly becoming a position requiring a specialized, intensive professional trained beyond the baccalaureate degree. Most states have provided for administrative certification to furnish the recognition of special training for educational administration, and to insure at least some specialized training on the part of those occupying administrative positions (26, pp. 145-146).

Douglas (14, p. 21) stated that training required for these certificates should be thought of only as minimum, rather than constituting an optimum. He felt that principals should seek additional training in order to be provided with the abilities necessary to meet the demands of the position.

Spears (60, pp. 47-48) reported to The University Council for Educational Administration that the standards of the past are insufficient to meet the quality needs of the present and the future. In order to accomplish his job, the high school principal of the future will need (1) a higher degree of intelligence than in the past because education will be more complex, (2) a better education because the general citizenry will be better educated, (3) more vision because educational problems and their solutions will be more far-reaching, (4) courage because the need for change in improvement will be greater, and (5) more ability because more will
be expected. These standards establish a position of high prestige. The high school principal must be a man who thinks well of himself and who knows the kind of support and help he needs to do an effective job. Findings (32) reported by a survey conducted by the National Association of School Principals caused a justifiable reason for concern. The high school principal cannot be one who lacks faith in the capacity of the high school to be useful to the American youth. Low estimates of the stature and potential of the job of the principal were inferred from the data concerning the conditions under which many principals work (28, pp. 79-80). Too many principals have been willing to accept their jobs under any and all conditions—conditions that have often made progress impossible. Men often behave the way they do because of consideration for a given position. The hypothesis that many high school principals have not behaved in such a way as to enhance the prestige of the position, resulted from the study. "Behavior" in this instance is used to describe the manner in which the principal concerns himself with his functions, and the kinds of activities that he emphasizes during the major portion of his working day.

McIntyre (46, p. 7) stated that educational administration must be a more exclusive profession than in the past, suggesting that one of the necessary steps which must be taken is to accredit for school administrative preparation
purposes only as many of the stronger institutions as are required to meet the demands. A universally and uniformly administered, interpreted, and reported aptitude test was also considered essential. Institutions preparing the school administrators should have some acceptable and effective manner of comparing their results with the results of other institutions throughout the nation. When certification standards place a premium on quality rather than quantity and an accumulation of credits, the prestige of the profession will be improved.

The Morale of the High School Principal

The tasks that challenge today's high school principal are varied. They range from the execution of simple managerial duties to the performance of leadership acts. The lives of many people are influenced by the educational leadership that can be provided (27, p. 93).

All forces of world conflict and indecision vitally affect the program of the schools and increase the challenges of the principalship. The high school principal needs to feel that he can meet these challenges and accomplish the tasks to the degree expected by the public, by his superiors, and by his own acceptance of responsibility (5, p. 40).

Principals have too often reported that they felt it was not possible to accomplish the tasks that were expected by the public, by themselves, and by their superiors. Many
principals have stated that they were uncertain as to whether they would enter the principalship if they were beginning their careers again. A survey (32) by the National Association of Secondary School Principals indicated that only three-fifths of the principals questioned would be willing to enter the principalship if they were beginning again. Many principals see the job as a stepping-stone to a higher position, either in school administration or in public service. Approximately 50 percent of the principals surveyed indicated that they aspired to move from the job which they were presently holding. Some of these men sought better principalships, while others sought higher administrative positions, and some sought to enter educational fields of higher learning (28, p. 75).

According to Hemphill (32), there appear to be several reasons why the morale of the high school principal needs to be improved. The lack of faith in the ability to fulfill all the responsibilities expected of them has been a negative influence on the job satisfaction of the principals. Another problem appears to be the way that principals spend their time. When questioned about their work day, many principals (28, pp. 73-74) reported that fifty to sixty hours were required in order to meet the demands of their job. Indications of the use of time by principals showed that (1) administrative planning, (2) meetings with students on matters other than discipline, (3) working with individual teachers
on their proficiency, (4) meeting with teachers for curriculum or instruction, (5) correspondence, (6) classroom teaching, (7) supervision of extracurricular activities, (8) meeting with students for disciplinary purposes, and (9) private thought and reflection were, in that order, occupying most of the working day. Much of the time was spent in conducting activities that did not provide for self-fulfillment (28, pp. 75-76).

The National Association of Secondary School Principals (32, p. 92) further reported that principals did not feel the public was willing to pay adequate compensation for the job, subject as it is to the frustrations and pressures that go with it. In 1964 the most frequent salary bracket for principals throughout the nation was $6,000 or less. Other frequent brackets reported were $7,000 to $8,000 and $10,000 to $12,000. Only 1 percent earned more than $17,500. The current provisions for salaries to Texas principals established by the Minimum Foundation Salary Schedule 1972-73 set a minimum of $8,580 for eleven-month units, with campuses having less than nineteen teaching positions. The top of this schedule provides for $14,472; however, the larger districts provide an additional supplement that allows some high school principals to earn more than $24,000 yearly. Since not all of the communities relate the principal's salary to the master's degree teacher salary, it can be assumed that in many places the principal's salary is negotiable (32, p. 93).
In summarizing the factors that influence the morale of the principal, it is important to view the roadblocks that principals frequently report as causes for failure to achieve the things that they would like to accomplish within their schools (28, pp. 72-73). Principals stated that (1) variation in ability, (2) time taken up by administrative detail, (3) lack of time, (4) inability to provide time for teacher planning and other professional improvement activities, (5) insufficient space and physical facilities, (6) inability to obtain funds, and (7) limited quantity and quality of the teaching staff were factors that prevented or limited the successful accomplishment of their goals.

Many of the problems affecting principal morale appear to be related to the ability to get the job done. Many of these factors have to do with the way the principal views his position and the opportunities to find self-fulfillment by carrying out the roles related to the principalship.

The Legal Status of the High School Principal

Estes (17, p. 69) reports that the legal decisions on the kind and amount of authority principals can now exercise are often contradictory. Sharing decision-making at various levels is often necessary and desirable in order to strengthen school management and provide authority for operation. As a vital element in the decision-making process the executive directs policy-making at the building level.
developing and implementing policies for the district, and modifies policies whenever desirable for the best interest of the school.

A survey (26, p. 144) by the National Association of Secondary School Principals attempted to define the legal status of the principal in fifty states. Texas was listed in the lowest category, with other states that failed to provide legal status to the principal. The principalship, like many other educational positions, has been given a great deal of responsibility without the legal authority commensurate with the responsibility.

In legal theory, the principal is responsible for the total program of his school. He is the one who must require that certain instructional practices be enforced in order to comply with local and state regulations. The principal has been charged by the board of education, through the office of the superintendent, to carry out certain prescribed duties and assume responsibilities for certain activities. He has implied legal power to carry out these obligations. In theory, the principal stands in a relationship to the single school unit much as a superintendent does to the total school program (25, p. 126).

Gauerke relates that certain powers are delegated to the principal by the board through the superintendent (25, p. 128). The principal retains responsibility for seeing that functions are carried out, even though they have been
delegated by him to other members of the staff. When the
delegation of responsibility carries with it authority com-
mensurate to do the job, legal pitfalls will be fewer and
final results will be superior.

George feels that one of the legal problems concerning
the high school principal is the fact that too often the
principalship is classified and identified as "school
teacher" in school codes. The distinctions between working
conditions, responsibilities, rights, duties, and negotiat-
ing position of the role of the principal and that of the
teacher, are non-existent. Many times this creates a role
conflict for the principal and questions the legality of
his operation (26, p. 145).

Gauerke (25, p. 111) feels that the legal aspects of
the relationship of the employee to the school principal
provide some framework for staff commitment. Staff relation-
ships with reference to assignment to a particular job, pro-
gram of instruction, records, record keeping, rules and
regulations are influenced by the legal authority vested in
the executive head. Too often the manner in which the prin-
cipal views his position and the manner in which the position
is viewed by other staff members cause legal and ethical
problems that would not arise if there existed a clearer
understanding of the legal responsibilities for operation.

George B. Redfern (53, p. 21) relates that one of the
strong challenges to the legal authority of the principal
comes in the form of professional negotiations. Teachers are no longer content to leave to administrative discretion decisions regarding class size, teaching assignment, auxiliary duties, noon-day activities, playground supervision, pupil discipline, staff meetings, and similar matters, but insist upon bringing these topics more and more to the bargaining table to be settled on a system-wide basis (71, p. 16). Principals find that they are forced to alter their patterns of decision-making to accommodate concessions that staff members have gained at the bargaining table.

Epstein stated that teacher militancy is raising many questions about traditional hierarchical practices in public education (16, p. 187). It has affected all levels of school operation, including the board of trustees, the central administrative staff, the school principal, and the building staff. Teachers and staff members are coming to look upon the superintendent, the principal, and other administrators less as colleagues, educational leaders, and persons from whom they seek guidance and help; rather, administrators are increasingly viewed as managerial representatives of their employer who are barriers to the free exercise of the teachers' collective will. This forces a redefinition of the powers, the authority, and the range of discretion of the administrators.

Crowley (12, p. 36) states that future job descriptions of the principal are being written by state legislatures in
the form of professional negotiation laws that will set the pattern for a long time to come. As a number of decisions regarding the kind and amount of authority that administrators may exercise are brought to the bargaining table, the authority of the principal to administer the school is challenged.

Challenges to the principal's legal authority for operation come from other sources as well. Robert Turman feels that the position of the principal is obsolete, and predicts that it will be eliminated (70, p. 22). Others who would redefine and reorganize the system of educational operation see the position of principal as essential, with more need for clearly defined functions (67). While many educators call for more instructional leadership by the principal, some see the principalship as essentially a middle management position in the educational administration hierarchy, primarily implementing policies and decisions made by others in the chain of command (53, p. 22).

Some writers (44, p. 30) foresee the time that the principal might possibly return to the role of the principal-teacher, serving as the nominal head of the professional staff. Under this arrangement, the ability of the principal to get the job done would depend on his capability to provide professional leadership, rather than an inheritance accorded by his assignment to a position. Staff members would participate in the administrative process rather than be bypassed or be obligated to assume unsatisfactory roles.
The Texas Education Agency requires that principals, as well as other Texas administrators, meet certification requirements in order to maintain their position. So long as certification is a requirement for the principal, it is not likely that this position will be taken over by a person not qualified as a professional educator (64). Certification requirements are continually elevated by the Texas Education Agency, and these requirements are increased or decreased as the need arises.

Another challenge to the legal status of the high school principal comes in the form of civil suits brought by parents, students, or some member of the community. The Texas Association of Secondary School Principals (63) reported that more than a dozen high school principals were taken into court in 1970 for carrying out the responsibilities delegated to them by the superintendent and board of trustees. The legal authority for operation is being challenged in the courtroom. The courts are more and more requiring that principals show that the rights of students, teachers, and other citizens are not abused, and that due process is a consideration in administrative operation (1).

The courts have rigidly held to the theory that the type of control exercised by the principal over the operation of the school must be both reasonable and necessary to the best interest of the school. His actions, at least visibly, must be without malice or bad faith (25, p. 126).
Regardless of the legal authority vested in the high school principalship, Estes (17) recommends that principals consider the concept of shared authority. He feels that if all those concerned with the results of decision are involved in the decision-making process, not only will the challenges to the principals' authority be fewer, but the resulting operation will be more successful.

The Principal as the Instructional Leader

According to Shelton (59, p. 31), the main purpose of each school and each teacher is to teach each pupil in the school to think and to operate at his maximum efficiency. The principal must insure that the various demands upon his time do not cause the concern for the improvement of instruction to be placed in a position of low priority.

Eurich (18, p. 269) states that the principal has a strategic and vital role of leadership to insure that the school provides appropriate and quality education for every learner who can profit from such education. It is his responsibility to see that the school fulfills its obligation to serve the educational needs of its students. In so doing, the school justifies its very reason for existence.

Spears believes that the main concern of the principal should be that of establishing and maintaining the highest educational programs available for the students of his school. What happens in the classroom is inextricably
associated with the principal, even though curriculum planning and development is a cooperative enterprise in which teachers, learners, parents, and supervisory personnel all have a part to play. The principal coordinates the activities related to educational improvement, stimulating and encouraging staff members, students, and parents to achieve their individual goals (60, p. 46).

McGrew (45, p. 55) concluded that instructional leadership and instructional responsibility was implicit in the position of the principal if the number one priority of the school is instruction. If the principal is to attain the objective set forth by modern schools, he must emphasize this priority and accept the role that places him in the unique position as instructional leader and provides him the opportunity to display leadership characteristics. As the instructional leader, the principal must survey his surroundings and utilize the resources available for the improvement of instruction. The responsibility for instructional leadership cannot be fulfilled by the principal who allows administrative and supervisory functions to consume the major part of his working day.

Estes (17, p. 72) has stated that nothing is going to be very successful for very long unless it has the enthusiastic support of the principal. It is his responsibility to place priority in the form of financial resources, building
facilities, staff assignments, and the administrative effort toward the development of a quality program of instruction.

Trump (69) recognizes that the principal must face the problem of providing instructional leadership and still manage all the difficulties, operations, and opportunities that make demands upon the principal's working day. A solution to the dilemma would call for the principal to organize his time and his school so that he can place his highest priority where he knows it belongs, and still insure that the other responsibilities will be assumed by qualified staff members.

The uniqueness of school administration, when compared to the executive function of other organizations, is the primary emphasis upon teaching and learning. All administrative positions in the field of education have the very highest value for learning for boys and girls. All personnel are instructional staff either directly or indirectly. Some administrators and some personnel merely have more instructional duties and responsibilities than others, and some principals more readily accept the responsibility for instructional leadership than do others (49, p. 267).

Eurich insists that it is imperative that the high school in the present and future be organized, administered, and programmed so that the educational experiences of all concerned contribute maximally to their development and realization. The curriculum of the school must be selected
on the basis that it provide authentic and relevant content that will guarantee a meaningful educational opportunity (18, p. 272).

Michael (49, p. 267) stated that the greatest problem facing the secondary principal today is his attempt to fulfill this role as the instructional leader and as a manager of change, while his position continues to grow more precarious and untenable because of the developing schism between teachers, boards of education, and school administrators. He feels that principals must study their role carefully and evaluate it in terms of expected outcomes for the students of the community.

Gorman (28, p. 72) believes that the principal today must prepare the way for tomorrow's high school, as well as meet present responsibilities. He must become more aware of the dynamics in the present educational setting and more committed to his leadership role. The school principal is an indispensable agent in the organization dedicated to the purpose of achieving quality education for all students.

Eurich (18, p. 269) believes that there are only a relatively few principals who are committed completely to the role of instructional leader, and who are performing to a level that will give the role that status. The principal in the future must stimulate, coordinate, and direct a vastly improved learning environment. As educational leader and statesman he should be able to facilitate change and
innovation. The principal must play a responsible role in policy development and implementation. He must assist in clarifying and interpreting the aims and functions of the school. He must foster the full professional growth and participation of all staff members in the development, selection, and evaluation of programs in order to guarantee equal educational opportunities for all students in the school. He is responsible for enlisting community understanding of, and support for, the resources that will provide instructional and learning effectiveness. Only to the degree that the principal assumes this distinctive position of institutional leadership will the high school fulfill its mission.

Trump (67) explains in Images of Future II how the principal must organize the high school in order to expedite instructional improvement. The principal must realize that it is important that he knows where he is going. He must read widely, listen to teachers and other experts, and reflect on the pressures that come from many sources. He must have developed a sound set of values so that he knows for the present what needs to happen in his school, and he should have plans that will allow these things to happen.

Trump (67) further envisions the principal as having abandoned the traditional office, and instead, he sees the principal placing the highest priority where it belongs, on the improvement of instruction involving teaching and learn-
75 percent of his time involved with solving instructional problems and improving the teaching-learning process.

Watson (71, p. 2) concluded that the instructional leader must keep instruction and learning foremost in his own planning, making certain they are central to all school deliberations. This leadership is demonstrated by adapting the school's program and procedures to the requirements of individual students and being sensitive to the needs of individual teachers. The leader helps to establish and clarify short and long-range school goals. As instructional leader, the principal develops ideas for program, curriculum, and organization, as well as acting as a catalyst for innovative thinking and action by others. He shows by the use of his time how important the improvement of instruction really is, regardless of whether his school is large or small.

The Principal and Executive Management

Shaver (58, p. 2) reports that management is an essential function of the principal and must be executed effectively to insure the most efficient operation of the school. The principal will determine operational duties that must be done, and then decide those tasks that he must perform and those that can be assigned to other members of the school administrative team. He retains the responsibility for the successful execution of all managerial phases of the
administration. Today's principal averages a fifty-hour week on school work and other directly related activities. He spends much of his time on the management function either because he views his role as proprietor of the operation or because the administrative structure is so inadequate or inefficient that he has difficulty in delegating managerial responsibility to others. It is of vital importance that principals select and organize a capable staff that can assist in the successful performance of most managerial tasks.

Estes (17, p. 71) related that no institution can realize its purpose if somebody does not see that priorities are established, strategies are developed and coordinated, and progress is systematically assessed. To fulfill these responsibilities, that person must have commensurate authority. Yet in the democratic climate of American schools, this authority will be more a matter of professional respect gained than power delegated to him by boards of trustees, the superintendent, or other agencies.

The key to effective organization in any enterprise is responsibility. The principal must be given more responsibility for his school—responsibility in terms of intended results (28, p. 120).

Autonomy, authority, and freedom to act are essential to responsibility. Today's high school principal, with rare
exception, is not granted the autonomy he needs to become an effective educational leader (28, p. 120).

Meade (47, pp. 192-93) reports in a speech to the secondary school principals that other forces are merging, each wanting a hand on the wheel, each wanting to play a significant role in the governance of schools. Previously, governance was a term much used by political scientists. Today it is being used more and more by parents and taxpayers of local school districts. In some communities it is an issue being raised by the teachers, and in some communities the idea of governance is in the minds of students. No one can be sure how this issue will be resolved. Most educators hope that the governance of schools will be a responsibility shared among the community, school board, superintendent, principal, administrative staff, teachers, and students.

Michael stated that many factors have combined to challenge the historic role of the principal as executive manager of the educational program at the building level. He felt that a problem of great significance has been created by the differences over professional negotiations which seem to be developing among teachers, boards of education, and the chief school administrators (49, pp. 106-107).

Epstein concluded that principals find certain things being written into agreements by negotiations groups which are unmanageable and impractical. Some of the items which are included in negotiations agreements are viewed to be
educationally harmful and professionally unjustifiable. Principals are beginning to seek a more clearly defined role at the bargaining table to maintain their position as executive manager of the schools and to produce more workable and satisfactory negotiations agreements (16, p. 188).

Principals have realized for some time that managerial duties have taken so much time from the working day that instructional leadership has not been fully effective. As more demands are made for the principal to exercise instructional leadership, the executive management role must be more clearly defined. No one expects the principal to abandon his managerial or administrative role to become an instructional leader; however, the flexibility of the principal's power should allow him to do both. The present conditions demand that he exercise greater directional leadership in the quest for the excellence which public education deserves. The principal must rise to the occasion by using his own personal talents, education, and foresightedness to lead his staff, students, and community toward establishing a realistic, creative, and far-reaching climate for the improvement of instruction (58, p. 13).

Realization of the instructional leadership role in this day has been less than adequate. The reason for this has been largely because the principal has been unable or unwilling to make the transition from the administrative management concerns about running the school and attending
to housekeeping chores, to institutional leadership ideals which presume a high level of educational vision and statesmanship (18, p. 269).

Meade (47, pp. 194-195) reported that community relations in many instances are demanding all the talents and skills that principals can muster to prevent, or bring together, the splits that are apt to occur among the many segments of a school community. Community groups, concerned and often alienated, are acting as individuals, groups, and elected agencies to protect what they feel is their inherent right to determine policies in the schools. The handling of confrontation or the avoidance of confrontation is the key objective of the principal when relating to groups who are dedicated to acquiring a greater role in policy determination.

Michael (49, p. 107) reports that one of the key concerns of the high school principal is to establish the role of educational leadership and maintain a successful management operation when faced with many other challenges that arise from within the school and within the community. There is no simple solution for preparing principals for these roles. Educators have not been able to agree on the characteristics of successful leaders, although there have been attempts at educated guesses. There is considerable evidence that intelligence is a major factor and that more attention should be paid to this characteristic than has been
evidenced in the past. No longer can administrators function solely on the basis of being an authority. Principals will need to possess whatever personal characteristics that can be identified as being related to a man who leads because he is a leader.

The Principal and Accountability

Schwartz (56, p. 32) reports that Albert H. Quie indicated a dissatisfaction with bench marks that educators have historically used as evidence that education is accomplishing what it is designed to accomplish. He viewed "accountability" as soon replacing "relevance" as the "in word" among educators. In its broadest sense, accountability in education means that schools will be held responsible for the improvement or lack of improvement in the performance of their students.

Estes observed that proof of performance more and more is being accepted by professionals as a normal requirement of their profession. The public has demonstrated a desire for knowledge regarding the use of resources, success of programs, and procedures for action (17, p. 72).

Schwartz (56, p. 31) reported that schoolmen overwhelmingly approved of the growing call for accountability in education. According to a nationwide poll conducted in early May by Nation's Schools, accountability was recognized as a positive movement in education by the superintendents involved in the study.
Gaines (23, p. 55) suggested that educators utilize the surge for accountability of job performance. She felt that accountability offers an opportunity for educators to save their profession and raise it to new levels of respectability and status, and to bridge the gap between them and their various publics. While the public realizes that schools cannot be held accountable for everything, the distance between not being accountable for everything and not being accountable for anything is quite a measure. The public cannot be expected to accept the idea that the schools are vital to the general health and welfare of this nation if schools cannot promise to bring about any of the outcomes expected of institutions which are vital to the nation's welfare.

Lessinger (39, p. 32) found that many leaders in politics, as well as in education, welcomed the concept of accountability on the basis of their own observations. Many spoke in favor of accountability. The agreement between the board of education in the city of New York and the teachers' union highlights the goal of accountability in its preamble. The superintendent of schools in San Diego issued a forceful policy statement for his district, declaring that the school system must be accountable for educational results, and that programs and practices must be designed so that they can be evaluated in terms of educational outcomes as they relate to program costs.
Lessinger (39, p. 107) further reports that President Nixon sent a special message on educational reform to Congress, which included a proposal calling upon the school system to begin the responsible, open measurement of how well the educational process is working. Nixon firmly endorsed the concept of accountability.

Epstein (16, p. 23), when reporting on professional negotiations, insisted that one of the things discussed as not being negotiable is the question of accountability. The principle of accountability is one which should never be overlooked in determining negotiability of any item. When something goes wrong in a school, it is the principal who is most often held accountable.

Buskin reported that taxpayers are no longer sitting still for the yearly 10 percent increase in educational expenditures. They are no longer willing to swallow the old cliché that more and more money is needed for quality education. They are saying, in effect, "Show us what we are getting for our money." Principals are being asked to plan their programs in terms of procedures that allow for the measurement of the performance of the programs, and pinpoint accountability for their success or failure. Principals are studying concepts that can enable them to show the taxpayer and the board what is required to run a good school program. (6, p. 64).
Schwartz (56, p. 33) reports that many agencies are examining performance contracting in an attempt to satisfy the public demand for accountability for performance. Many educators still feel that performance contracting needs further evaluation. This does not exclude the principal from seeking ways to provide information concerning his own performance.

Gaines (23, p. 58) stated that the accountability scheme recently discussed in New York City for teachers is a design that does not fix responsibility. In essence, it gives an educational accounting system, not an "accountable" system. The public does not object to such a system, but neither does it accept it as a substitute for a system of accountability. The New York City design talks of collective responsibility of the school staff for knowing as much as it can about the pupils, and the collective responsibility of the staff to use this knowledge as best it can to maximize the development of the pupil toward defined performance and objectives. The evident question is, "How can a staff be collectively responsible for anything? How can the concept be made operational? If students collectively fail, are staff members to be held responsible separately or collectively?"

The role of the principal carries with it certain expectations for behavior and performance that derive from many sources, notably from what are known as principals'
reference groups (28, p. 13). When the principal acts and performs in an expected manner, he is conforming to the role of expectations held for him by his reference groups. There are certain individuals and groups, both within and outside the school system, who hold certain expectations for the principal's role and assess his effectiveness in terms of the extent to which he meets these expectations.

No one can be an effective administrator for very long unless he engages in administrative planning, activities, and behavior. He must be prepared to be held accountable for these plans, activities, and behavior (17, p. 69). Accountability will be accomplished when those who have some power in the business of education are willing to look critically at themselves (73, p. 504).

Meade (47, p. 196) was convinced that administrators must be able to account in reasonable ways for what is mandated to be done in schools, or face the possibility of losing their acquired rights to govern the schools. Realizing that the schools are public domain, it is, therefore, easy to make a case for governance by community. The schools serve the students, and the teachers represent the majority in the professional ranks. If principals default on the question of accountability, they will lose their right to govern and will become more technicians than governors.

Gaines (23, p. 55) described a useful accountability system as one that would provide educators with what they
need to know in order to be successful in their work. First, they would find out what is expected of them because the parents and the public would, at long last, have to deal with the overly inclusive, often conflicting set of expectations, and set forth agreed-upon goals. This means that goals would be agreed upon between district parents, administrators, principals, and teaching staff. Second, having agreed upon what is expected of them, principals could learn the extent to which they are, or are not, meeting those expectations. They could take that information and use it to help search out, in a clear and concise way, those practices and programs which hold promise of helping them learn to behave in such a way as to meet the expectations successfully. Finally, the performance of the principal is the most critical determinant of the undertaking to improve the position of the high school principalship. His performance will provide the real measure of accountability.

The Principal and the Superintendent and Board of Trustees

Evans (20, p. 86) sees the principal in present-day school operation as the chief school administrator's representative in the actual day-to-day administration of the high school. The high school principal has many obligations as he coordinates his leadership efforts with those of the superintendent, the central office staff, and the board of trustees.
Williams (73, p. 55) reports that the basic duties and functions of the principal are determined by the superintendent and the board of trustees, and are usually stated in the administrative policy book. Most of the principal's relationships with the superintendent and his staff will stem from supervisory and administrative tasks as the school's educational leader. Local school autonomy must be recognized by the principal to be a concept that is largely determined by the attitude of the superintendent. The freedom and authority with which the principal executes the operations of the school will exist as the result of his administrative ability and the philosophy of the superintendent and board of education. The professional attitude of the principal toward his superiors should be unquestioned. The principal should communicate regularly with the superintendent and his staff regarding various aspects of the school program.

The position of the principal has been referred to by some educators (47, 49) as that of middle management. His relationship to the building staff and his responsibility to the superintendent of schools have sometimes placed him in a position of role conflict. The many varied elements of school operation have sometimes found the desires of the staff and the will of the superintendent to be in direct conflict. This often happens during times of professional negotiations between the staff and the school administration and the board of trustees. Brandt (4) saw the principal as clearly
being drawn toward the management role; however, the traditional loyalties of the principal are under stress. Sometimes principals have found it desirable to shield and buffer their staff members from the central office and the board of trustees. At other times they have perceived their role to be a part of management. When the principal's role is clearly defined, this conflict should be lessened or nonexistent.

Brandt and others (4, 16, 47) considered it essential for the principal to be represented on the district negotiating team. The feeling was that since agreements which are administered at the building level are reached in negotiations, principals should be designated to participate on the superintendent's negotiating team. Principals generally view their absence from professional negotiations as being an abnormal, if not threatening, situation. Principals feel that their relationship to the superintendent and board of trustees would be more clearly defined, and that the resulting negotiations agreement would represent a more workable and more practical plan, if they were members of the negotiating team.

In most school districts today, the high school principal is only one of a number of administrators responsible to the superintendent. Administrative regulations and formula frequently control organizational practices in individual schools. It should be recognized that organizational
structure should not restrict the realization of the goals of the schools. It is predicted that the changing role of the principal will be accompanied by changes in the role of other administrators and will assist in developing a system-wide team to facilitate the implementation of the changes desired, as well as encouraging innovation in the organizational practices in individual schools. The principal in the future will continue to be responsible for the total educational enterprise in the school he serves, while fulfilling the responsibilities delegated by the superintendent and the board of trustees (18, pp. 270-271).

The Principal and the Staff

It is useful to think of the principal as a manager of human resources. According to Melton (48, p. 24), this entails organizing and developing the teaching staff into a coherent unit committed to creating the best possible situation for students. It involves building a competent, balanced, professionally alert staff through sound selection, thorough orientation, and continuing in-service activities. This staff is not limited to those professionals who are involved only with instruction. The comprehensive high school provides many services that utilize employees who are non-certified and who do not hold college degrees. When considering the principal's personnel management responsibilities, consideration must be given to his relationship with
the ancillary workers as well as with his instructional staff (9).

Trump (67, 69) discussed in detail the principal's responsibility for organizing the administrative and supervisory staff within the building. He felt that this was a vital function in personnel management, in order for each staff member to work up to his potential, and to allow the principal to devote the necessary time to the supervision of instruction. Better use of the human resources is a critical factor in the present and future high school. How the school's resources, human and material, are used will determine more than anything else how effectively the organization achieves its goals.

Gorman (28, pp. 157-158) states that there are three basic reasons for the inclusion of careful attention to problems of teacher personnel in the principal's work. First, he states that the teacher is a single most important ingredient in a recipe that is to result in a quality school. Second, for twenty-five years the average high school has had little choice in the selection and employment of teachers. Third, an expanding employment of both technological and professional staff members demands extensive reexamination in the utilization of teachers' energy.

As the executive head of the school, the principal usually has a major role in the hiring, assigning, supervising, promoting, and sometimes dismissing teachers. In order-
to carry out these responsibilities, he must develop a careful plan for personnel management and supervision. This plan should be cooperatively developed with those who are to be supervised, and every effort should be made to see that this plan is operational (59, p. 31).

Shaver related that the principal is concerned with a number of critical problems in personnel management which demand some resolution. One of these problems is the determination of the relative status and role of the principal and the teacher. Another problem concerns the entire complexity of conflicts and disturbing realities which are created by the school as an organization operating under public direction in a complex society. A third problem involves the actual task of identifying and evaluating the performance and behavior of a diversified staff (58, p. 18).

In an article to the National Association of Secondary School Principals, Taffel (62, p. 72) stated that the introduction of trade unionism in the staff and school board relations has brought a marked change in the position of all school supervisory personnel. The effect of professional negotiations has been to isolate the principal between the school board and the negotiating unit. The introduction of a militant teacher ideology, resulting from the negotiations process, has produced a separation between the principal and his staff. The friendly professionalism which has characterized the relationship between the principal and the
individual staff member has been replaced by a more formal and impersonal relationship with the bargaining agents.

According to Epstein (16, p. 188), when teachers and staff members seek to bypass the superintendent and go directly to the board of education, they are either ignoring the principal or they are including him in their negotiating unit. Either course severely limits administrative prerogatives which have previously existed within the school society.

Shaver reports that a power struggle exists within the educational profession between the teacher on the one hand and the boards of education on the other. This teacher activism has changed, and will continue to change, the framework of convention which has characterized traditional ideas of the principalship (58, p. 29).

Shannon (57, p. 52) observed that negotiations and negotiating powers give employees a voice in determining their working conditions, and this voice affects the administrative and educational policies established by the school. The power of employees to challenge the authority of the principal necessitates that the duties and responsibilities of school administrators be clearly defined.

The function of personnel management is an area of administrative responsibility that has been significantly influenced by the negotiating power of employees, and schools are not free from this influence. Staff members want to
negotiate with the superintendent and board of trustees decisions affecting their working conditions and staff relationships. Whether the principal is involved in the negotiation procedures, or is bypassed in the process, his role in personnel management is challenged by the building staff (71, p. 16).

Estes (17, p. 72) stated that administrators must work more closely with staff members and share the responsibilities for the school's activities. The cooperative effort of all staff members in developing, organizing, and operating procedures for personnel management provides a solution to the problems of the relationship between the principal and the staff. Staff involvement in the planning, operating, and evaluating of the school's total program narrows the gap between the administration and the staff.

The Principal and the Students

Through custom, control of students' activities is the task of the teachers and the principal in each building. The principal's basic responsibility is to determine that the school's overall program provides the essential ingredients to equip each student to meet the demands of a life in this democratic society (38, p. 64).

Weisbord (72, p. 18) related that, while education may be free in America, nobody is free to refuse to be educated. It is the inevitable fate of every citizen, whether he likes it or not. A business can choose its employees or employees
can choose the business for which they wish to work. The public schools and students, for better or worse, are stuck with each other. The schools are expected to provide the growing generation with the tools to master the challenges of an increasingly complex technological society, and the burden has been placed on school principals of opening new paths to individual fulfillment, making the promise of America an avenue broad enough for all to travel.

Jones (37) revealed that recent developments have suggested that students want to have a greater voice in the decisions which affect the quality of their education. As teachers are pressing for more and more voice in decision-making processes, students will be encouraged to do likewise; they also want a more significant part in the governing of schools. Examples of student activity can be found in the high schools in small towns and suburban centers as well as in the large metropolitan centers. The mechanism of student dissent continues to spread very rapidly.

A survey (17, p. 69; 35, pp. 4-5) conducted by the National Association of Secondary School Principals showed that protest activities were widespread among the school students and that the movement was on an increase. Fifty-nine percent of the respondents indicated that some form of protest had occurred in their schools. Eighty-two percent of the principals of schools which had experienced protest said that school regulations were under attack, while
45 percent indicated that it was the school's instructional program that was being criticized.

Students are not the only ones who are dissatisfied with what they see in schools. In many places, parents and community members are dissatisfied with the problems they view to be significant within the educational study. Results of the second annual Gallup Poll (24, p. 35) show that the United States population considered lack of discipline as the school's biggest problem. In the more recent survey reported in 1971, discipline moved to third place behind finance and integration.

A report prepared for the United States Office of Education by researchers at the University of Michigan analyzed teacher and student views on high school disorders. It identified five causes as being most contributive to school disruption. Interracial tension, outside agitators, permissive upbringing, adolescent rebelliousness, and disrespect for teachers were reported as significant influences for dissatisfaction and resulting disruptions. When teachers were asked what changes in the school they would like to see to meet the current phase of student activism, the report stated that "how to discipline," followed by "changes in the curriculum" and "better administration" were the most popular responses. Teachers also were reported as recommending that the influence of superintendents be decreased and the influence of principals and teachers be increased while
maintaining the current level of student influence (2, pp. 2-3).

Reports from the Ford and Danforth Foundations (22, p. 2) suggested that at least two items from the students' point of view be considered. Since it was widespread student dissent that forced a critical look at the schools, the conference concluded that students' views regarding learning activities were important considerations. Students want these activities to be exciting and alive, related to their own feelings and problems and to the important issues that shape the world they will inherit. The other issue concerned the desire by students to be treated with respect and credited with the same needs for status, influence, power, achievement, and a feeling of self-worth that principals, teachers, or parents have, despite any differences in age or values. The first issue has to do with curriculum, teaching style, and the subject matter appropriate to education, while the second has to do with the management of education, the pattern of politics, and the exercise of power in the schools.

Ultimately it will be the high school principal who determines whether or not the climate within the school assists in developing the relationship between principal, teachers, and students to allow solutions to the problems without the need of dissent and disruption. Gorman (28, p. 120) suggests that teachers encourage a student to follow
his own initiative and try out his own ideas without fear that the administration would oppose the procedures. Too often the pursuit of pupil initiative is so disturbing to the organization that it is discouraged, and the innovative teacher frequently gives up; the student stops trying to become thoroughly and absorbingly involved. It is so much easier for all to beat the same rhythm on the same drum.

Weisbord (72, p. 26) suggests that educational institutions increasingly abandon the comforts of *in loco parentis* and examine critically, as students increasingly have, the distinction between those privileges which may be withheld and those that should be denied on the basis of sound school operations.

On the basis of the United States Office of Education study of student unrest, Anrig (2, pp. 2-3) suggested the following procedures as alternatives to student disruption and dissent. He recommended that principals (1) work toward the shared power concept with teachers, students, and parents, (2) seek alternatives to the "tight ship" syndrome, (3) develop new and broader areas of communication with students, and (4) organize the learning activities to provide a greater relevancy to the world of work, and relevancy to the community with which the school identifies. He will fulfill his responsibility for establishing a climate in school that will make disruptive conflict unnecessary, and channel
diversity in such a way that it builds a strong, more uni-
ified student body (17, p. 70).

The Principal and the Parents
and Citizens

McCloskey (43) recognized that maintaining cooperative
working relationships with citizens who support schools is
an essential element of public communication. Creating
arrangements which encourage participation in school affairs
complies with democratic principles affirming that citizens
have rights and obligations to be informed about public
services, to help formulate public policy, and to contribute
thought and energy to the general well-being. Participation
increases the individual's interest in education and willing-
ness to support the schools.

Hillson (33, pp. 119-120) indicated that failing to
communicate with parents and citizens often results in the
failure of school programs to achieve their intended goals.
Citizens tend to be wary and suspicious of activities that
have been developed without their participation and are im-
plemented without their full understanding. Principals who
demonstrate a lack of confidence in their school publics by
failing to develop their trust, cooperation, and understand-
ing, can expect these publics to demonstrate a lack of con-
fidence in the programs of the school.

Williams (73, p. 458) stated that the high school prin-
cipal must be aware of the ever-present desire of parents
and the community members to be informed about the school and its program. Well established direct lines of communication from the school to the home provide dramatic evidence of the school's search for academic excellence and citizenship development. The high school should develop a well-written, documented statement concerning its own concept of good school-community relations. All policy statements should place the school in its proper perspective as a defender of community interest and the proprietor in planning the school's program cooperatively with the community.

The public school actually owes its origin and much of its development to the interest and effort of its citizens (43, pp. 386-387). The governing body of Massachusetts, in 1647, reflected the views of citizens by establishing rules and regulations providing for the education of the children of the communities. As communities grew larger and more complex, citizens recognized that they could no longer formulate and administer all local government policies in town meetings. Local boards of trustees were delegated the responsibility for studying facts and shaping policies related to the educational program. The electors would be periodically asked to approve policies and procedures for the operation of the educational program. Citizens' interest in education still continues as individuals and groups express either well or poorly informed opinions and exert
either enlightened or unenlightened efforts to modify educational programs.

Eurich (18, p. 274) feels that the future school authorities will be expected to give citizens the opportunity to know, understand, and influence the development of their schools. Community involvement will be essential to the resolution of problems and issues related to the role of the school concerning change, innovation, and decision making. History demonstrates that progress is beneficial, and progress requires change aimed at improvement of existing arrangements (43, p. 396). A rational means of making affirmative decisions about the way of meeting new educational demands is especially important in this era of rapid change. Those who oppose essential curriculum developments deprive children of opportunity and jeopardize the security of progress of all citizens.

Thoughtful means of deciding what parents and community members favor are more useful than their protests about what they are against. The Gallup Poll (24, p. 33) is one of many measurements of public opinion available to school administrators. When principals work closely with all elements of the community, an understanding of the public's needs and desires will be readily available. Working to develop public services that meet today's needs in the expanding capacities for better living is as essential as
opposing those ideas and programs disliked by community members (43, p. 390).

Casavis (8, p. 213) evaluates the school in the future in terms of the principal-community relationship. The responsibility of the parent will be more involved and time consuming than in today's schools. Attempts will be made to provide orientation and instruction to parents and citizens concerning existing school problems and changes in curriculum. The development of the citizens as active and responsible team members will be an important factor in school programs. The popularity of offering falsely simple answers to complicated problems, or ignoring difficulties that must be faced, should be replaced by the responsibility for the more complex and urgent task of thinking of facts and ideas essential for improvement (43, p. 397).

If the school of the future is to function as a social service complex completely involving parents and citizens, as well as their governmental representatives, the principal of the future will be the educational catalyst of the local school enterprise (8, p. 215). The role of an educational innovator, a prime mover in activating community support and a chairman in working with various teacher, parent, and student action groups, will necessitate orientation and training for the principal that prepare him as a skilled community worker. The ability of principals to be truly secure in their roles, and maintain themselves as professional educators,
will be influenced by their perceptions of established role definitions for the principal and the educational staff.
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CHAPTER III

COLLECTION OF DATA

Investigation of the Development of H.B. 235

This investigation had two basic purposes: (1) an understanding of the circumstances that brought this legislation into being, and (2) an awareness of the intent of the legislation by the educational and political leaders who conceived it and proposed its enactment.

The investigation consisted of the examination of records, documents, and transcripts concerning the proposal and passage of the legislation, beginning in part with communication with Cecil Redd, then president of the Texas Association of Secondary School Principals. This communication led to written correspondence and a commitment to assist in the study. Redd also recommended that Harold Massey, executive secretary of the Texas Association of Secondary School Principals, could be a valuable asset to the study because of his influence in the development of the legislation. A letter to Massey established a willingness to cooperate in the study. He identified Senator Ralph Hall and Representative Dan Kubiak as the legislators who sponsored the bill in their respective legislative bodies.
It was decided that personal interviews with these four men would add to the study, especially in determining the intent of H.B. 235. The first interview took place early in May with Cecil Redd and Harold Massey. Data obtained in this interview set the stage for future interviews of more detail and assisted in developing the survey instrument to be used later. Meetings were arranged with Senator Hall and Representative Kubiak during the special session of the legislature. After meeting with these men and collecting data from their records, an investigation of the files of the legislative reference library was conducted. A complete description of the proceedings of legislative action which resulted in H.B. 235 was made available. Copies of the first printing, committee action, amendments, and the statute in its final form were obtained (2).

A detailed interview with Harold Massey was conducted in an attempt to clarify and organize the data (3). Arrangements were made to continue communication with these educational and political leaders in order to verify the data, clarify the information, and establish conclusions. The findings from these procedures are reported in Chapter IV and related to one of the purposes of the study.

Establishment of the Population for Sampling

One of the major purposes of this study was to determine the impact of H.B. 235 on the role of the high school
principal. Even though high school principals could provide data for the study, it was determined that a more complete investigation could be accomplished if superintendents and college professors were surveyed as well. The perceptions of university professors who train high school principals, and superintendents, who select, assign, and supervise these principals, added to the perceptions of the high school principals and gave sufficient range of data to draw conclusions about the legislation.

Construction of the Initial Survey Questionnaire

The main purpose of the survey instrument was to gain the perceptions of the selected groups of educators regarding the impact of H.B. 235 on the role of the high school principal. It was also important to evaluate the legislation in terms of its overall strengths and weaknesses and to determine which factors, if any, had limited its effectiveness. Each item for the survey instrument was selected on the basis of its ability to furnish data that would assist in answering questions designed to investigate the impact of H.B. 235 on the role of the high school principal. The basic questions, and the items related to these questions, were selected on the basis of their association to the role of the principal and their relevance to the legislation. Three to five items were related to each basic question to be answered, and so designated in the survey instrument.
A review of related literature and a close study of H.B. 235 were the bases for selecting the basic questions to be answered and the initial items to be related to these questions. Some items were related to the weaknesses and limitations of the legislation to allow for the development of additional recommendations. The advice of a university professor, a superintendent, and a high school principal was initially used in making the proper selection of the questions and related items. The items were then written and responses to them were developed. The instrument was then submitted to an advisory panel.

Selection of the Advisory Panel

It was decided to use an advisory panel that would be somewhat representative of the sampling groups and that would do some of the same kinds of things that a jury panel would be asked to do. The advisory panel was composed of three high school principals, three superintendents, two university professors, and the president of the Texas Association of Secondary School Principals. Each was contacted and asked to assist in the study and each agreed to do so. The panel was given directions for marking the initial questionnaire and assisting in developing and selecting valid items.
Validation of the Initial Questionnaire

The purpose of this procedure was to select valid items, eliminate invalid items, add worthwhile items, and reconstruct items which were not clear. The advisory panel was used to assist in the process.

Each member was instructed to judge each survey item on the basis of its clarity and its appropriateness for providing information for the study. A rating scale from one to three was provided for each item. Members of the panel were asked to rate the item "1" only if it was satisfactory to include in the instrument. A "2" rating was given to items that lacked clarity or caused indecision. Items inappropriate or unrelated were rated "3." Space was available for comment regarding each item so that the experience and knowledge of each panel member could be fully utilized in the development of a valid survey instrument.

Construction of the Final Questionnaire

The advisory panel approved a majority of the items on the initial survey instrument. Recommendations were mostly centered at wording changes, providing for responses that would be mutually exclusive, and providing for perceptions in both positive and negative direction. There were strong indications that a Likert scale for responses was worth consideration. Only a small number of the items were ruled inappropriate by a significant number of panel members.
The final questionnaire was constructed after making the changes in the initial questionnaire that seemed appropriate from the recommendations of the panel. Changes in wording and construction were incorporated when the purpose of the item was not affected.

Selecting a Jury Panel

A jury panel was selected for the purpose of validating the final survey questionnaire. It was decided to use a nine-member panel and attempt to have it closely representative of the populations to be sampled by choosing three high school principals, three superintendents, and three university professors. The size of the institutions and their locations within the state were considerations in selecting this panel. The doctoral advisory committee was asked to approve the membership of the jury panel on the basis of the perceptions of the committee regarding the experience, education, and background of prospective jury members. The qualifications earlier mentioned were also considered.

Validating the Final Survey Questionnaire

The final questionnaire was submitted to the jury panel with instructions similar to those received by the advisory panel. Each member was asked to rate each item on the basis of its clarity, its appropriateness, and the probability that it would provide the necessary information. The rating scale was arranged in the matrix.
jury member circled "1," it was an indication that this was an appropriate item; circling "2" indicated that the item was unclear; circling "3" indicated that the item was not appropriate. Jury members were asked to make comments whenever they felt an improvement was desirable or necessary.

It had been determined that six votes of approval for an item would represent a two-thirds majority and that this would be sufficient for the validation of an item.

Selection of Samples

It had previously been decided to sample populations of high school principals, superintendents, and professors of educational administration. Since the populations of high school principals and school superintendents were each to be divided into four categories, representing the various sizes of school districts, a sample representing 15 percent of each of the four categories for high school principals and each of the four categories for superintendents was sufficient to represent the total population. Since there are only a small number of colleges and universities accredited and active in developing secondary school principals in Texas, it appeared appropriate to sample the total population by selecting a professor from each institution actively involved in educational administration. This was accomplished by referring to the College Blue Book (1) for the list of colleges and universities who qualified for the population
described, and by contacting the Texas Education Agency for an approved list. A letter was sent to the Dean of Education for each institution listed asking him to verify that they were accredited for certifying secondary school principals, and to identify the professor in his institution most responsible for this field of instruction. All institutions responded and professors were identified for the survey.

Identifying samples for school districts proved to be a more difficult task. The districts were to be divided into four categories, according to the number in average daily attendance. This was accomplished by using data provided by the Texas State Teachers Association, the Texas Education Agency, and the University Interscholastic League. Lists of districts, the school superintendents, and the high schools represented were compiled, using the three sources of information previously mentioned.

A table of random numbers was utilized to insure randomization of the selection of the samples. The beginning number was selected by asking an unbiased individual to select a number to represent the column and a number to represent the row. From this starting point, numbers were chosen by moving horizontally, using the last three digits of the number in the table. Numbers larger than the population were disregarded. Since the list of principals and list of superintendents were arranged in the same order, and the same
random number was used for each group and each category, the samples included principals and superintendents of the same school district. This was done purposely, to insure homogeneity of the samples to be compared.

Establishing the Significance of Responses

One of the important procedures in this study was the establishment of the range of responses necessary to enable conclusions of significance to be drawn and the range of responses necessary to allow conclusions of major significance to be drawn. This was done by submitting possible score ranges to five educational experts who were familiar with the study, the legislation, and the populations to be surveyed. These experts were asked to recommend the range of responses to indicate significance and the range of responses to indicate major significance. The five ranges recommended by the experts for each decision were arranged in order of size. Sixty-five percent was the median for significance and 80 percent was the median for major significance.

Administration of the Final Questionnaire

The final questionnaire was written as validated, with only minor changes. To make major changes at this point would have caused an invalid instrument to be submitted.

The survey instrument was commercially printed on nine
page and an introductory letter were attached. The questionnaire was sent to potential respondents in a brown envelope, nine inches by twelve inches, that would avoid the need for folding. Commercial printing was used for the return address and mailing address on the stamped envelope provided for the return of the instrument. A personal copy of H.B. 235 was printed and enclosed as a memento to the respondent, and as assurance that no confusion could exist concerning the nature of the legislation. These procedures were used to add to the prestige of the survey in hope that respondents would be motivated to give it careful and immediate attention.

After the first replies to the survey were returned, a second survey was sent to those who had failed to respond. This effort yielded additional responses. A third contact was made with those who had still not yet responded; this time the recipients were asked to at least return the form, giving some indication that their lack of response was by their own choice. Responses exceeding two-thirds of the samples resulted from this approach, and all reasonable efforts were made to insure that the responses were truly representative of the total sample selected. As a result, the conclusions were based on a total return of 233 responses, comprised of 70 percent of the principals, 71 percent of the superintendents, and 100 percent of the professors identified and selected for the study. These responses exceeded
the level of two-thirds response that was established as a satisfactory standard.

A tabulation of the number of respondents participating in the study showed a return of 233 questionnaires from 325 respondents selected, giving a return in excess of 71 percent. The number of returns from principals showed 20 returns from 29 samples in Category I, 34 returns from 51 samples in Category II, 20 returns from 30 samples in Category III, and 43 returns from 57 samples in Category IV, for a total of 117 returns from 167 samples. The number of returns from superintendents showed 8 returns from 8 samples in Category I, 35 returns from 51 samples in Category II, 22 returns from 30 samples in Category III, and 39 returns from 57 samples in Category IV, for a total of 104 returns from 146 samples. Twelve professors were sampled and all twelve responded.

The data collected are reported in Chapter IV. These data were related to one of the purposes of the study and provided the information necessary for developing conclusions, inferences, and recommendations.
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CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF DATA

The purposes of this study were to analyze the development and provisions of H.B. 235 and to determine the impact of its implementation upon the role of the high school principal. The data presented in Chapter IV are divided into twelve sections. Each section reports data related to one of the twelve questions for which answers were sought in attempting to achieve the purposes of the study.

Data from the Investigation Related to Question I

The purposes of the investigation of the development of H.B. 235 were twofold. First, the investigation attempted to determine what steps and procedures were necessary to bring about this legislative action to assist public education. Second, the investigation attempted to determine the intent of the legislature and the educational leaders who were instrumental in writing and proposing the legislation.

H.B. 235 originated from the office of the executive secretary of the Texas Association of Secondary School Principals. This position, manned presently by Harold Massey, has many functions, one of which is to act as liaison between the association and the legislators. Massey stated the
reasoning for H.B. 235 as follows:

The Executive Secretary is required to keep abreast of the events within the state and within the nation that affect the educational process. Through research, observation, correspondence, and communications there developed an awareness that the principal, especially at the secondary level, faced a nearly impossible task. The performance of the duties related to the position and the defense against the challenges that protested the right of the principal to act on behalf of the school district required more resources than many principals possessed. In some areas within the nation, the operation of schools was being assigned to persons who had not prepared for educational administration. Legislative action appeared to be one of the most effective ways to combat the dilemma (3).

Several drafts were made of the proposed legislation to insure that it defined what needed to be defined, and avoided defining the functions that required reasonable amounts of flexibility. According to Massey (4), some of the statements purposely included in the proposal intended to (1) define who could be a school principal, (2) emphasize that administrative management, as well as instructional leadership, were duties of the principal, supervised by the superintendent, (3) place the principal directly responsible for staff evaluation, recommendation, selection, and assignment, (4) provide for student discipline through the efforts of the principal, (5) avoid changing or restricting the superintendent's responsibilities, and (6) avoid encroaching upon the authority of the boards of trustees.

The proposal was referred to both the legislative committee and the board of directors of the Texas Association
of Secondary School Principals. Upon their recommendation, the Texas State Teachers Association was asked to recommend this proposal. This group gave serious study to the document, especially to the section related to personnel management. The president of the Texas Association of School Administrators verified the superintendents' support for the proposal and negated any feeling that the section related to personnel management violated the authority of superintendents. Massey (3) summed up the feelings of the associations by saying, "It was not the intent or the attempt, by statement or interpretation, to encroach upon or usurp the authority or the responsibilities of the superintendents or boards of trustees."

Senator Ralph Hall chose to sponsor the legislation in the Senate. Hall made the following comments:

There was no difficulty with the passage of the legislation, even though it had not been brought up in other sessions. Senators recognized the need to provide principals with the legal authority to do the things they were expected to do. The legislators felt that it was their responsibility to provide the needed assistance. It appeared that recognizing the principal as an agent of the state was one of the best approaches to the problem (1).

When Representative Dan Kubiak introduced the bill to the Texas House of Representatives, he reported,

More than a dozen principals were taken into court last year simply as a result of performing the duties assigned to them by their superintendents. The principal must have the legal authority to execute his duties and responsibilities if he is to be expected to
perform in a professional manner. When parents and students are educated about the duties and responsibilities of principals, a more cooperative atmosphere will exist within the school setting (2).

Kubiak (2) further related that the superintendents and boards of trustees were well within their jurisdiction to expect the principals to administer the policies of the school districts.

The Committee for Public Education considered the proposal and worked on the wording and phraseology. Reports (1, 2, 4, 6) related to the actions of the committee indicate that it intended to (1) hold the principal responsible for the handling of student conduct, both for the promotion of a satisfactory educational atmosphere and for the protection of the students' rights to due process, (2) cause the principal and the staff to work out problems of personnel management, rather than going directly to the superintendent with the problems, (3) encourage the principal to accept the responsibility for instructional excellence as well as for administrative operations, and (4) insure that educational decisions would continue to be made by professional educators.

The bill came out of the committee and passed through the legislature with an emergency section which exempted it from additional readings. The vote in the House of Representatives was 140 ayes, one nay; the Senate voted 31 ayes, 0 nay. It was signed by the governor on April 1, 1971. It
was published and explained to principals and superintendents soon after that date (6).

In evaluating the efforts of the legislature, Massey stated,

Statutes in other states were studied during the development of H.B. 235. This is much better legislation for Texas than can be found in other states. It is tailored to meet the unique characteristics found in individual school districts (3).

Redd concluded that the legislation does a great deal to assist the principal on the one side, and it also causes him to pay more attention to some of the things he should be doing, especially in the area of instructional leadership and evaluation. He stated, "No attempt was made to glorify or magnify the importance of the high school principal; however, prestige should result from fulfilling responsibilities of high priority" (5).

Massey evaluated the strengths of the legislation by saying, "There was never any plan to make the wording of the legislation stronger, even though one member of the educational committee emphasized the need for a strong piece of legislation." The legislation intended to provide role definition without limiting the duties that principals could be assigned. About 67 percent of the districts in Texas have fewer than one thousand scholastics in grades one through twelve. The duties of principals in smaller schools should be expected to vary from those in larger districts (4).
Massey (3) predicted that the legislation would have some immediate influences and some long-range results. The public generally does not get involved in matters that do not directly affect them. As they become more aware of the implications of the legislation, it will provide greater assistance to the operation of the schools.

Parents and citizens will probably see a savings in time and money, as unnecessary challenges to the principal's authority and expensive court cases consume less time and money. The legal status afforded the principal should help eliminate these time-consuming and expensive procedures.

Massey explained,

There are many agencies ready to assist the principal. A staff evaluation instrument is already being developed by the Texas Association of Secondary School Principals to aid the principal in the personnel management function. The Texas Education Agency will probably be interested in determining whether H.B. 235 is being implemented. Instruments to evaluate the principal's performance will likely be constructed around the duties and responsibilities outlined by the legislation. Colleges and universities offer excellent opportunities for principals to better prepare to fulfill their responsibilities. Principals in Texas are fortunate to have this kind of response (4).

In summary, H.B. 235 resulted from the attempts of some of the educational and legislative agencies to provide assistance to the principal. The legislation provided the principal with legal status and role definitions, yet retained the flexibility for superintendents and boards of trustees to give direction toward individual needs.
Principals were provided direction for instructional leadership and administrative responsibility. The function of personnel management was also outlined. Few limitations were related to procedures for job performance by principals.

Data from the Questionnaire Related to Question II

The data reported in this section are concerned with the prestige of the high school principal. Items related to prestige deal with (a) the influence of this landmark legislation, (b) the comparison of the high school principalship to other professions, and (c) the emphasis on the proper selection of the high school principal.

For the purpose of reporting efficiently the data collected by the survey instrument, two tables were used for each survey item. One table shows the responses of the categories of principals and the categories of superintendents, allowing for comparisons of the categories within the groups, as well as the same categories of the two groups. These categories are based on the size of the school districts. The other table shows the total responses of the three groups of educators, as well as the total responses of all groups. These data provide the information necessary for establishing conclusions.

Table I presents data reported from the responses of principals and superintendents to Survey Item Number 1. The
data reflect the influence of this landmark legislation upon the principal's prestige.

**TABLE I**

RESPONSES OF THE PRINCIPALS AND SUPERINTENDENTS TO SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Answers Reported in Percentage of Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*H.B. 235, as the first legislation of its kind in Texas, significantly adds to the prestige of the principal. (a) strongly agree, (b) agree, (c) undecided, (d) disagree, (e) strongly disagree.

Principals "agreed" that the landmark legislation significantly added to their prestige, as shown by the responses of 72 percent of Category IV, 65 percent of Category III, 58 percent of Category II, and 55 percent of Category I. Only 12 percent (composed of 10 percent of Category I, 12 percent of Category II, 15 percent of Category III, and 12 percent of Category IV) "disagreed."

Superintendents indicated "agreement" with the item as 60 percent of Category III, 57 percent of both Category II and Category IV, and 50 percent of Category I combined for a
total of 58 percent. Thirty percent of Category II represented the largest indication that some of the superintendents "disagreed" with the majority.

Seventy-two percent of Category IV principals, compared to 60 percent of Category III superintendents, showed the highest response in their respective groups. Category III had the highest response to "strongly agree" by superintendents, 15 percent, and the lowest response, 5 percent, by principals. Category II provided the widest ranges when comparing the responses of superintendents and principals. Category I had the largest percentage of principals and superintendents, 20 percent and 25 percent respectively, who were "undecided."

Table II presents data representing the combined responses of the categories of principals, the responses of the combined categories of superintendents, and the total responses of the professors to Survey Item Number 1. These data indicate the total responses of all educators sampled and provide for comparison of group responses.

There was little difference among the percentages of responses of principals, superintendents, and professors, 61 percent, 58 percent, and 58 percent respectively, who "agreed" to Survey Item Number 1. The basic difference is indicated by the total positive responses of the groups, which showed that 10 percent of both the principals and the superintendents, opposed to none of the professors, "strongly
### TABLE II

**RESPONSES OF THE SELECTED GROUPS OF EDUCATORS TO SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Answers Reported by Percentage of Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*H.B. 235, as the first legislation of its kind in Texas, significantly adds to the prestige of the principal. (a) Strongly agree, (b) agree, (c) undecided, (d) disagree, (e) strongly disagree.

Agreed" with the stated premise. Forty-one percent of the professors, contrasted with 12 percent of the principals and 16 percent of the superintendents, "disagreed" with the majority of the educators.

Table III reports on the influence of H.B. 235 on the principalship as a profession. The data indicate the views of principals and superintendents regarding Survey Item Number 2. The responses are reported by percentage of each of the categories of principals and superintendents.

In Category I, principals varied in their perception of the principalship compared to other professions. Twenty-five percent felt it was higher; 25 percent felt it was lower; and 45 percent were undecided. Principals in Category II generally viewed it to be "higher," as shown by 51 percent.
TABLE III
RESPONSES OF THE PRINCIPALS AND SUPERINTENDENTS TO
SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Answers Reported by Percentage of Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Prestige of the principalship outlined by H.B. 235, when compared to other professions requiring similar amounts of education and experience, ranks (a) much higher, (b) higher, (c) undecided, (d) lower, (e) much lower.

response, or were "undecided," indicated by 39 percent. In Category III, 30 percent responded "higher," 35 percent reported "lower," and 35 percent were undecided. Principals in Category IV reported 48 percent viewed their profession to have "higher" prestige than others requiring similar experience and preparation.

With the exception of Category II, superintendents felt that the principals' prestige was higher than comparable professions. Sixty-three percent of Category IV, 60 percent of Category III, and 50 percent of Category I superintendents viewed the profession as either "higher" or "much higher" than others.
There were noticeable differences in the responses of principals and the superintendents in the same categories, as well as those from different categories. Only 27 percent of Category II superintendents, compared to 51 percent of Category II principals, responded "higher." Category I and Category III also furnished examples of this variation.

Table IV presents data representing the total responses of each group of educators. The data provide an opportunity for comparing the responses of the groups to Survey Item Number 2, and for reporting the total responses.

**TABLE IV**

RESPONSES OF THE SELECTED GROUPS OF EDUCATORS TO SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Answers Reported by Percentage of Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Prestige of the principalship outlined by H.B. 235, when compared to other professions requiring similar amounts of education and experience, ranks (a) much higher, (b) higher, (c) undecided, (d) lower, (e) much lower.

Forty percent of the principals viewed their prestige to be "higher" than similar professions; 44 percent of the superintendents and 58 percent of the professors held the
same view. Twenty-one percent of the principals and 18 percent of the superintendents indicated the principal's prestige was "lower"; none of the professors indicated that this was their perception. Five percent of the superintendents responded "much higher."

The responses of principals and superintendents to Survey Item Number 3 are represented by the data reported in Table V. These data are related to the influence of the legislation on the selection of the high school principal.

**TABLE V**

**RESPONSES OF THE PRINCIPALS AND SUPERINTENDENTS TO SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Answers Reported by Percentage of Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The fulfillment of the duties and responsibilities outlined by H.B. 235 places a greater emphasis on the proper selection of a high school principal. (a) Strongly agree, (b) agree, (c) undecided, (d) disagree, (e) strongly disagree.

Most principals "agreed" that greater emphasis had been placed on the proper selection of a high school principal,
as indicated by responses of 65 percent of Category I, 69 percent of Category II, 75 percent of Category III, and 68 percent of Category IV. In Category IV, 16 percent "strongly agreed" with the statement.

The responses of superintendents in Category II varied from the others, as indicated by the fact that 42 percent of the sample "disagreed" and 3 percent "strongly disagreed" with the premise of Item Number 3. Category I had 37 percent "agree" and 37 percent "strongly agree"; Category III had 40 percent "agree" and 35 percent "strongly agree"; and Category IV had 63 percent "agree" and 21 percent "strongly agree."

Category IV provided the most similarity of positive responses between principals and superintendents, shown by the respective responses of 68 percent and 63 percent who "agreed"; 16 percent and 21 percent "strongly agreed." The most variation between positive responses was observed in Category II, as 69 percent of the principals, compared to 45 percent of the superintendents, reportedly "agreed"; the same comparison of those who "strongly agreed" showed that 6 percent of the superintendents and 12 percent of the principals held the same view.

The data indicating the responses of all the educators sampled is presented in Table VI. These data allow for the comparison of total group responses to Survey Item Number 3,
TABLE VI
RESPONSES OF THE SELECTED GROUPS OF EDUCATORS TO SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 3*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Answers Reported by Percentage of Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The fulfillment of the duties and responsibilities outlined by H.B. 235 places a greater emphasis on the proper selection of a high school principal. (a) Strongly agree, (b) agree, (c) undecided, (d) disagree, (e) strongly disagree.

and provide the total sample responses related to the impact on the selection of the principal.

Fifty-eight percent of the educators "agreed" that the duties in H.B. 235 placed greater emphasis on the proper selection of the high school principal, as indicated by the responses of 68 percent of the principals, 48 percent of the superintendents, and 41 percent of the professors. In addition, 11 percent of the principals, 20 percent of the superintendents, and 33 percent of the professors "strongly agreed" with the statement. Only 19 percent of all respondents "disagreed," with most of that statistic, 24 percent and 25 percent, attributed to superintendents and to professors, in that order.
In summary, it can be concluded that H.B. 235 has added to the prestige of the high school principal. The responses of the educators to the three items related to Question II provided the data for drawing this conclusion.

Data from the Questionnaire Related to Question III

The data reported in this section reflect the views of the selected groups of educators to the items related to Question III, which is concerned with the impact on the morale of the high school principal. The items deal with provision of commensurate authority, provision of job satisfaction, required hours for completion of work and acceptance of compensations. The responses of each group of educators were reported for each of the related items.

The data presented in Table VII represent the responses of principals and superintendents to Survey Item Number 4. These data are concerned with the provision of authority commensurate with position requirements.

Responses from principals representing 75 percent of Category I, 72 percent of Category II, 60 percent of Category III, and 64 percent of Category IV, "agreed" that strengthened morale resulted from the provisions of H.B. 235. In Category III, 20 percent "strongly agreed" with this statement. Only a small percentage, represented by 20 percent of both Category I and Category III, "disagreed."
### TABLE VII
RESPONSES OF THE PRINCIPALS AND SUPERINTENDENTS TO SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 4*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Answers Reported by Percentage of Categories</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The morale of the principal is significantly strengthened by H.B. 235 as it provides authority commensurate with position requirements. (a) Strongly agree, (b) agree, (c) undecided, (d) disagree, (e) strongly disagree.

Superintendents in Category I generally approved the premise of this item, reflected by 12 percent response that "strongly agreed" and 50 percent who "agreed." Both Category III and Category IV showed 60 percent reportedly "agreed" with the majority.

The responses of Category II showed a wide range in the views of principals and superintendents, denoted by the fact that 72 percent of the principals and 33 percent of the superintendents "agreed" with the premise of Item 4. Also, 33 percent of the superintendents "disagreed," yet only 6 percent of the principals held that same view. In Category IV the responses of principals and superintendents were very similar.
The data reported in Table VIII reflect the total views of the groups of educators responding to Survey Item Number 4. This table reports the total responses, and provides the comparisons of the group responses. Survey Item Number 4 was designed to determine if the morale of the principal was affected by provision of authority.

TABLE VIII
RESPONSES OF THE SELECTED GROUPS OF EDUCATORS TO SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 4*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Answers Reported by Percentage of Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The morale of the principal is significantly strengthened by H.B. 235 as it provides authority commensurate with position requirements. (a) Strongly agree, (b) agree, (c) undecided, (d) disagree, (e) strongly disagree.

A total of 55 percent of the sample, composed of 68 percent of the principals, 41 percent of the professors, and 48 percent of the superintendents "agreed" that principal morale had been strengthened by providing authority commensurate with position requirements. An additional 12 percent "strongly agreed." Only 16 percent of the professors "disagreed"; however, 41 percent were "undecided." Fourteen percent of the principals "disagreed" with the positive response
of 76 percent of their group. More superintendents, 22 percent, than either principals or professors, chose to "disagree" with the majority.

Table IX reports the views of principals and superintendents regarding Survey Item Number 5. The responses are concerned with the perceptions of either an increase or a decrease in job satisfaction.

**TABLE IX**

RESPONSES OF THE PRINCIPALS AND SUPERINTENDENTS TO SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 5*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Answers Reported by Percentage of Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Job satisfaction provided to the principal for fulfilling the provisions of H.B. 235 is (a) much higher than before, (b) higher than before, (c) the same as before, (d) lower than before, (e) much lower than before.*

In Category III and Category IV, at least half of the principals, as indicated by responses of 50 percent and 60 percent respectively, indicated that the legislation had improved job satisfaction; however, only 45 percent of Category I and 33 percent of Category II showed positive responses.
Fifteen percent of Category III and 3 percent of Category II felt it was "lower than before."

Three categories of superintendents had at least half the samples indicate positive responses, as shown by 50 percent of Category I, 70 percent of Category III, and 57 percent of Category IV. Category II had 33 percent that perceived "higher" job satisfaction.

Responses of principals and superintendents were identical in Category II, and very similar in Category I and in Category IV. Category III provided variation in responses.

Table X reports data that reflect the total responses of each group of educators to Survey Item Number 5. The data are presented in such a manner that comparisons may be made among the responses of the three groups, and that the total responses may be reported.

TABLE X

RESPONSES OF THE SELECTED GROUPS OF EDUCATORS TO SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Answers Reported by Percentage of Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Job satisfaction provided to the principal for fulfilling the provisions of H.B. 235 is (a) much higher than before, (b) higher than before, (c) the same as before, (d) lower than before, (e) much lower than before.
Forty-two percent of all the sample, consisting of 41 percent of the principals, 41 percent of the professors, and 42 percent of the superintendents, observed the job satisfaction of principals to be "higher than before"; however, only 6 percent felt that it was "much higher than before." A total of 45 percent of the sample, comprised of 41 percent of the superintendents, 49 percent of the principals, and 58 percent of the professors, indicated that job satisfaction had not been influenced. There was little evidence, shown by a total of 6 percent response, that the principal's job had been made less satisfactory.

Table XI presents the data collected from the responses of principals and superintendents to Survey Item Number 6. This item was concerned with the amount of time required of the high school principal to fulfill the responsibilities and duties outlined in the legislation.

A majority of the principals in each category felt that the hours required to work had remained "the same as before," as indicated by the responses of 75 percent of Category I, 75 percent of Category II, 65 percent of Category III, and 56 percent of Category IV. Some principals observed that "more" hours were required, as indicated by the reports of 20 percent of Category I, 18 percent of Category II, 25 percent of Category III, and 32 percent of Category IV.

Most superintendents reported that principals' working
TABLE XI

RESPONSES OF THE PRINCIPALS AND SUPERINTENDENTS TO SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 6*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Answers Reported by Percentage of Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*To fulfill the duties and responsibilities of H.B. 235, the principal is required to work (a) substantially more hours than before, (b) more hours than before, (c) the same hours as before, (d) fewer hours than before, (e) substantially fewer hours than before.

percent of Category II and 87 percent of Category I. In Category III, 30 percent felt that "more" hours were needed. In Category II, more superintendents, 90 percent, than principals, 75 percent, indicated that "the same" number of working hours were required. In Category I, 87 percent of the superintendents, compared to 75 percent of the principals, reported responses with variations that were similar.

Table XII presents data that represent the responses of each group of educators and the sample's total responses to Survey Item Number 6. These data indicate the observations of the educators concerning the influence of H.B. 235 on the working hours of the high school principal.
**TABLE XII**

RESPONSES OF THE SELECTED GROUPS OF EDUCATORS TO SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 6*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Answers Reported by Percentage of Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*To fulfill the duties and responsibilities of H.B. 235 the principal is required to work (a) substantially more hours than before, (b) more hours than before, (c) the same hours as before, (d) fewer hours than before, (e) substantially fewer hours than before.

Most respondents felt that the principal was required to work "the same number of hours as before" to fulfill his responsibilities. A total of 68 percent, consisting of 67 percent of the principals, 72 percent of the superintendents, and 58 percent of the professors indicated that this was their view. Of all the educators, 22 percent, comprised of 23 percent of the principals, 18 percent of the superintendents, and 33 percent of the professors, thought that the principal had been required to work "more hours than before."

Survey Item Number 7 determines the manner in which educators view the compensations received by principals for the execution of the defined duties. Table XIII shows data that reflect the responses of principals and superintendents to this item.
TABLE XIII
RESPONSES OF THE PRINCIPALS AND SUPERINTENDENTS TO SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 7*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Superintendents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Compensations, especially in the form of salary, vacation, holidays, and sick leave, for the execution of the defined duties and responsibilities appear now to be (a) much more satisfactory than before, (b) more satisfactory than before, (c) neither more nor less satisfactory than before, (d) less satisfactory than before, (e) much less satisfactory than before.

Principals in Category II and Category IV reported similarly, as denoted by the fact that 72 percent of each group felt that satisfaction with compensations remained the same; 21 percent of Category II and 24 percent of Category IV reported compensations to be "more satisfactory." Twenty percent of Category I and Category II also felt that the compensations to principals appeared to be more favorable.

Slightly more than one-third of the superintendents in Category I, Category III, and Category IV, as shown by 37 percent, 35 percent, and 36 percent responses, in that order, reported that compensations were viewed "more satisfactory."
Only 18 percent of Category II held the same opinion. Fifteen percent of Category III observed compensations to be "less satisfactory than before."

In Category III, a total of 45 percent of the superintendents, compared to 20 percent of the principals, felt that compensations appeared more favorable. In Category I, 37 percent of the superintendents and 20 percent of the principals had the same perception.

Table XIV presents data representing the responses of each of the selected groups of educators to Survey Item Number 7. These data are shown in the forms of total group responses and of total responses from all groups.

**TABLE XIV**

RESPONSES OF THE SELECTED GROUPS OF EDUCATORS TO SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 7*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Answers Reported by Percentage of Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Compensations, especially in the form of salary, vacation, holidays, and sick leave, for the execution of the defined duties and responsibilities, appear now to be (a) much more satisfactory than before, (b) more satisfactory than before, (c) neither more nor less satisfactory than before, (d) less satisfactory than before, (e) much less satisfactory than before.
Superintendents generally perceived compensations to appear "more satisfactory" than did either the principals or the professors, as indicated by responses of 29 percent, 21 percent, and 25 percent, in that order. Also, 5 percent of the superintendents felt the compensations for the principals were "much more satisfactory." The majority of the educators, 66 percent, perceived no change in the manner in which compensations to the principals had been influenced. Seventy-one percent of the principals represents the highest response of any of the groups that felt satisfaction with compensations had not been influenced.

In summary, it appears that H.R. 235 has not improved the morale of the high school principal. The item related to the provision of authority commensurate with responsibility received significant approval; however, items related to job satisfaction, working hours, and compensations failed to get enough positive responses to provide evidence of significant influence. Only one of the four items related to Question III showed significant evidence that the morale of the principal had been improved.

Data from the Questionnaire Related to Question IV

This section presents data related to Question IV, which investigates the legal status of the high school principal. Items related to this question concern court litigation, challenges to authority from organizations and
individuals, and the legal requirement for the certification of the high school principal.

Table XV reports data reflecting the responses of principals and superintendents to Survey Item Number 8. This item is concerned with the influence of H.B. 235 on the legal status of the principal in court litigation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE XV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RESPONSES OF THE PRINCIPALS AND SUPERINTENDENTS TO SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 8</strong>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Choice of Responses</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In case of court litigation, H.B. 235 places the legal status of the principal in (a) a much stronger position than before, (b) a stronger position than before, (c) the same position as before, (d) a weaker position than before, (e) a much weaker position than before.*

Fifty percent in Category I, 51 percent in Category II, 65 percent in Category III, and 44 percent in Category IV responded that the principal is in a "stronger position than before." Fifteen percent of Category I, 21 percent of Category II, 20 percent of Category III, and 24 percent of Category IV observed that the principal was in a "much stronger
position than before." In Category I, 35 percent, in Category II, 24 percent, and in Category IV, 28 percent felt that the legal status of the principal was still in the "same position as before." Some of the principals, a total of 4 percent, indicated that the legal status had been placed in a "weaker position than before."

Superintendents saw the legal status of the principal placed in a "stronger position," as shown by responses of 62 percent in Category I, 51 percent in Category II, 50 percent in Category III, and 54 percent in Category IV, plus the fact that 25 percent of Category I, 18 percent of Category II, 30 percent of Category III, and 24 percent of Category IV view the legal status as being placed in a "much stronger position." Some superintendents, signified by the 30 percent response in Category II, perceive that the legal status has remained in the "same position as before."

In Category I, 62 percent of the superintendents, compared to 50 percent of the principals, responded that legal status was "stronger"; in Category IV, 54 percent of the superintendents, compared to 44 percent of the principals, responded similarly. In Category II and in Category III, slightly more principals than superintendents felt that the principal's legal status was "stronger."

The data presented in Table XVI represent the responses of the selected groups of educators to Survey Item Number 8.
The data reflect the total responses of each group and the total responses of all participants in the survey.

**TABLE XVI**

RESPONSES OF THE SELECTED GROUPS OF EDUCATORS TO SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 8*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Answers Reported by Percentage of Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In case of court litigation, H.B. 235 places the legal status of the principal in (a) a much stronger position than before, (b) a stronger position than before, (c) the same position as before, (d) a weaker position than before, (e) a much weaker position than before.

Seventy-three percent of all the respondents felt that the legal status of the principal in court litigations was either in "a stronger position than before" or in "a much stronger position than before," as indicated by responses of 50 percent and 23 percent, respectively. Fifty-one percent of both the principals and the superintendents, and 66 percent of the professors denoted a "stronger position"; 20 percent of the principals, 23 percent of the superintendents, and 33 percent of the professors viewed the legal position as "much stronger."
Table XVII presents data which indicate the views of principals and superintendents regarding the principal's legal position to face challenges to authority. Acquiring this data was the basic purpose of Survey Item Number 9.

TABLE XVII
RESPONSES OF THE PRINCIPALS AND SUPERINTENDENTS TO SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 9*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Answers Reported in Percentage of Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*As a result of H.B. 235, the principal is in a stronger legal position to face challenges to authority from organizations and other individuals. (a) Strongly agree, (b) agree, (c) undecided, (d) disagree, (e) strongly disagree.

The responses of 20 percent of Category I proved that some principals were "undecided" whether legal authority had been strengthened; however, most "agreed" that it had been strengthened. The responses of 50 percent of Category I, 69 percent in Category II, 55 percent in Category III, and 56 percent in Category IV denoted principals who "agreed," plus 20 percent in Category I, 18 percent in Category II, 30 percent in Category III, and 16 percent in Category IV who
"strongly agreed" with the statement. Only a few principals, as indicated by responses of 10 percent in Category I, 9 percent in Category II, 15 percent in Category III, and 8 percent in Category IV, indicated "disagreement."

Only in Category II and Category III was there ample evidence that superintendents "disagreed" with the statement in Survey Item Number 9, as indicated by responses of 18 percent and 15 percent, respectively. Sixty-two percent of Category I, 60 percent of Category II, 50 percent of Category III, and 69 percent of Category IV "agreed" that the principal's legal position had been strengthened. Thirty, 25, 18, and 12 percent of Category III, Category I, Category IV, and Category II, respectively, "strongly agreed" with the statement.

In Category IV, more superintendents, 69 percent, than principals, 56 percent, "agreed" that the principal had been assisted in facing challenges to his legal authority. Sixty-two percent of the superintendents in Category I, compared to 50 percent of the principals, responded similarly.

Table XVIII reports the responses of all the selected groups of educators to Survey Item Number 9. These data are related to the principal's legal status of authority. The responses of principals and the responses of superintendents who "strongly agreed" are similar, as evidenced by 20 percent and 19 percent respectively, while 8 percent of the professors chose this response. Twelve percent of the
TABLE XVIII

RESPONSES OF THE SELECTED GROUPS OF EDUCATORS TO
SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Answers Reported by Percentage of Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*As a result of H.B. 235, the principal is in a stronger legal position to face challenges to authority from organizations and other individuals. (a) Strongly agree, (b) agree, (c) undecided, (d) disagree, (e) strongly disagree.

superintendents, as compared to 9 percent of the principals and none of the professors, chose to "disagree." Eleven percent of the principals, 8 percent of the superintendents, and 16 percent of the professors represented the "undecided" portion of each group. Of the total educators that were sampled, 60 percent "agreed" that the legal position of the principal had been strengthened.

The purpose of Survey Item Number 10 was to gain data concerning the influence of the legislation to insure that certification remained a requirement for high school principals. Table XIX reports the responses of principals and superintendents to the statement in Survey Item Number 10.

Most principals "agreed" that H.B. 235 provided stronger assurance that certification would continue to be a
TABLE XIX
RESPONSES OF THE PRINCIPALS AND SUPERINTENDENTS TO
SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 10*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Answers Reported by Percentage of Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*H.B. 235 provides stronger assurance that certification will continue to be a requirement for the principal. (a) Strongly agree, (b) agree, (c) undecided, (d) disagree, (e) strongly disagree.

requirement, as shown by the responses of 60 percent of Category I, 75 percent of Category II, 65 percent of Category III, and 52 percent of Category IV. Twenty-five percent in Category I, 20 percent in Category III, and 36 percent in Category IV "strongly agreed" that this had happened. Few principals "disagreed," as reflected by the response of 5 percent, and few were "undecided."

In Category II, some superintendents "disagreed" that greater assurance for certification had been provided, as indicated by responses of 27 percent, and 12 percent were "undecided." This did not reflect the views of the majority of superintendents, as indicated by the fact that 57 percent
Category I, as well as 45 percent of Category III, "agreed" that certification had been further assured. Twenty-five percent of Category I, 9 percent of Category II, 40 percent of Category III, and 24 percent of Category IV "strongly agreed" with this majority opinion.

In Category II, the responses of superintendents, when compared to principals, placed a greater emphasis on the legislation, as indicated by the responses of 40 percent and 20 percent, respectively, who "strongly agreed" that certification was assured. In Category II, 27 percent of the superintendents "disagreed"; however, none of the principals chose that response. The responses of principals were similar to the responses of superintendents in Category IV.

Table XX reports the views of all the groups sampled concerning the provision of assurance that certification for the principal would continue to be a requirement. This is the text of Survey Item Number 10.

Principals comprised the largest response, 63 percent, of the total 56 percent who "agreed" that H.B. 235 provided greater assurance of principal certification; however, 50 percent of the superintendents and 66 percent of the professors also "agreed" that this was true. The 22 percent of the superintendents was equalled by 22 percent of the principals who "strongly agreed." There was indecision, as reflected by the total 11 percent who were "undecided," involving 8 percent of the
TABLE XX
RESPONSES OF THE SELECTED GROUPS OF EDUCATORS TO
SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 10*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Answers Reported by Percentage of Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*H.B. 235 provides stronger assurance that certification will continue to be a requirement for the principal. (a) Strongly agree, (b) agree, (c) undecided, (d) disagree, (e) strongly disagree.

superintendents, and 25 percent of the professors. Sixteen percent of the superintendents "disagreed" with the majority of the total sample.

In summary, H.B. 235 appears to have had influence on the legal status of the high school principal. Responses were significant in regard to a positive influence in case of court litigation, in case of challenge to authority from outside organizations and individuals, and for more assurance of the certification requirement for the high school principal. Respondents, by number and degree, strongly supported the positive influence of the legislation.
Data from the Questionnaire Related to Question V

This section is concerned with data related to the influence of the legislation on the instructional leadership role of the high school principal. The items are designed to indicate priority, implementation of innovative programs, selection of instructional material, emphasis placed upon instructional supervision, and the planning and evaluating of the instructional program. The responses of educators to these items provide the perceptions of the instructional leadership role of the high school principal.

Table XXI denotes data indicating the priority given by the principal to instructional leadership. The responses of principals and superintendents to Survey Item Number 11 are used to provide these data reported in Table XXI.

A greater percentage of principals in Category III and Category IV felt an influence on priority for instructional leadership, as indicated by the fact that 65 percent and 56 percent, respectively, perceived a "greater priority," and 10 percent and 12 percent, respectively, perceived a "substantially greater priority." Responses in Category I showed that 10 percent felt a "substantially greater priority," 55 percent felt a "greater priority," and the priority for 35 percent remained "the same." Similarly, the responses of Category II indicated a "substantially greater priority" for 9 percent, a "greater priority" for 54 percent, and the
TABLE XXI

RESPONSES OF THE PRINCIPALS AND SUPERINTENDENTS TO
SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 11*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Answers Reported by Percentage of Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*H.B. 235 places the principal's responsibility for instructional leadership in a position of (a) substantially greater priority, (b) greater priority, (c) the same priority, (d) lesser priority, (e) substantially lesser priority.

"same priority" for 33 percent. There were few responses from principals that the priority for instructional leadership had been reduced by the provisions of the legislation.

Superintendents in Category III and Category IV believed that instructional leadership received a "greater priority," as indicated by responses of 60 percent and 66 percent, respectively, plus 15 percent in Category III, who indicated that "substantially greater priority" had been placed on the principal's responsibility for instructional leadership. In Category I, 62 percent perceived a "greater priority." The majority of Category II, 48 percent, indicated that "the same priority" existed, while 45 percent...
reported that a "greater priority" existed. Ten percent of Category III felt that a "lesser priority" had resulted.

In Category II, 48 percent of the superintendents, compared to 33 percent of the principals, indicated "the same priority" for instructional leadership. In Category I, 10 percent of the principals and none of the superintendents felt the priority was "substantially greater."

The data provided in Table XXII indicate the change, or lack of change, brought in the priority for instructional leadership placed as the responsibility of the principal. The data collected from the responses of educators to Survey Item Number 11 is reported by the total responses of each group and by the total responses of all the participants sampled.

**TABLE XXII**

RESPONSES OF THE SELECTED GROUPS OF EDUCATORS TO SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 11*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Answers Reported by Percentage of Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*H.B. 235 places the principal's responsibility for instructional leadership in a position of (a) substantially greater priority, (b) greater priority, (c) the same priority, (d) lesser priority, (e) substantially lesser priority.
More of the professors, 83 percent, than either the principals, 55 percent, or the superintendents, 56 percent, felt that a "greater priority" for instructional leadership was placed on the principal. A greater percentage of principals, 10 percent, than either superintendents, 6 percent, or professors, none, perceived that a "substantially greater priority" existed. Some principals, 30 percent, and some superintendents, 38 percent, indicated that "the same priority" was still in evidence. Only 4 percent of the respondents indicated that a "lesser priority" had been placed on instructional leadership.

The data presented in Table XXIII relate to the implementation of innovative programs as partial evidence of the principal's instructional leadership. The data reported in this table were based on the responses of principals and superintendents to Survey Item Number 12.

Sixty percent of the principals in Category III and 72 percent of the principals in Category IV "agreed" that more programs had resulted. Forty-five percent of Category I and 48 percent of Category II "agreed" with the statement. The highest percentages of those who "strongly agreed" were 10 percent of Category I and 10 percent of Category III, followed by 9 percent of Category II and 8 percent of Category IV. Category I also had the largest percentage who "disagreed," as indicated by 25 percent, followed by 18 percent
TABLE XXIII
RESPONSES OF THE PRINCIPALS AND SUPERINTENDENTS TO SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 12*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Answers Reported by Percentage of Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*H.B. 235 has caused the principal, as instructional leader, to implement, or plan to implement, more innovative programs. (a) Strongly agree, (b) agree, (c) undecided, (d) disagree, (e) strongly disagree.

in Category II, 20 percent in Category III, and 4 percent in Category IV.

Superintendents who "agreed" that innovative programs had been implemented are denoted by 54 percent of Category IV, 50 percent of Category III, 27 percent of Category II, and 25 percent of Category I. Six percent of Category II and 5 percent of Category III "strongly agreed." Superintendents who "disagreed" with the premise are mostly shown by 42 percent of Category II. That some superintendents were "undecided" is evidenced by 75 percent of Category I, followed by 33 percent of Category IV, 25 percent of Category III, and 21 percent of Category II. Only 3 percent of Category II reported that they "strongly disagreed."
In Category I, the responses of 25 percent of the superintendents, compared to 45 percent and 10 percent responses from the principals, recognized innovation as a result of the legislation. Seventy-two percent of Category IV principals, compared to 54 percent of Category IV superintendents, felt that innovative programs had resulted from instructional leadership.

Table XXIV presents data that reflect the total views of each of the groups of educators, plus the total responses of all the educators. These data give an indication concerning the development of innovative programs.

**TABLE XXIV**

RESPONSES OF THE SELECTED GROUPS OF EDUCATORS TO SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 12*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Answers Reported by Percentage of Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*H.B. 235 has caused the principal, as instructional leader to implement, or plan to implement, more innovative programs. (a) Strongly agree, (b) agree, (c) undecided, (d) disagree, (e) strongly disagree.

More principals tended to "agree" than either superintendents or professors, as indicated by responses of 55
percent, 40 percent, and 8 percent, respectively, that more innovative programs could be attributed to results of H.B. 235. The total percentage of educators who "agreed" was 46 percent. Approximately equal numbers of superintendents and principals "disagreed," as reflected by 22 percent and 16 percent, respectively. More principals "strongly agreed," as indicated by 9 percent response, whereas the entire total is 7 percent. The fact that many educators were "undecided" is reflected by the total, 26 percent response, consisting of 18 percent of the principals, 30 percent of the superintendents, and 58 percent of the professors.

Survey Item Number 13 was designed to indicate whether the principal, as the instructional leader, had assumed a greater responsibility for the selection of material for instruction. Table XXV reports the responses of principals and superintendents to the statement.

Principals reported that selection of instructional material became "more important" for 45 percent of Category I, 48 percent of Category II, 45 percent of Category III, and 52 percent of Category IV. The responsibility appeared "much more important" for 8 percent of Category IV and 10 percent of Category III. Category I contained 50 percent that perceived this responsibility to be "unchanged," followed by 45 percent of Category II, 40 percent of Category IV, and 35 percent of Category III. Few of the principals
TABLE XXV

RESPONSES OF THE PRINCIPALS AND SUPERINTENDENTS TO
SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 13*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Answers Reported by Percentage of Categories</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Resulting from the enactment of H.B. 235, the principal's responsibility for the selection of instructional material appears to be (a) much more important, (b) more important, (c) unchanged, (d) less important, (e) much less important.

perceived this responsibility to be "less important," indicated by the total 3 percent response.

Reports from superintendents indicated that 63 percent of Category IV, followed by 62 percent of Category I, 50 percent of Category III, and 33 percent of Category II, in descending order, felt that the principal's responsibility for the selection of instructional material appeared to be "more important." The largest percentage of superintendents who saw this responsibility to be "unchanged," was reported in Category II, with 63 percent, compared to 37 percent of Category I, 35 percent of Category III, and 27 percent of Category IV. This responsibility appeared to be "much more
important" to 3 percent of Category II and Category IV, and
5 percent of Category III.

In Category II, 63 percent of the superintendents, com-
pared to 45 percent of the principals, saw no change in the
principal's role in selection of instructional material. In
Category IV, the majority of the principals, 52 percent, and
of the superintendents, 63 percent, perceived material selec-
tion as a "more important" responsibility of the principal.
In Category III, the responses of the principals were simi-
lar to the responses of the superintendents.

The responses of each group of educators, plus the com-
bined responses to Survey Item Number 13, provided the data
reported in Table XXVI. The data are an indication of the
manner in which the principal's responsibility for the selec-
tion of instructional material, as a result of the legisla-
tion, was perceived by the educators sampled.

More principals and superintendents, shown by responses
of 47 and 48 percent, respectively, than professors, with 16
percent response, felt that the principal's responsibility
appeared "more important." The responsibility appeared "un-
changed" to 83 percent of the professors, 42 percent of the
principals, and 41 percent of the superintendents, in that
order. Therefore, the responsibility was "unchanged" for 45
percent and "more important" for 46 percent of the sample.
TABLE XXVI
RESPONSES OF THE SELECTED GROUPS OF EDUCATORS TO SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 13*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Answers Reported by Percentage of Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Resulting from the enactment of H.B. 235, the principal's responsibility for the selection of instructional material appears to be (a) much more important, (b) more important, (c) unchanged, (d) less important, (e) much less important.

Survey Item Number 14 was designed to determine if H.B. 235 emphasized instructional supervision. Table XXVII indicates the views of principals and superintendents concerning the emphasis this responsibility should receive.

Principals felt that instructional supervision should receive "more emphasis," according to 70 percent of Category I, 57 percent of Category II, 60 percent of Category III, and 76 percent of Category IV. Twenty percent of Category I and 20 percent of Category III felt that it should receive "much more emphasis." The responsibility should have "the same emphasis," according to some principals, as represented by 30 percent response of Category II.
TABLE XXVII
RESPONSES OF THE PRINCIPALS AND SUPERINTENDENTS TO
SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 14 *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Answers Reported by Percentage of Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Since the passage of H.B. 235, instructional supervision as a responsibility of the principal should receive (a) much more emphasis, (b) more emphasis, (c) the same emphasis, (d) less emphasis, (e) much less emphasis.

Superintendents in Category III felt that instructional supervision received "more emphasis" for 75 percent, and "much more emphasis" for 5 percent. Category I, Category II, and Category IV also indicated that this responsibility had been influenced, as 75 percent, 54 percent, and 69 percent, respectively, felt that it received "more emphasis." "Much more emphasis" was the response for 9 percent of Category IV and 6 percent of Category II. Category II led all groups, with 39 percent, who perceived no change.

Category II had the lowest percentage of principals, 57, and the lowest percentage of superintendents, 54, that perceived "more emphasis" for instructional supervision. In Category I, 75 percent of the superintendents and 70 percent
of the principals held the same view. Thirty-nine percent of Category II superintendents and 30 percent of Category II principals felt that instructional supervision had not been influenced.

Table XXVIII presents data that reflect the views of each group of educators and their total responses to Survey Item Number 14. This table indicates the emphasis that has been placed on instructional leadership by H.B. 235.

**TABLE XXVIII**

RESPONSES OF THE SELECTED GROUPS OF EDUCATORS TO SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 14*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Answers Reported by Percentage of Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Since the passage of H.B. 235, instructional supervision as a responsibility of the principal should receive (a) much more emphasis, (b) more emphasis, (c) the same emphasis, (d) less emphasis, (e) much less emphasis.

A total response of 64 percent felt that instructional supervision should receive "more emphasis," as reflected by responses of 64 percent of the principals, 63 percent of the superintendents, and 58 percent of the professors. Thirty-three percent of the professors, 13 percent of the --
and 7 percent of superintendents, indicated that "much more emphasis" should be received by this function. The same emphasis was observed by 20 percent of the total, consisting of 23 percent of superintendents, 18 percent of principals, and 8 percent of professors. None of the sample indicated that instructional supervision should receive "much less emphasis," and only 4 percent viewed any decrease in emphasis as a result of the responsibilities defined by H.B. 235. Twenty percent of the respondents reported that instructional supervision as a responsibility of the principal should receive "the same emphasis."

Survey Item Number 15 was designed to determine if planning and evaluating the instructional program had been emphasized as a result of H.B. 235. Table XXIX reports the responses of principals and superintendents to this item and indicates their views concerning the influence on planning and evaluating the instructional program.

Principals denoted that 65 percent of Category I and Category III, plus 63 percent of Category II and 72 percent of Category IV, reportedly "agreed" that planning and evaluating had been emphasized. Fifteen percent of Category I, 16 percent of Category IV, and 20 percent of Category III "strongly agreed" that more emphasis had been placed on planning and evaluating, as a function of the principal. Fifteen percent of Category I and 15 percent of Category II
TABLE XXIX

RESPONSES OF THE PRINCIPALS AND SUPERINTENDENTS TO
SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 15*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Answers Reported by Percentage of Categories</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>Superintendents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I    II   III  IV  Total</td>
<td>I    II   III  IV  Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>15   9   20  16  14</td>
<td>12   3   10  6   7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>65   63  65  72  65</td>
<td>75   57  70  78  66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>15   15  0   4   9</td>
<td>12   3   5   3   5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>5    12  15  8   10</td>
<td>0    36  15  12  20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>0    0   0   0   0</td>
<td>0    0   0   0   0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*H.B. 235 places more emphasis on the position of the principal for planning and evaluating the instructional program. (a) Strongly agree, (b) agree, (c) undecided, (d) disagree, (e) strongly disagree.

were "undecided." Some principals "disagreed," as indicated by 12 percent in Category II and 15 percent in Category III.

According to the reports, superintendents generally "agreed" that planning and evaluating the instructional program had gained more emphasis, as shown by the responses of 75 percent of Category I, 57 percent of Category II, 70 percent of Category III, and 78 percent of Category IV. Some superintendents "strongly agreed," as shown by 12 percent of Category I. Thirty-six percent of Category II "disagreed" with the majority of their colleagues. Very few superintendents were "undecided" on the issue, as indicated by 12 percent in Category I, 5 percent in Category III, and 3 percent in both Category II and Category IV.
In Category II, 36 percent of the superintendents, compared to 12 percent of the principals, "disagreed" that program planning and evaluating had been emphasized. Category IV had the largest response from superintendents, 78 percent, and from principals, 72 percent, who "agreed" with the premise that program planning and evaluating was emphasized.

The data reported in Table XXX were provided by the responses of each group of educators to Survey Item Number 15. These data indicate whether there has been more emphasis placed on the principal for the planning and evaluating of the instructional program.

**TABLE XXX**

RESPONSES OF THE SELECTED GROUPS OF EDUCATORS TO SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 15*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Answers Reported by Percentage of Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*H.B. 235 places more emphasis on the position of the principal for planning and evaluating the instructional program. (a) Strongly agree, (b) agree, (c) undecided, (d) disagree, (e) strongly disagree.

Sixty-four percent of the total sample, consisting of 66 percent of superintendents, 65 percent of principals, and
41 percent of professors "agreed" that planning and evaluating has been emphasized. Fifty-eight percent of the professors, compared to 14 percent of the principals, and 7 percent of the superintendents, responded that they "strongly agreed." Some educators "disagreed" with the premise, as evidenced by responses of 20 percent of the superintendents and 10 percent of the principals; however, none of the educators "strongly disagreed." Nine percent of the principals, as compared to 5 percent of the superintendents and none of the professors, were undecided about the matter.

In summary, it can be concluded that H.B. 235 has influenced the instructional leadership role of the principal. The legislation has increased the priority on instructional leadership, increased the emphasis on instructional supervision, and caused more emphasis on planning and evaluating the instructional program. The importance of the selection of instructional material and the implementation of innovative programs was recognized by at least half of the respondents. Educators have indicated in related literature that instructional leadership is a vital role.

Data from the Questionnaire Related to Question VI

The purpose of this section is to present data related to the perception of educators concerning the facilitation of executive management operations for the high school principal. The items selected to provide these data concern the
influence of written job definitions, the involvement in establishing policy and the effect on role conflict.

The data reported in Table XXXI reflect the responses of principals and superintendents to Survey Item Number 16. These data indicate the influence of the written job definitions on the executive management role in high school operations.

TABLE XXXI
RESPONSES OF THE PRINCIPALS AND SUPERINTENDENTS TO SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 16*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Answers Reported by Percentage of Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The executive management role in high school operations is more effective because of the written job definitions provided by H.B. 235. (a) Strongly agree, (b) agree, (c) undecided, (d) disagree, (e) strongly disagree.

Principals' reports showed that 50 percent of Category I, 60 percent of Category II, 65 percent of Category III, and 60 percent of Category IV "agreed" that executive management was more effective as a result of written job definitions. Some principals "strongly agreed," as indicated
by responses of 10 percent in Category I and 12 percent in both Category II and Category IV. The largest percentage who "disagreed" are found in Category II, indicated by 20 percent, followed by 15 percent in Category I and 12 percent in Category III. Twenty-five percent of Category I and 18 percent of Category II reported that they were "undecided."

Responses from superintendents indicate that 50 percent of Category I, 39 percent of Category II, 55 percent of Category III, and 66 percent of Category IV "agreed" that executive management was more effective. Only in Category II, where 39 percent have indicated that they "disagreed," does there appear to be noticeable dissent; however, some superintendents are "undecided." Nine percent of Category II and 15 percent of Category III "strongly agreed" that executive management was more effective.

Category II supplied one of the highest total responses from principals, 72 percent, that perceived a positive influence upon the executive management role; however, only 48 percent of the superintendents in the same category reacted in a similar manner. In Category I, 50 percent of both the principals and the superintendents "agreed" that written job definitions facilitated the executive management role.

The data in Table XXXII reflect the responses of each group of educators and their total responses to Survey Item Number 16. The purpose of these data is to determine whether the executive management role has been made more effective by the written job definition.
### TABLE XXXII

RESPONSES OF THE SELECTED GROUPS OF EDUCATORS TO SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 16*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Answers Reported by Percentage of Groups</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>Superintendents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The executive management role in high school operations is more effective because of the written job definitions provided by H.B. 235. (a) Strongly agree, (b) agree, (c) undecided, (d) disagree, (e) strongly disagree.

Sixty-six percent of the professors, added to 51 percent of the superintendents and 58 percent of the principals, for a total of 56 percent, indicated that they "agreed" with the premise in Survey Item Number 16. Twenty-five percent of the superintendents and 13 percent of the principals, compared to 8 percent of the professors, reported that they "disagreed." Similar responses were reported by each group who were "undecided," as indicated by 14 percent of the superintendents and 17 percent of the principals, plus 16 percent of the professors. A total of only 9 percent, composed of 10 percent of the principals and 8 percent of the superintendents, plus 8 percent of the professors, indicated that they "strongly agreed."
Table XXXIII reports the responses of principals and superintendents to Survey Item Number 17. The data provide an indication of whether H.B. 235 influenced the involvement of the principal in establishing policies and procedures for administrative operation.

**TABLE XXXIII**

RESPONSES OF THE PRINCIPALS AND SUPERINTENDENTS TO SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 17*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Answers Reported by Percentage of Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I  II  III IV Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>10  6  0  16  8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>45  63 80  72  64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>35  24  5  8  18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>10  6  15  4  8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>0  0  0  0  0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*H.B. 235 influences the involvement of the principal in establishing operational policies and procedures for fulfilling administrative responsibility. (a) Strongly agree, (b) agree, (c) undecided, (d) disagree, (e) strongly disagree.

Reports from principals indicated that 35 percent of Category I were "undecided," concerning increased involvement; however, 45 percent "agreed" and 10 percent "strongly agreed" with it. The other categories most frequently "agreed," as indicated by responses of 63 percent of Category II, 80 percent of Category III, and 72 percent of
Category IV, that involvement in establishing policies and procedures had been influenced.

Responses in Category II indicated that it had the most superintendents who "disagreed," as indicated by 30 percent, that involvement had been influenced. The most frequent response indicated that superintendents "agreed" with the premise, as shown by 75 percent of Category I, 54 percent of Category II, 65 percent of Category III, and 60 percent of Category IV. Only a small number reported that they were "undecided," with 25 percent of Category I and 21 percent of Category IV comprising most of those.

Eighty percent of Category III principals and Category III superintendents either "agreed" or "strongly agreed" that H.B. 235 influenced principal involvement. In Category I, 75 percent of the superintendents and 45 percent of the principals "agreed" with the majority of the educators.

Table XXXIV provides data that report the influence of the legislation on the involvement of the principal in establishing policies and procedures. The data were compiled from responses to Survey Item Number 17 and indicate the total responses of all participants.

Most of the educators reported that they "agreed" with the statement, as evidenced by responses of 75 percent of the professors, 64 percent of the principals, and 58 percent of the superintendents. The most "indecision" was reported by 18 percent of the principals, and the most disagreement was reported by 17 percent of the superintendents.
TABLE XXIV
RESPONSES OF THE SELECTED GROUPS OF EDUCATORS TO SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 17*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Answers Reported by Percentage of Groups</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>Professors</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*H.B. 235 influences the involvement of the principal in establishing operational policies and procedures for fulfilling administrative responsibility. (a) Strongly agree, (b) agree, (c) undecided, (d) disagree, (e) strongly disagree.

Table XXXV reports data that reflect the responses of principals and superintendents to Survey Item Number 18. This item was designed to determine if the problem of "role conflict" had been affected by H.B. 235.

The most frequent response from principals indicated that role conflict had "neither increased nor decreased," as evidenced by 75 percent of Category I, 66 percent of Category II, 35 percent of Category III, and 48 percent of Category IV. In Category III, 30 percent felt that the problem had been "increased." Thirty-three percent of the total sample, consisting of 20 percent of Category I, 30 percent of Category II, 30 percent of Category III, and 52 percent of Category IV, reported that the problem of role conflict had been "decreased."
**TABLE XXXV**

RESPONSES OF THE PRINCIPALS AND SUPERINTENDENTS TO SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 18*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Answers Reported by Percentage of Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*H.B. 235 affects the problem of "role conflict" that arises because of the principal's allegiance to the superintendent and the principal's allegiance to his staff by (a) substantially decreasing the problem, (b) decreasing the problem, (c) neither increasing nor decreasing the problem, (d) increasing the problem, (e) substantially increasing the problem.

The most frequent response of superintendents indicated that the problem of role conflict had been "neither increased nor decreased," as this was the choice of 62 percent of Category I, 72 percent of Category II, 45 percent of Category III, and 30 percent of Category IV. A "decrease" in the principal's role conflict was the indication of only 51 percent of Category IV, 40 percent of Category III, 24 percent of Category II, and 37 percent of Category I.

Category IV showed the highest response from principals, 52 percent, and the highest response from superintendents, 51 percent, that felt role conflict had been "decreased."
In Category III, 30 percent of the principals and 15 percent of the superintendents perceived a negative influence on role conflict.

Data in Table XXXVI indicate whether the role conflict of the principal has been influenced. These data indicate the views of each group of educators and the total sample, as indicated by the responses to Survey Item Number 18.

TABLE XXXVI
RESPONSES OF THE SELECTED GROUPS OF EDUCATORS TO SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 18*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Superintendents</th>
<th>Professors</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*H.B. 235 affects the problem of "role conflict" that arises because of the principal's allegiance to the superintendent and the principal's allegiance to his staff by (a) substantially decreasing the problem, (b) decreasing the problem, (c) neither increasing nor decreasing the problem, (d) increasing the problem, (e) substantially increasing the problem.

Fifty-two percent of the total sample denoted "neither increase nor decrease in the problem" of role conflict, with each group responding similarly, as indicated by 56 percent of the principals, 49 percent of the superintendents, and 58 percent of the professors. A slight indication that the
problem had been "increased" came from 7 percent of the principals and 6 percent of the superintendents. Thirty-six percent of all respondents indicated that the problem had been "decreased," and 4 percent indicated that it had been "substantially decreased."

In summary, educators have indicated a significant influence on executive management by the legislation. This influence was reported mostly from the written job definitions and from the involvement in establishing operational policies and procedures; however, the problem of role conflict has also been decreased.

Data from the Questionnaire Related to Question VII

This section was designed to provide information related to the influence of H.B. 235 on the accountability for job performance by the principal. The items related to this question concern the provision of accountability for job performance by outlined duties and responsibilities, the availability of accountability measures as a result of H.B. 235, and the use of H.B. 235 as an effective measuring scale for the performance of duties and responsibilities. The influence of the legislation upon the provision of accountability for job performance by the principal will be determined on the basis of responses to these items.

The data reported in Table XXXVII indicate whether principals have been assisted in providing accountability
for job performance by the outlining of their duties and responsibilities. Responses of principals and superintendents to Survey Item Number 19 provided this information.

**TABLE XXXVII**

RESPONSES OF THE PRINCIPALS AND SUPERINTENDENTS TO SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 19*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Answers Reported by Percentage of Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*By outlining his duties and responsibilities, H.B. 235 assists the principal in providing accountability for job performance. (a) Strongly agree, (b) agree, (c) undecided, (d) disagree, (e) strongly disagree.

Categories I, II, III, and IV "agreed" that assistance for accountability had resulted, according to 60 percent, 72 percent, 70 percent, and 72 percent, respectively. Some principals "disagreed," as shown by 15 percent of Category I and 15 percent of Category IV. A total of 12 percent were "undecided" on the issue.

Not all superintendents indicated that accountability had been assisted, as reflected by 36 percent of Category II, who "disagreed" with the statement.
statistic, most superintendents did "agree," shown by responses of 62 percent of Category I, 51 percent of Category II, 70 percent of Category III, and 63 percent of Category IV, that assistance was evidenced. Twelve percent of Category I and Category IV, 9 percent of Category II, and 10 percent of Category III "strongly agreed."

In Category II, 51 percent of the superintendents, compared to 72 percent of the principals, "agreed" with the theory that the designated duties and responsibilities assisted in establishing accountability; 36 percent of the superintendents and 6 percent of the principals "disagreed."

In Category IV, 63 percent of the superintendents and 72 percent of the principals "agreed" with the premise. More superintendents than principals in Category III recognized a positive influence from H.B. 235 upon accountability.

Table XXXVIII reports whether accountability has been assisted, according to the responses of each group of educators to Survey Item Number 19. Conclusions were drawn from the data of each group, as well as the total responses from the entire sample.

An equal percentage of the superintendents and the professors "agreed," as indicated by the responses of 58 percent. Sixty-eight percent of the principals responded in the same manner. The 19 percent of the superintendents who "disagreed" can be compared to 10 percent of the principals and 8 percent of the professors. Seventy-four percent of
TABLE XXXVIII
RESPONSES OF THE SELECTED GROUPS OF EDUCATORS TO
SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 19*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Answers Reported by Percentage of Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*By outlining his duties and responsibilities, H.B. 235 assists the principal in providing accountability for job performance. (a) Strongly agree, (b) agree, (c) undecided, (d) disagree, (e) strongly disagree.

all educators either "agreed" or "strongly agreed" that the legislation had assisted accountability by outlining the principal's duties and responsibilities.

The data reported in Table XXXIX reflect the views of principals concerning the measurement of accountability, as assisted by H.B. 235. The responses of principals and superintendents to Survey Item Number 20 provided the data and indicated whether measurement of accountability had been influenced.

Fifty-eight percent of the principals reported that "more measures" and "substantially more measures" were available as a result of the influence of the legislation. Forty-five percent of Category I, 42 percent of Category II, 35
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Answers Reported by Percentage of Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*H.B. 235 influences accountability to the extent that (a) substantially more accountability measures are available, (b) more accountability measures are available, (c) accountability measures are neither increased nor decreased, (d) fewer accountability measures are available, (e) substantially fewer accountability measures are available.

indicated that accountability measures had been "neither increased nor decreased."

The responses of superintendents showed that 60 percent of Category III, as compared to 37 percent of Category I, reported "more accountability measures were available." Also, 15 percent of Category III felt that "substantially more measures" resulted as influences of the legislation. "Neither increased nor decreased" was the indication of 62 percent of Category I, 45 percent of Category II, and 30 percent of Category IV, in viewing measures of accountability.

Fifteen percent of the superintendents in Category III recognized "substantially more accountability measures";
however, none of the principals in the same category held a similar view. In Category I, 10 percent of the principals perceived "substantially more" measures; none of the superintendents chose that response.

Table XL indicates whether accountability measures have been increased or decreased as a result of H.B. 235. The data for this table were provided by the responses from all groups of educators to Survey Item Number 20.

**TABLE XL**

RESPONSES OF THE SELECTED GROUPS OF EDUCATORS TO SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 20*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Answers Reported by Percentage of Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*H.B. 235 influences accountability to the extent that (a) substantially more accountability measures are available, (b) more accountability measures are available, (c) accountability measures are neither increased nor decreased, (d) fewer accountability measures are available, (e) substantially fewer accountability measures are available.

Responses of positive influence on the availability of accountability measures from superintendents and from principals were considerably more than from professors, as indicated by 52 percent, 51 percent, and 33 percent, respectively,
representing totals of each group that viewed an increase in this area. Sixty-six percent of the professors, 34 percent of the superintendents, and 38 percent of the principals, for a combined total of 39 percent, indicated that "accountability measures had been neither increased nor decreased." None of the educators perceived that measurement of accountability had been substantially decreased as a result of the legislation, and only 3 percent observed any decrease.

Survey Item Number 21 allowed educators to indicate whether the duties and responsibilities outlined in H.B. 235 could be used as a measuring scale for accountability for job performance. Table XLI reports the responses of principals and superintendents concerning this premise.

Principals generally "agreed" that a rating instrument had been established, as reported by 70 percent of Category I, 75 percent of Category III, 68 percent of Category IV, and 57 percent of Category II, respectively. In Category I, 10 percent "disagreed" that job performance can satisfactorily be measured in this manner, and the other categories responded similarly. Some principals were still "undecided," as reflected by the responses of 15 percent of Category I, 24 percent of Category II, 15 percent of Category III, and 8 percent of Category IV.

Superintendents' responses indicated that 75 percent of Category I, 75 percent of Category II, 85 percent of Category III, and 78 percent of Category IV either "agreed" or
### TABLE XLI
RESPONSES OF THE PRINCIPALS AND SUPERINTENDENTS TO SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 21*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Superintendents</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Principals who rate high in the performance of the duties and responsibilities defined by H.B. 235 have satisfactorily proven accountability for job performance. (a) strongly agree, (b) agree, (c) undecided, (d) disagree, (e) strongly disagree.

"strongly agreed" that an instrument for rating the job performance of the principal had resulted from the legislation. The largest percentage who "disagreed" was reported by 12 percent of Category II. Only a few superintendents were "undecided," as indicated by the total response of 12 percent.

Ten percent of the superintendents in Category III "strongly agreed" that accountability for job performance and performance of "duties and responsibilities" have been correlated by H.B. 235; none of the principals in Category III held that same opinion. More superintendents than principals in Category II, as indicated by responses of 72 percent and 57 percent, respectively, "agreed" that H.B. 235
established "duties and responsibilities" that could prove accountability.

Table XLII indicates whether educators feel that the principal's performance can be based on the provisions of H.B. 235, and can satisfactorily prove accountability. Item 21 is especially important, as it provides the perceptions of each group of educators related to the value of this measure of job performance.

**TABLE XLII**

RESPONSES OF THE SELECTED GROUPS OF EDUCATORS TO SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 21*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Answers Reported by Percentage of Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Principals who rate high in the performance of the duties and responsibilities defined by H.B. 235 have satisfactorily proven accountability for job performance. (a) Strongly agree, (b) agree, (c) undecided, (d) disagree, (e) strongly disagree.

The most positive response comes from superintendents, as 65 percent "agreed" and 11 percent "strongly agreed" with the statement related to Survey Item Number 21. Sixty-five percent of the principals and 66 percent of the professors "agreed" with the majority of the superintendents. Only
10 percent of all the educators, consisting of 16 percent of the principals, 12 percent of the superintendents, and 8 percent of the professors, "disagreed" that accountability had been influenced. Fifteen percent were "undecided."

In summary, there is ample evidence that the principal has been assisted in providing accountability for job performance. By outlining the duties and responsibilities of the principal, H.B. 235 has assisted in providing accountability for job performance and, in some instances, has increased the number of accountability measures available. Accountability for job performance can be proven by principals who satisfactorily meet the provisions of the legislation. Administrators who have been faced with indecision concerning a basis for measuring the job performance of principals have been provided with a partial solution to the problem.

Data from the Questionnaire Related to Question VIII

This section provides information concerning the influence of the legislation on the principal's relationship with the superintendent and board of trustees. The items, related to the question of whether improved relationships have resulted, deal with strengthening or weakening the relationship, involvement in planning sessions, improvement of communications procedures, consideration given to the level of
professionalism, and the association of superintendent-board of trustees relationship to the principal.

Survey Item Number 22 indicates whether the principal-superintendent relationship has been strengthened or weakened by the provisions of the legislation. Table XLIII reports the responses of principals and superintendents regarding the principal-superintendent relationship.

**TABLE XLIII**

RESPONSES OF THE PRINCIPALS AND SUPERINTENDENTS TO SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 22*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Superintendents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a*H.B. 235, as it relates to the superintendent, affects the principal-superintendent relationship by (a) substantially strengthening the relationship, (b) strengthening the relationship, (c) causing no change in the relationship, (d) weakening the relationship, (e) substantially weakening the relationship.

Principals reported that 65 percent of Category III, compared to 52 percent of Category IV, 39 percent of Category II, and 35 percent of Category I, reported that their relationship with the superintendent was "strengthened."
Nine percent of Category II felt that the relationship was "substantially strengthened." As indicated by 65 percent of Category I, 48 percent of Category II, 20 percent of Category III, and 44 percent of Category IV, many principals perceived "no change" in the relationship.

A "substantially strengthened" relationship was perceived by 11 percent of the superintendents, consisting of 18 percent of Category IV, 12 percent of Category I, 6 percent of Category II, and 5 percent of Category III. Thirty-seven percent of Category I, 33 percent of Category II, 60 percent of Category III, and 45 percent of Category IV reported that the relationship had been "strengthened." Category II had more superintendents who saw "no change," indicated by responses of 57 percent.

H.B. 235 "substantially strengthened" the principal-superintendent relationship, according to 18 percent of the superintendents and 4 percent of the principals in Category IV. The total positive responses of principals and superintendents in Category III showed that 55 percent of each sample recognized that the principal's relationship with the superintendent had been "strengthened."

Table XLIV shows whether the principal-superintendent relationship was strengthened or weakened as a result of H.B. 235. The responses of all groups to Survey Item Number 22 provide the data in Table XLIV.
TABLE XLIV
RESPONSES OF THE SELECTED GROUPS OF EDUCATORS TO SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 22*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Answers Reported by Percentage of Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*H.B. 235, as it relates to the superintendent, affects the principal-superintendent relationship by (a) substantially strengthening the relationship, (b) strengthening the relationship, (c) causing no change in the relationship, (d) weakening the relationship, (e) substantially weakening the relationship.

Sixty-six percent of the professors, 46 percent of the principals, and 42 percent of the superintendents, for a combined total of 45 percent, perceived a "strengthening," and a combined total of 8 percent viewed a "substantial strengthening" of the principal-superintendent relationship. A significant number of educators, 40 percent, perceived "no change" had been effected. It is significant to note that even though the principal was legally placed in the subordinate role to the superintendent, no significant "weakening" of the principal-superintendent role resulted.

Survey Item Number 23 indicates whether closer involvement of the principal and superintendent in planning sessions
has resulted from the legislation. Table XLV reports the responses of principals and superintendents related to this premise.

**TABLE XLV**

RESPONSES OF THE PRINCIPALS AND SUPERINTENDENTS TO SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 23*

| Choice of Responses | Principals | | | | | Superintendents | | | |
|---------------------|------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|                     | I | II | III | IV | Total | I | II | III | IV | Total |
| (a)                 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 16 | 5 | 12 | 3 | 15 | 18 | 12 |
| (b)                 | 50 | 42 | 70 | 60 | 53 | 37 | 39 | 60 | 57 | 48 |
| (c)                 | 15 | 33 | 15 | 16 | 21 | 37 | 9 | 5 | 15 | 13 |
| (d)                 | 30 | 21 | 15 | 8 | 18 | 12 | 45 | 20 | 9 | 24 |
| (e)                 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

*H.B. 235 has caused the principal and the superintendent to have closer involvement in planning sessions. (a) Strongly agree, (b) agree, (c) undecided, (d) disagree, (e) strongly disagree.

Responses from principals showed that 70 percent of Category III, 60 percent of Category IV, 50 percent of Category I, and 42 percent of Category II, "agreed" that closer involvement in planning sessions existed. Thirty percent of Category I and 21 percent of Category II "disagreed" that closer involvement had resulted. A total of 21 percent were "undecided" about the matter.

Twelve percent of the superintendents in Category I "strongly agreed" that closer planning with the principal
existed. Thirty-seven percent of Category I, 39 percent of Category II, 60 percent of Category III, and 57 percent of Category IV "agreed" with the statement in Survey Item Number 23. A substantial response in Category II, 45 percent, indicated "disagreement" regarding closer planning sessions. There was little "indecision," except for the response of 37 percent of Category I.

The responses of 30 percent of the principals, compared to 12 percent of the superintendents, who "disagreed" with the premise of Survey Item Number 23, indicated some variation between the groups in Category I samples. In Category II, 45 percent of the superintendents, compared to 21 percent of the principals, also "disagreed." In Category III, 70 percent of the principals and 60 percent of the superintendents "agreed" that involvement improved; 15 percent of the superintendents "strongly agreed." The responses of principals in Category IV were very similar to the responses of superintendents in Category IV.

Table XLVI indicates whether closer involvement between principal and superintendent in planning sessions has resulted from the legislation. The responses of each group of educators to Survey Item Number 23 were compiled and totalled to provide data presented in this table.

Fifty-three percent of the principals, 48 percent of the superintendents, and 58 percent of the professors "agreed," and a combined 71 percent of all three groups indicated involvement improved.
TABLE XLVI

RESPONSES OF THE SELECTED GROUPS OF EDUCATORS TO SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 23*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Superintendents</th>
<th>Professors</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*H.B. 235 has caused the principal and the superintendent to have closer involvement in planning sessions. (a) Strongly agree, (b) agree, (c) undecided, (d) disagree, (e) strongly disagree.

agreed" that the principal and the superintendent were more closely involved in planning. A total of 20 percent, consisting of 18 percent of the principals, 24 percent of the superintendents, and 8 percent of the professors "disagreed" on the item related to planning sessions.

The data reported in Table XLVII indicate whether improved communications between the superintendent and the board of trustees and the principal have resulted from the legislation. Responses of principals and superintendents to Survey Item Number 24 indicated their perceptions regarding this item.

Fifty-five percent of Category III and 60 percent of Category IV, opposed to 33 percent of Category II and 40 percent of Category I, indicated that principals "agreed" that
TABLE XLVII
RESPONSES OF THE PRINCIPALS AND SUPERINTENDENTS TO SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 24*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Answers Reported by Percentage of Categories</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
<td>III</td>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*H.B. 235 has caused improved communication procedures between the principal and the superintendent and board of trustees. (a) Strongly agree, (b) agree, (c) undecided, (d) disagree, (e) strongly disagree.

Procedures for communications had been improved. Forty percent of Category I and 24 percent of Category II "disagreed" with the statement. Some of the principals were "undecided," as reflected by the responses of 20 percent of Category I, 42 percent of Category II, 30 percent of Category III, and 24 percent of Category IV.

Eleven percent of the total superintendents "strongly agreed" that the procedures for communications had improved. Seventy percent of Category III, 48 percent of Category IV, and 42 percent of Category II "agreed," while 45 percent of Category II "disagreed" with the statement in Survey Item Number 24. Only a small portion of the superintendents were "undecided."
In Category I, 25 percent of the superintendents "strongly agreed" that communications had been improved; none of the principals chose the same response. In Category III, 80 percent of the superintendents reported positive views, whereas only 55 percent of the principals recognized an improvement in communications. In Category II, 45 percent of the superintendents, added to 24 percent of the principals, "disagreed."

Table XLVIII indicates whether improved communications procedures were perceived by all educators sampled. The responses of educators to Survey Item Number 24 were compiled by groups and totalled for the entire sample so as to indicate their views.

**TABLE XLVIII**

RESPONSES OF THE SELECTED GROUPS OF EDUCATORS TO SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 24*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Answers Reported by Percentage of Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*H.B. 235 has caused improved communication procedures between the principal and the superintendent and the board of trustees. (a) Strongly agree, (b) agree, (c) undecided, (d) disagree, (e) strongly disagree.
A total of 47 percent of all educators, consisting of 75 percent of the professors, 47 percent of the superintendents, and 46 percent of the principals, "agreed" that communications procedures between the principal and the superintendent and the board of trustees had been improved as a result of the legislation. Twenty-four percent of the superintendents and 21 percent of the principals reportedly "disagreed." One of the educators "strongly disagreed." Only 11 percent of the superintendents "strongly agreed."

Whether H.B. 235 has caused the board of trustees to appraise the principal on a higher professional level was to be determined from Survey Item Number 25. Data from the responses of principals and superintendents concerning the appraisal are reported in Table XLIX.

Principals reported that 45 percent of Category I, 66 percent of Category II, 45 percent of Category III, and 52 percent of Category IV observed that they were appraised on the "same" professional level that existed before H.B. 235. Forty-five percent of Category I and 45 percent of Category III comprise the majority of the 38 percent who felt that they were appraised on a "higher" professional level.

Reports from superintendents showed that 25 percent of Category I indicated that principals were appraised on a professional level "much higher than before," and 33 percent of Category II, 55 percent of Category III, and 57 percent of Category IV indicated "a higher" level. Sixty-six percent
TABLE XLIX
RESPONSES OF THE PRINCIPALS AND SUPERINTENDENTS TO
SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 25*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Answers Reported by Percentage of Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*H.B. 235 causes the board of trustees to appraise the principal on a professional level (a) much higher than before, (b) higher than before, (c) the same as before, (d) lower than before, (e) much lower than before.

of Category II, plus 50 percent of Category I, 27 percent of Category IV, and 25 percent of Category III, indicated that no change had resulted.

In Category I, the total positive responses of both the superintendents and the principals was equal to 50 percent; however, 25 percent of the superintendents felt that principals were appraised on a level "much higher than before." In Category IV, 57 percent of the superintendents and 36 percent of the principals observed a "higher" level of principal appraisal. The responses of superintendents in Category II were identical to the responses of the principals in Category II.
The data in Table I indicate whether boards of trustees appraise the principal on a higher professional level. These data were derived from the responses of all educators to Survey Item Number 25.

TABLE I
RESPONSES OF THE SELECTED GROUPS OF EDUCATORS TO
SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 25*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Answers Reported by Percentage of Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*H.B. 235 causes the board of trustees to appraise the principal on a professional level (a) much higher than before, (b) higher than before, (c) the same as before, (d) lower than before, (e) much lower than before.

Concerning the appraisal of the professional level of principals, the combined total of educators, 47 percent, perceived it to be "the same as before." Thirty-eight percent of the principals, 44 percent of the superintendents, and 58 percent of the professors, making a total of 42 percent, indicated that it was "higher than before." Even though the principal was clearly placed in a subordinate role to the superintendent and board of trustees, only 4 percent of the educators felt that boards of trustees appraise the principal on a level "lower than before."
The intent of Survey Item Number 26 was to determine if the principal's relationship with the board of trustees could be more nearly equated with his relationship with the superintendent as a result of H.B. 235. Table LI reports the responses of principals and superintendents to this premise.

**TABLE LI**
RESPONSES OF THE PRINCIPALS AND SUPERINTENDENTS TO SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 26*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Answers Reported by Percentage of Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*H.B. 235 causes the principal's relationship with the board of trustees to be more nearly equivalent to his relationship with the superintendent. (a) Strongly agree, (b) agree, (c) undecided, (d) disagree, (e) strongly disagree.

In Category II, 9 percent of the principals "strongly disagreed," 39 percent "disagreed," and 36 percent were "undecided." In Category I, 55 percent "disagreed" and 30 percent were "undecided" concerning equating the superintendent and the board of trustees. In Category III, 25 percent "disagreed," 25 percent "agreed," and 50 percent were
"undecided," while in Category IV, 52 percent "agreed," 24 percent "disagreed," and 20 percent were "undecided."

A majority of Category I, 50 percent, and of Category II, 63 percent, indicated that superintendents "disagreed" with the statement. Fifty percent of Category III, 39 percent of Category IV, and 18 percent of Category II responded that they "agreed" that the relationship had been more nearly equated. There were few who were "undecided," mostly represented by 15 percent of Category IV, 15 percent of Category II, and 25 percent of Category I.

In Category III, 50 percent of the superintendents, compared to 25 percent of the principals, "agreed" that the principal's relationship with the board of trustees had been more nearly equated with his relationship with the superintendent. Responses to the same statement show that 39 percent of Category IV superintendents, compared to 52 percent of Category IV principals, also "agreed." The responses of superintendents and principals in Category I were similar.

The responses of all groups of educators to Survey Item Number 26 are reported in Table LII. These data indicate whether H.B. 235 caused the principal's relationship with the board of trustees to be more nearly equivalent to his relationship with the superintendent.

The principal's relationship with the board of trustees has not been more nearly equated with his relationship with the superintendent. This was the
TABLE LI
RESPONSES OF THE SELECTED GROUPS OF EDUCATORS TO SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 26*

Choice of Responses | Answers Reported by Percentage of Groups
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>Superintendents</td>
<td>Professors</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*H.B. 235 causes the principal's relationship with the board of trustees to be more nearly equivalent to his relationship with the superintendent. (a) Strongly agree, (b) agree, (c) undecided, (d) disagree, (e) strongly disagree.

principals, 5 percent of the superintendents, and 8 percent of the professors, who "strongly disagreed," and 35 percent of the principals, 47 percent of the superintendents, and 66 percent of the professors, who "disagreed" with the premise in Survey Item Number 26. A total of 27 percent of the educators, consisting of 26 percent of the principals, 31 percent of the superintendents, and none of the professors, "agreed" with the statement in that item.

In summary, H.B. 235 has not had influence of significance on the principal's relationship with the superintendent and the board of trustees. Only about 50 percent of the educators reported that it had resulted in a strengthening of the principal-superintendent relationship, caused closer involvement in planning sessions between the principal
and the superintendent, improved communication procedures between the principal and the superintendent and the board of trustees, and caused the board of trustees to appraise the principal on a slightly higher professional level.

Data from the Questionnaire Related to Question IX

This section is designed to determine if improved principal-staff relationships have resulted from the enactment of H.B. 235. Items designed to provide the information to answer this question are related to the influence on the principal's responsibility for personnel management, improved principal-staff planning and evaluating of the instructional program, improved channels of communications, established procedures for staff evaluation, and the extent to which the principal-staff relationship was strengthened or weakened.

The data reported in Table LIII represent the responses of principals and superintendents to Survey Item Number 27. These data indicate whether the principal's responsibility for personnel management was greater or lesser as a result of the legislation.

According to 50 percent of Category I, 66 percent of Category II, 35 percent of Category III, and 40 percent of Category IV, the principal still has the "same responsibility" for personnel management. Forty-four percent of the principals, represented by 56 percent of Category IV, 50 percent
### TABLE LIII

**RESPONSES OF THE PRINCIPALS AND SUPERINTENDENTS TO SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 27**

*H.B. 235 affects the principal-staff relationship because personnel management is defined as (a) a substantially greater responsibility than before, (b) a greater responsibility than before, (c) the same responsibility as before, (d) a lesser responsibility than before, (e) a substantially lesser responsibility than before.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Answers Reported by Percentage of Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

of Category III, 45 percent of Category I, and 33 percent of Category II, indicated that personnel management is a "greater responsibility than before." Five percent of Category I perceive the responsibility to be "substantially greater."

Six percent of the superintendents indicated that the principal's responsibility for personnel management was "substantially greater," and 49 percent, consisting of 50 percent of Category I, 33 percent of Category II, 65 percent of Category III, and 60 percent of Category IV, reported "a greater responsibility" for the principal. The majority of
superintendents in Category II, 63 percent, viewed the principal's responsibility as being "the same."

Total positive responses of 66 percent of the superintendents, compared to 56 percent of the principals, provided indications that Category IV recognized an increased responsibility for personnel management. In Category III, 75 percent of the superintendents, compared to 50 percent of the principals, responded in the same manner. The responses of principals in Category II were almost identical to the responses of superintendents in Category II.

Table LIV provides indication from all the educators regarding increased or decreased personnel management responsibility for the principal. These data resulted from the responses of each group of educators and the total responses to Survey Item Number 27.

Sixty-six percent of the professors, compared to 49 percent of the superintendents and 44 percent of the principals, indicated that H.B. 235 had caused the principal's responsibility for personnel management to become "greater than before." A total of 44 percent of all the sample felt that his responsibility had remained "the same." Only 4 percent of the respondents reported a decrease of this function.

Survey Item Number 28 was designed to determine whether improved principal-staff planning and evaluating the instructional program had resulted from the legislation.
TABLE LIV

RESPONSES OF THE SELECTED GROUPS OF EDUCATORS TO SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 27*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Answers Reported by Percentage of Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*H.B. 235 affects 1
because personnel management is defined as (a) a substantially greater responsibility than before, (b) a greater responsibility than before, (c) the same responsibility as before, (d) a lesser responsibility than before, (e) a substantially lesser responsibility than before.

Table LV reports the responses of principals and superintendents concerning this premise.

Forty-seven percent of the principals, consisting of 65 percent of Category III, 45 percent of Category II, 44 percent of Category IV, and 40 percent of Category I, "agreed," compared to 14 percent, consisting mostly of 25 percent of Category I and 15 percent of Category III, who "disagreed" that improved principal-staff planning and evaluating has resulted. Thirty-five percent of Category I, 42 percent of Category II, 20 percent of Category III, and 36 percent of Category IV were "undecided."

Five percent of the superintendents "strongly agreed" and 54 percent, consisting of 50 percent of Category I,
TABLE LV
RESPONSES OF THE PRINCIPALS AND SUPERINTENDENTS TO
SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 28*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Answers Reported by Percentage of Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*H.B. 235 has brought about improved principal-staff planning and evaluating of the instructional program. (a) Strongly agree, (b) agree, (c) undecided, (d) disagree, (e) strongly agree.

48 percent of Category II, 70 percent of Category III, and 57 percent of Category IV, "agreed" that principal-staff relations have improved in this area. In Category II, 45 percent "disagreed." Twenty-four percent of Category IV and 25 percent of Category I were "undecided."

Total positive responses of 75 percent of the superintendents and 65 percent of the principals indicated that Category III perceived improved principal-staff planning and evaluating the instructional program. In Category II, 45 percent of the superintendents, contrasted with 12 percent of the principals, "disagreed."

Whether improved principal-staff relationship in the area of planning and evaluating the instructional program
has resulted from the enactment of H.B. 235 is reported in Table LVI. These data are from the responses of each group of educators and the total responses of the sample to Survey Item Number 28.

**TABLE LVI**

RESPONSES OF THE SELECTED GROUPS OF EDUCATORS TO SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 28*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Answers Reported by Percentage of Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*H.B. 235 has brought about improved principal-staff planning and evaluating of the instructional program. (a) Strongly agree, (b) agree, (c) undecided, (d) disagree, (e) strongly disagree.

Forty-seven percent of the principals, as compared to 54 percent of the superintendents and 58 percent of the professors, "agreed" that improved principal-staff planning and evaluating of the instructional program had resulted from the legislation. Twenty-four percent of the superintendents and 14 percent of the principals "disagreed" with this premise. Twenty-five percent of the educators were "undecided."
The purpose of Survey Item Number 29 was to determine whether improved channels of communication between the principal and the staff had resulted from the provisions of H.B. 235. Responses of principals and superintendents to this item provided the data reported in Table LVII.

**TABLE LVII**

RESPONSES OF THE PRINCIPALS AND SUPERINTENDENTS TO SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 29*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Answers Reported by Percentage of Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*H.B. 235 caused the development of improved channels of communication between the principal and the staff. (a) Strongly agree, (b) agree, (c) undecided, (d) disagree, (e) strongly disagree.

Forty-three percent of the principals, consisting of responses of 60 percent in Category III, 52 percent in Category IV, 45 percent in Category I, and 27 percent in Category II, "agreed" that communications had been improved, while 21 percent, represented by 25 percent of Category I, 24 percent of Category II, 20 percent of Category III, and 16 percent of Category IV, "disagreed." A total of 30 percent,
consisting mostly of 42 percent of Category IV and 30 percent of Category I, were "undecided." Category II, with 27 percent response, provided the least indication that improved channels of communication had been developed as a result of the legislation.

The most noticeable group of superintendents who did not feel that improved channels of communication resulted from H.B. 235 was Category II, represented by 51 percent, who "disagreed." Thirty-seven percent of Category I, 36 percent of Category II, 75 percent of Category III, and 48 percent of Category IV "agreed" that communications channels had been improved. Only a few superintendents, as indicated by 27 percent in Category IV and 25 percent of Category I, were "undecided."

Educators in Category III observed the development of improved channels of communications, according to the responses of 80 percent of the superintendents and 60 percent of the principals. Category II contained the most superintendents who "disagreed" and the fewest principals who "agreed," represented by responses of 51 percent and 27 percent, respectively.

The influence of the legislation on channels of communication was derived from the data provided by responses of each group of educators to Survey Item Number 29. These responses were tabulated and reported in Table LVIII.
TABLE LVIII
RESPONSES OF THE SELECTED GROUPS OF EDUCATORS TO SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 29*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Answers Reported by Percentage of Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*H.B. 235 caused the development of improved channels of communication between the principal and the staff. (a) Strongly agree, (b) agree, (c) undecided, (d) disagree, (e) strongly disagree.

Twenty-five percent of the professors, as compared to 43 percent of the principals and 47 percent of the superintendents, "agreed" that the channels of communication between the principal and the staff had been improved. Only 8 percent of the professors, as compared to 21 percent of the principals and 27 percent of the superintendents, "disagreed." The total sample had 26 percent "undecided."

Survey Item Number 30 was developed to determine if H.B. 235 had caused greater emphasis on procedures for staff evaluation. Table LIX reports the responses of principals and superintendents according to their views on the issue.

The total of 55 percent of the principals, consisting of 50 percent of Category I, 51 percent of Category II, 60
TABLE LIX

RESPONSES OF THE PRINCIPALS AND SUPERINTENDENTS TO
SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 30*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Answers Reported by Percentage of Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*H.B. 235 has caused greater emphasis toward establishing satisfactory procedures for staff evaluation. (a) strongly agree, (b) agree, (c) undecided, (d) disagree, (e) strongly disagree.

"agreed," compared to a total of 18 percent, involving 30 percent of Category I and 18 percent of Category II, who "disagreed" that improved procedures for staff evaluation resulted from H.B. 235. Only a small minority were "undecided," as indicated by 30 percent of Category II and 30 percent of Category III.

Most of the "disagreement" from superintendents to Survey Item Number 30 was indicated by the responses of 48 percent of Category II. Most superintendents, as indicated by 75 percent of Category I, 48 percent of Category II, 65 percent of Category III, and 66 percent of Category IV, "agreed" that procedures for staff evaluation had received
greater emphasis. Few superintendents, a total of 8 percent of the respondents, were "undecided."

In Category II, the positive responses of 51 percent of the principals and 51 percent of the superintendents indicated improved staff evaluation procedures; however, 48 percent of the superintendents, contrasted to 18 percent of the principals, "disagreed." In Category I, none of the superintendents, opposed to 30 percent of the principals, "disagreed" that staff evaluation had been influenced. The responses of Category IV principals were very similar to Category IV superintendents.

The data reported in Table LX represent the responses of educators to Survey Item Number 30. A greater emphasis toward establishing satisfactory procedures for staff evaluation, as a result of H.B. 235, is the topic of discussion related to the responses of the total sample.

Staff evaluation has received more emphasis, according to a total of 57 percent of the sample, comprised of 55 percent of the principals, 58 percent of the superintendents, and 66 percent of the professors who "agreed." Eight percent of the professors, 6 percent of the superintendents, and 2 percent of the principals "strongly agreed" with the premise. Twenty-six percent of the superintendents, compared to 18 percent of the principals and none of the professors, "disagreed." Twenty-three percent of the principals,
TABLE LX

RESPONSES OF THE SELECTED GROUPS OF EDUCATORS TO
SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 30*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Answers Reported by Percentage of Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*H.B. 235 has caused greater emphasis toward establishing satisfactory procedures for staff evaluation. (a) Strongly agree, (b) agree, (c) undecided, (d) disagree, (e) strongly disagree.

compared to 16 percent of the professors and 8 percent of the superintendents, were "undecided."

Survey Item Number 31 indicates the extent to which H.B. 235 has either strengthened or weakened the principal-staff relationship. The data reported in Table LXI represent the responses of principals and superintendents related to this item.

Principals generally perceived that their relationship with the staff had been "neither strengthened nor weakened," as indicated by 70 percent of Category I, 75 percent of Category II, 40 percent of Category III, and 32 percent of Category IV. The fact that the principal-staff relationship has been "strengthened" in some schools is indicated by the
TABLE LXI
RESPONSES OF THE PRINCIPALS AND SUPERINTENDENTS TO
SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 31*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Answers Reported by Percentage of Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*To what extent has H.B. 235 influenced the relationship between the principal and his staff? (a) Substantially strengthened the relationship, (b) strengthened the relationship, (c) neither strengthened nor weakened the relationship, (d) weakened the relationship, (e) substantially weakened the relationship.

responses of 30 percent of Category I, 24 percent of Category II, 45 percent of Category III, and 68 percent of Category IV.

Superintendents mostly reported that principal-staff relationships had been "neither strengthened nor weakened," as indicated by 72 percent of Category II, 50 percent of Category I, 42 percent of Category IV, and 30 percent of Category III. Of the remaining superintendents, 37 percent of Category I, 27 percent of Category II, 50 percent of Category III, and 45 percent of Category IV indicated that the relationship was "strengthened." Six percent felt that it was "substantially strengthened."
In Category I, 12 percent of the superintendents felt that the principal-staff relationship was "substantially strengthened"; however, none of the principals shared that opinion. In Category IV, 68 percent of the principals and 45 percent of the superintendents reported that principal-staff relationship was "strengthened." Fifteen percent of the principals and 10 percent of the superintendents in Category III reported negative responses.

The responses of educators to Survey Item Number 31 are reported in Table LXII. These data indicate views of educators related to the extent that principal-staff relationship has been strengthened or weakened.

**TABLE LXII**

RESPONSES OF THE SELECTED GROUPS OF EDUCATORS TO SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 31*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Answers Reported by Percentage of Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*To what extent has H.B. 235 influenced the relationship between the principal and his staff? (a) Substantially strengthened the relationship, (b) strengthened the relationship, (c) neither strengthened nor weakened the relationship, (d) weakened the relationship, (e) substantially weakened the relationship.
Most professors, 66 percent, felt that the principal-staff relationship was "neither strengthened nor weakened." Thirty-three percent of the professors reported that it had been "strengthened"; 40 percent of the principals and 38 percent of the superintendents made the same observation.

In summary, there is not significant evidence that H.B. 235 has improved the relationship of the high school principal and his staff. Even though a majority of the sample reported that the principal's responsibility for personnel management had been increased, cooperative planning and evaluating of the instructional program had improved, and the establishment of satisfactory procedures for staff evaluation had been emphasized, this was not significant to the 65 percent level for significance. The item related to the improvement of communications and the item designed to determine the extent that this staff relationship was strengthened did not receive positive response from 50 percent of the sample. Legislators and educators should notice that there was little negative influence evidenced, as reported by the responses of the educators. This appears to be worthy of attention, since the designation of the principal as the person responsible for the operation of the educational program at the building level places other staff members in a role that is subordinate to the principal.
Data from the Questionnaire Related to Question X

This section is designed to report data reflecting the views of educators concerning the influence of H.B. 235 on the principal's relationship with students and to determine whether this relationship has been improved. The items selected to provide this information relate to the principal's responsibility for student discipline, the development of channels of communication, the participation between the principal and the students in planning and decision making, and the realization of the extent to which principal-student relationship has been strengthened or weakened.

Table LXIII indicates the responses of principals and superintendents to Survey Item Number 32. The substance of this item is a statement that the responsibility for student discipline is more clearly established.

The responses of Category I principals to the statement concerning discipline were nearly equally divided among "strongly agree," "agree," "undecided," and "disagree," as indicated by responses of 20 percent, 35 percent, 25 percent, and 20 percent, respectively. Category II reported that 57 percent "agreed," 9 percent "disagreed," and 24 percent were "undecided." Reports from Category III and Category IV showed that 55 percent and 64 percent "agreed" and 25 percent and 20 percent were "undecided," in that order.
TABLE LXIII
RESPONSES OF THE PRINCIPALS AND SUPERINTENDENTS TO
SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 32*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Answers Reported by Percentage of Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*H.B. 235 more clearly establishes that student discipline is the responsibility of the principal. (a) Strongly agree, (b) agree, (c) undecided, (d) disagree, (e) strongly disagree.

With the exception of Category II, which reported that 51 percent "agreed," 30 percent "disagreed," and 18 percent were "undecided," most superintendents reported the establishment of student discipline as the principal's responsibility. Twenty-five percent of Category I "strongly agreed" and 50 percent "agreed." In Category III, 15 percent "strongly agreed" and 60 percent "agreed." In Category IV, 12 percent "strongly agreed" and 66 percent "agreed." Only 11 percent of all the categories were "undecided."

Concerning the premise that student discipline was emphasized as a responsibility of the principal, in Category II 9 percent of the principals "strongly agreed"; none of the superintendents chose that response. In Category III,
15 percent of the superintendents and 5 percent of the principals also "strongly agreed." In Category II, 9 percent of the principals, contrasted to 30 percent of the superintendents "disagreed." Responses of principals were similar to responses of superintendents in Category IV.

The data reflecting the responses of each group and the total group responses are reported in Table LXIV. The data indicate the combined perceptions of educators concerning the responsibility for student discipline.

**TABLE LXIV**

RESPONSES OF THE SELECTED GROUPS OF EDUCATORS TO SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 32*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Answers Reported by Percentage of Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*H.B. 235 more clearly establishes that student discipline is the responsibility of the principal. (a) Strongly agree, (b) agree, (c) undecided, (d) disagree, (e) strongly disagree.

Eleven percent of the principals, 10 percent of the superintendents, and 8 percent of the professors "strongly agreed," and 53 percent of the principals, 56 percent of the superintendents, and 33 percent of the professors "agreed,"
for a combined total of 63 percent who felt that the principal was more clearly responsible for student discipline. Eleven percent of the principals, 41 percent of the professors, and 21 percent of the superintendents "disagreed."

Survey Item Number 33 was designed to determine to what extent H.B. 235 has strengthened or weakened principal-student relationship. Table LXV reports the responses of principals and superintendents to this statement.

**TABLE LXV**

RESPONSES OF THE PRINCIPALS AND SUPERINTENDENTS TO SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 33*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Answers Reported by Percentage of Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*To what extent has H.B. 235 influenced the relationship between the principal and the students? (a) Substantially strengthened the relationship, (b) strengthened the relationship, (c) neither strengthened nor weakened the relationship, (d) weakened the relationship, (e) substantially weakened the relationship.

The fact that many principals saw no change in this relationship was indicated by the fact that 64 percent, consisting of 75 percent of Category I, 75 percent of Category
reported that their relationship with students had been "neither strengthened nor weakened." Some principals, as reflected by 25 percent of Category I, 24 percent of Category II, 35 percent of Category III, and 40 percent of Category IV, reported that principal-student relationship had been "strengthened." Only 3 percent of the respondents indicated that it had been "weakened."

Superintendents in Category II and Category I reflected views of the majority, as indicated by responses of 78 percent and 75 percent, respectively, that principal-student relationship has been "neither strengthened nor weakened." In Category III, 10 percent viewed this area to be "substantially strengthened" and 50 percent reported that it was "strengthened." Six percent and 39 percent of the same responses in the same order came from Category IV.

The responses of principals were very similar to the responses of superintendents in Category I, Category II, and in Category IV. In Category III, the principal-student relationship was viewed as "strengthened" by 50 percent of the superintendents and 35 percent of the principals; "substantially strengthened" was the report from 10 percent of the superintendents but none of the principals.

Table LXVI indicates the responses of educators to Survey Item Number 33. The substance of this item was related to the strengthening or weakening of principal-student relationship.
TABLE LXVI

RESPONSES OF THE SELECTED GROUPS OF EDUCATORS TO SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 33*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Answers Reported by Percentage of Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*To what extent has H.B. 235 influenced the relationship between the principal and the students? (a) Substantially strengthened the relationship, (b) strengthened the relationship, (c) neither strengthened nor weakened the relationship, (d) weakened the relationship, (e) substantially weakened the relationship.

A large percentage of all educators, including 83 percent of the professors, 64 percent of the principals, and 55 percent of the superintendents, for a total of 61 percent, indicated that the relationship between principals and students had been "neither strengthened nor weakened." Thirty-three percent of the superintendents and 30 percent of the principals, as compared to 8 percent of the professors, felt that a "strengthened" relationship has resulted. Only 5 percent of the respondents "disagreed" with the premise, and none "strongly agreed."

The intention of Survey Item Number 34 was to determine if H.B. 235 had caused the development of improved channels of communication that would influence the principal's
relationship with the students. Table LXVII reflects responses of principals and superintendents to the premise that improved communications channels have been developed.

TABLE LXVII

RESPONSES OF THE PRINCIPALS AND SUPERINTENDENTS TO SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 34*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Answers Reported by Percentage of Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*H.B. 235 has caused the development of improved channels of communications between the principal and the students. (a) Strongly agree, (b) agree, (c) undecided, (d) disagree, (e) strongly disagree.

The responses of principals showed that Category II had 21 percent "agree," 21 percent "disagree," and 54 percent "undecided," compared to Category IV, which had 20 percent "disagree," 48 percent "agree," and 28 percent were "undecided." Thirty percent in Category I "agreed," 30 percent "disagreed," and 40 percent reported that they were "undecided." In Category III, 30 percent "agreed," 20 percent "disagreed," and 50 percent indicated "indecision."
Thirty-eight percent of the superintendents, derived from 51 percent of Category IV, 50 percent of Category III, 24 percent of Category II, and 25 percent of Category I "agreed" with the premise. Thirty percent, comprised mostly of 48 percent of Category II, "disagreed." "Undecided" was the response of 26 percent, shown by 50 percent of Category I.

The reports from principals were similar to the reports from superintendents in Category I and in Category IV. The most noticeable difference in Category II resulted from the responses of 48 percent of the superintendents, compared to 24 percent of the principals who "disagreed" that principal-student communications had improved. In Category III, 50 percent of the superintendents, compared to 30 percent of the principals, reportedly "agreed" that better communications had resulted from the legislation.

The data reported in Table LXVIII indicate the views of each group and of the total sample, related to Survey Item Number 34. These data are related to the principal-student relationship in the area of communications.

With the exception of professors, educators have indicated such varied responses that conclusions of significance cannot be determined regarding the matter of principal-student communications. Thirty-eight percent of the superintendents and 31 percent of the principals "agreed" with the premise, while 30 percent of the superintendents and 23 percent
TABLE LXVIII
RESPONSES OF THE SELECTED GROUPS OF EDUCATORS TO SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 34*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Answers Reported by Percentage of Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*H.B. 235 has caused the development of improved channels of communications between the principal and the students. (a) Strongly agree, (b) agree, (c) undecided, (d) disagree, (e) strongly disagree.

of the principals "disagreed." Forty-one percent of the professors, 43 percent of the principals, and 26 percent of the superintendents were "undecided." Four percent of the superintendents "strongly agreed" with the substance of the item; none of the educators "strongly disagreed."

Survey Item Number 35 attempts to determine if the participation between the principal and the students in planning and decision making had increased or decreased as a result of the legislation. Table LXIX reflects the views of principals and superintendents concerning their participation with students in planning and decision making.

Most principals indicated that there had been no change in this area of school operations, reflected by the response of 63 percent, consisting of 75 percent of Category I, 75
TABLE LXIX
RESPONSES OF THE PRINCIPALS AND SUPERINTENDENTS TO
SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 35*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Superintendents</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I  II  III IV</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>I  II  III IV</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>0  0  0  0  0  0</td>
<td>0  0  5  3  3</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>0  0  0  0</td>
<td>0  0  0  0</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>0  0  0  0</td>
<td>0  0  0  0</td>
<td>(a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>25  21  35  52  32</td>
<td>12  21  45  48  34</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>25  21  35  52  32</td>
<td>12  21  45  48  34</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>25  21  35  52  32</td>
<td>12  21  45  48  34</td>
<td>(b)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>75  75  55  48  63</td>
<td>87  78  40  42  56</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>75  75  55  48  63</td>
<td>87  78  40  42  56</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>75  75  55  48  63</td>
<td>87  78  40  42  56</td>
<td>(c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>0  3  10  0  3</td>
<td>0  0  10  6  5</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>0  3  10  0  3</td>
<td>0  0  10  6  5</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>0  3  10  0  3</td>
<td>0  0  10  6  5</td>
<td>(d)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>0  0  0  0  0</td>
<td>0  0  0  0  0</td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>0  0  0  0  0</td>
<td>0  0  0  0  0</td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>0  0  0  0  0</td>
<td>0  0  0  0  0</td>
<td>(e)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*As a result of H.B. 235, participation between the principal and the students in planning and decision making has (a) substantially increased, (b) increased, (c) remained the same, (d) decreased, (e) substantially decreased.

percent of Category II, 55 percent of Category III, and 48 percent of Category IV, that it had "remained the same."

Some principals have felt a change, as indicated by 25 percent of Category I, 21 percent of Category II, 35 percent of Category III, and 52 percent of Category IV, who felt that it had "increased."

The responses of superintendents to the same item showed an overwhelming response from Category I and Category II, 87 percent and 78 percent, respectively, comprising a total of 56 percent who indicated that student involvement had "remained the same." Some superintendents, as indicated by 48 percent of Category IV, 45 percent of Category III, and 21 percent of Category II, felt that principals and students
had "increased" their involvement in planning and decision making. Three percent of Category III and 5 percent of Category IV perceived a "substantial increase."

The responses of the superintendents were similar to the responses of the principals in Category I, Category II, and Category IV. In Category III, 45 percent of the superintendents, compared to only 35 percent of the principals, observed an "increase" in student involvement; 5 percent of the superintendents observed a "substantial increase."

The data presented in Table LXX represent the responses of educators to Survey Item Number 35. Perceptions of principal-student participation are reported according to the group responses and the total responses of the educators sampled.

**TABLE LXX**

RESPONSES OF THE SELECTED GROUPS OF EDUCATORS TO SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 35*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Answers Reported by Percentage of Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*As a result of H.B. 235, participation between the principal and the students in planning and decision making has (a) substantially increased, (b) increased, (c) remained the same, (d) decreased, (e) substantially decreased.
The majority of each group of educators, led by 83 percent of the professors, indicated that participation in planning and decision making between the principal and the students remained the same. Only 8 percent of the professors, compared to 32 percent of the principals and 34 percent of the superintendents, perceived an "increase" in participation.

In summary, it can be concluded that the provisions of H.B. 233 have not had significant influence on the relationship of the principal and the students, even though it does more clearly define the principal's responsibility for the conduct of students. This single item, related to student-principal relationship, does not provide sufficient evidence of broad influence. The slight indication that the relationship has been strengthened, that improved channels for the communication of ideas have been developed, and that student involvement in planning and decision making has increased, does not support a premise of improved principal-student relationship and conclusions of significance cannot be drawn.

Data from the Questionnaire Related to Question XI

The data discussed in this section are related to the influence of the legislation on the relationship between the principal and the parents and citizens. The items related to this question concern the strengthening or weakening of the relationship, the improvement of planning sessions, and
the influence upon cooperative effort between the principal and the parents and citizens.

Data reported in Table LXXI represent responses of the principals and superintendents to Survey Item Number 36. These responses indicate whether the principal's relationship with parents and citizens has been strengthened or weakened.

**TABLE LXXI**

**RESPONSES OF THE PRINCIPALS AND SUPERINTENDENTS TO SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 36**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Answers Reported by Percentage of Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*As a result of H.B. 235, the relationship between the principal and the parents and citizens has been (a) substantially strengthened, (b) strengthened, (c) neither strengthened nor weakened, (d) weakened, (e) substantially weakened.

Reports from principals showed that 65 percent of Category I, 69 percent of Category II, 45 percent of Category III, and 56 percent of Category IV felt that the principal's relationship with parents and citizens had been "neither strengthened nor weakened." Thirty-three percent, composed
of 30 percent of Category I, 27 percent of Category II, 40 percent of Category III, and 40 percent of Category IV, indicated that the relationship was "strengthened." Five percent of the responses in Category I felt that it had been "substantially strengthened."

The responses of superintendents showed that only in Category IV, with 48 percent, and Category III, with 40 percent, were there indications of noticeable size that principal-community relationships had been improved. Seventy-five percent of Category I, 81 percent of Category II, 45 percent of Category III, and 42 percent of Category IV chose the response that indicated a lack of influence by the legislation.

In Category I, a total of 35 percent of the principals, compared to 25 percent of the superintendents, felt that the principal-community relationship had been improved; 65 percent and 75 percent, respectively, perceived no change. In Category III, 15 percent of the principals and 10 percent of the superintendents reported that the relationship had been "weakened."

The responses of each group of educators and of the total sample indicate whether the principal's relationship with the community was strengthened or weakened. These data are reported in Table LXXII.

There was very little variation in the responses of the groups, as indicated by a total of 59 percent, comprised of
TABLE LXXII

RESPONSES OF THE SELECTED GROUPS OF EDUCATORS TO
SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 36*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Answers Reported by Percentage of Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*As a result of H.B. 235, the relationship between the principal and the parents and citizens has been (a) substantially strengthened, (b) strengthened, (c) neither strengthened nor weakened, (d) weakened, (e) substantially weakened.

59 percent of the principals, 75 percent of the professors, and 57 percent of the superintendents who reported no change in the principal's relationship with the parents and citizens. A portion of the sample, 33 percent, consisting of 33 percent of the principals, 33 percent of the superintendents, and 25 percent of the professors indicated that the legislation had "strengthened" the relationship. Only 5 percent of the respondents felt it was "weakened."

Data from responses to Survey Item Number 37 are reported in Table LXXIII. These data indicate whether principal-community involvement in planning sessions has improved, according to principals and superintendents.

Twenty percent of Category I, 21 percent of Category II,
**TABLE LXXIII**

RESPONSES OF THE PRINCIPALS AND SUPERINTENDENTS TO
SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 37*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Answers Reported by Percentage of Categories</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
<td>Superintendents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
<td>II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Generally improved planning sessions with parents and citizens and the principal are evidence of influence resulting from H.B. 235. (a) strongly agree, (b) agree, (c) undecided, (d) disagree, (e) strongly agree.

"agreed" that improved planning has resulted. A total of 32 percent, consisting of 30 percent of Category I, 36 percent of Category II, 40 percent of Category III, and 24 percent of Category IV, "disagreed." A total of 39 percent, consisting of 50 percent of Category I, 42 percent of Category II, 30 percent of Category III, and 36 percent of Category IV, were "undecided." None of the respondents "strongly disagreed."

The responses of superintendents showed that most of the "disagreement" with the premise was reported by 54 percent of Category II; however, a total of 33 percent, comprised of 50 percent of Category I, 36 percent of Category II, 25 percent of Category III, and 18 percent of Category
IV, were "undecided." Forty-five percent of Category III indicated that improved planning had resulted, but only 33 percent of Category IV, 25 percent of Category I, and 9 percent of Category II could "agree" with them. Five percent of Category III "strongly agreed."

In Category II, 21 percent of the principals, contrasted with 9 percent of the superintendents, "agreed" that improved planning sessions had resulted. Fifty-four percent of the superintendents and 36 percent of the principals "disagreed." In Category III, a total of 50 percent of the superintendents, compared to 30 percent of the principals, reported positive responses; negative responses came from 40 percent of the principals and 25 percent of the superintendents.

The perceptions of each group and of the total sample, concerning the improved planning between principals and parents and citizens, are reported in Table LXXIV. The data were compiled from the responses of the selected groups of educators to Survey Item Number 37.

Only 26 percent of the principals, 31 percent of the superintendents, and none of the professors "agreed" that improved planning was evidenced. A total of 33 percent, consisting of 32 percent of the principals, 32 percent of the superintendents, and 33 percent of the professors "disagreed." Thirty-seven percent were "undecided." Only 2
TABLE LXXIV

RESPONSES OF THE SELECTED GROUPS OF EDUCATORS TO SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 37*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Answers Reported by Percentage of Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Generally improved planning sessions with parents and citizens and the principal are evidence of influence resulting from H.B. 235. (a) Strongly agree, (b) agree, (c) undecided, (d) disagree, (e) strongly disagree.

percent of the respondents "strongly agreed" with the premise, and none "strongly disagreed."

The substance of Survey Item Number 38 was related to the influence of the legislation upon the cooperative effort of the principal with parents and citizens. The responses of principals and superintendents to this issue are reported in Table LXXV.

Only 25 percent of the principals recognized "more cooperative effort" with parents and citizens. There were 68 percent, consisting of 75 percent of Category I, 75 percent of Category II, 55 percent of Category III, and 68 percent of Category IV, who indicated "neither more nor less cooperative effort" was perceived. Five percent of Category I
**TABLE LXXV**

RESPONSES OF THE PRINCIPALS AND SUPERINTENDENTS TO SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 38*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Answers Reported by Percentage of Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*H.B. 235 has influenced the principal's relationship with the parents and citizens as evidenced by (a) substantially more cooperative effort, (b) more cooperative effort, (c) neither more nor less cooperative effort, (d) less cooperative effort, (e) substantially less cooperative effort.

reported "substantially more" and 15 percent of Category III reported "less" cooperative effort.

The responses of the superintendents indicated their views related to the legislation's influence upon cooperation of the principal and the community. More superintendents from the smaller school districts, 55 percent of Category III and 42 percent of Category IV, than the larger districts, 25 percent of Category I and 15 percent of Category II, perceived that "more cooperative effort" had resulted. Most of the total sample, as indicated by 50 percent response, indicated "neither more nor less cooperative effort" had been brought about by the legislation. Only 5
percent of the respondents perceived it to be "substantially more."

"More cooperative" effort was observed by 55 percent of the superintendents and 30 percent of the principals in Category III. In Category IV, 68 percent of the principals, compared to 51 percent of the superintendents, did not observe an influence in the area of cooperative effort. In Category III, 15 percent of the principals and 10 percent of the superintendents reported "less cooperation."

The responses of each group plus the total responses from the sample to Survey Item Number 38 are reported in Table LXXVI. These data provide information related to whether more cooperative effort or less cooperative effort has resulted from the provisions of the legislation.

Eighty-three percent of the professors, 68 percent of the principals, and 58 percent of the superintendents reported that "neither more nor less cooperation" had resulted. Thirty-three percent of the superintendents, 25 percent of the principals, and 8 percent of the professors reported "more" cooperation, while 2 percent of the respondents perceived "substantially more cooperative effort."

In summary, there was insufficient evidence to conclude that the relationship between the principal and the parents and citizens had been improved. The percentage of educators who viewed a strengthened principal-community relationship, who viewed improved planning, or who perceived increased
TABLE LXXVI
RESPONSES OF THE SELECTED GROUPS OF EDUCATORS TO SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 38*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Answers Reported by Percentage of Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*H.B. 235 has influenced the principal's relationship with the parents and citizens as evidenced by (a) substantially more cooperative effort, (b) more cooperative effort, (c) neither more nor less cooperative effort, (d) less cooperative effort, (e) substantially less cooperative effort.

cooperative effort was not significant when compared to the 65 percent level established as a criteria for the drawing of significant conclusions.

Data from the Questionnaire Related to Question XII

The data reported in this section provide indications of the weaknesses and limitations of H.B. 235, as perceived by the educators sampled. The weaknesses of the legislation were determined by comparing the data from Survey Item Number 39, concerned with the needs for legislation, with the data from Survey Item Number 40, related to the influence of the legislation.
The data shown in Table LXXVII denote the responses of the sample to Survey Item Number 39. The items were ranked according to the number of times they were selected by each group, placed in descending order, and listed according to the total number of times they were selected.

**TABLE LXXVII**

RESPONSES OF THE SELECTED GROUPS OF EDUCATORS TO SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 39*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Answers Reported by Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal status</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional leadership</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance accountability</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with superiors</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with staff</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige of the principal</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morale of the principal</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with students</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional consultations</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive management</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant management</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extracurricular operation</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget operation</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with parents</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal management</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special services operation</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (write in)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*From the list (above) select the areas that in your opinion should have been influenced by legislation.
Legal status ranked first in priority. Each of the groups as well as the total sample selected this answer most frequently.

Instructional leadership ranked second as a need. Principals and superintendents selected it second; professors chose it third.

Accountability for job performance was listed in third place. Professors chose it second; principals and superintendents listed it third.

Relationship with superiors was accorded fourth place in the list of needs for legislation. Principals and professors listed it fourth; superintendents ranked it sixth.

Fifth place went to the relationship with the staff. Superintendents rated it fourth.

The prestige of the principal was chosen for sixth place. This ranked sixth with principals, eighth with superintendents, and seventh with professors.

The morale of the principal was accorded seventh place, relationship with the students was ranked eighth, and ninth place was the overall rank for professional consultations.

Executive management ranked tenth. Superintendents listed it thirteenth, principals chose it ninth, and professors selected it sixth.

Plant management ranked eleventh. Principals and superintendents chose it tenth; professors chose it eleventh.
Extracurricular operations ranked twelfth. This need was listed ninth by superintendents, thirteenth by principals, and fourteenth by professors.

Budget operations ranked thirteenth, the relationship with parents was listed as fourteenth, and fiscal management ranked fifteenth.

Special services operations only ranked sixteenth. The need for legislation in this area was rated at the bottom of the prepared list.

Other problems listed ranked only seventeenth. None of the principals listed other problems.

The responses to Survey Item Number 40 provided the data reported in Table LXXVIII. The areas perceived by educators to have been significantly influenced by H.B. 235 are ranked in descending order, according to the frequency of their selection.

The principal's legal status was ranked most often as the area influenced by the legislation. It was listed first by all three groups.

Second place was the rank for accountability for job performance. All three groups ranked this answer second.

Instructional leadership was recorded often enough to gain third place. Superintendents placed it third, principals placed it fourth, and professors placed it sixth.

The prestige of the principal received mention with enough frequency to make it fourth.
### TABLE LXXVIII
RESPONSES OF THE SELECTED GROUPS OF EDUCATORS TO SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 40*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Principals</th>
<th>Superintendents</th>
<th>Professors</th>
<th>Total Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legal status</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance accountability</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional leadership</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestige of the principal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morale of the principal</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with staff</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with superiors</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive management</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional consultations</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with parents</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with students</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extracurricular operation</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant management</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal management</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget operations</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special services operation</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (write in)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*From the list (above) select the areas that in your opinion have been influenced significantly by H.B. 235.

listed this area third, whereas the superintendents selected prestige in sixth place.

Fifth place was the overall rank of the problem of principal morale. Superintendents ranked it fifth, principals ranked it sixth, and professors ranked it seventh.
The principal's relationship with his staff has been influenced enough to rank sixth place. Superintendents and professors listed it fourth, while principals placed it seventh.

Seventh place was the rank for the problem of the principal's relationship with his superiors. Principals and professors ranked it fifth, yet superintendents ranked it eighth.

The influence on executive management was recognized often enough to rank eighth, professional consultations ranked ninth, and the principal's relationship with parents was listed in tenth place.

The principal's relationship with the students ranked in eleventh place. Principals, superintendents, and professors selected the area of concern in tenth, eleventh, and twelfth place, respectively.

The influence on extracurricular operation ranked twelfth, plant management ranked thirteenth, and the influence on fiscal management ranked fourteenth. Budget operations ranked fifteenth.

Special services operations ranked only sixteenth on the list. Professors listed it fourteenth and principals and superintendents listed it sixteenth.

The responses of the selected groups of educators to Survey Item Number 41 provided the data reported in Table LXXIX. These responses provided the list of limitations of
TABLE LXXIX

RESPONSES OF THE SELECTED GROUPS OF EDUCATORS TO
SURVEY ITEM NUMBER 41*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice of Responses</th>
<th>Answers Reported by Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of public understanding</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No means for enforcement</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not strong enough</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of administrative push</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short tenure of the statute</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of public support</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of clarity</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courts fail to comply</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too ambiguous</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Failure of principals to comply</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contradictory to tradition</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (write in)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undesirable legislation</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If you have observed that H.B. 235 has some limitations at this time, please select limitations as they appear best stated in the list (above). Restate or add other limitations if you desire. Select as many as needed to properly respond.

H.B. 235 that were apparent to the sample. The limitations were ranked according to the frequency with which they were selected, and were reported in descending order.

Lack of public understanding of the legislation was the limitation ranked first. Principals, superintendents, and professors selected this response as the number one limita-

"No means for enforcement" was second on the list. Principals and superintendents listed it second, whereas the professors listed it fifth.

The fact that the legislation was "not strong enough" ranked third. Professors chose this factor for fourth place, but principals and superintendents listed it third.

"Lack of administrative push" was the fourth factor listed according to the responses. It ranked second with professors, fifth with principals and seventh with superintendents.

The "short tenure of the statute" was listed fifth. "Lack of public support" and "lack of clarity" were ranked sixth and seventh, respectively.

The fact that "courts fail to comply" with the legislation was ranked eighth. Principals and professors listed it seventh, whereas superintendents listed it tenth.

Enough educators felt that the legislation was "too ambiguous" to rank that premise ninth. Professors listed it third; superintendents listed it ninth; and principals recorded it tenth.

"Failure of the principals to comply" ranked tenth. "Contradictory to tradition" ranked eleventh.

"Other" limitations ranked twelfth. Most of those were concerned with the inability of any legislation to solve the problems related to the high school principalship or to
bring out the leadership characteristics necessary for satisfactory job performance.

The last choice on the list was related to "undesirable legislation." This choice ranked thirteenth on the principals' list, and thirteenth by the superintendents. This response was not selected by professors.

In summary, the responses of educators provided a list of areas that should have been influenced by legislation and a list of areas that were influenced by H.B. 235. A comparison of the lists provided indications that most of the areas that should have been influenced, according to a rank of importance, were influenced at a similar level. The data provided by the two lists, as well as the list of limitations, will be described as a part of the findings reported in Chapter V. Findings related to Question XII, as well as those related to the other eleven questions, will be reported. Conclusions, implications, and recommendations will be developed from the findings.
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CHAPTER V

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, INFERENCES,
AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The objective of Chapter I was to furnish an introduction to the study and the procedures for collecting and processing the data needed for the study. A review of the literature related to the study was presented in Chapter II. Detailed procedures for the collection of data were outlined in Chapter III, and the data collected were presented in Chapter IV.

Chapter V presents the processed data in the form of findings. Conclusions were drawn and inferences were suggested from the results of the findings. Recommendations were made on the basis of findings that were reported, conclusions that were drawn, and inferences that were suggested.

Findings

The data presented from the study of House Bill 235 are reported in the form of findings listed below:

1. The objective of Question I was to determine the ultimate intent of the legislative and educational leaders who were instrumental in writing and proposing H.B. 235.
Findings related to this investigation indicated that the legislation was intended

(a) to provide legal authority to the principal for the fulfillment of his duties and responsibilities by writing into state law many of the things he was already doing, or was held responsible for doing;

(b) to provide the principal the legal authority to carry out the mandates of the superintendent and the board of trustees;

(c) to hold the principal responsible to the superintendent and board of trustees for carrying out their directives;

(d) to represent a directive from the legislature defining the principal's responsibility for personnel management in the areas of staff assignment, staff evaluation, and staff recommendations;

(e) to establish student discipline as an ultimate responsibility of the principal, thus eliminating reprisals from parents and unmanageable demands from teachers;

(f) to encourage principals to give greater attention to instructional leadership;

(g) to provide job definitions for the principal and still allow for the flexibility and
individuality that is necessitated by the wide disparity in the size of school districts and the demands placed upon the district by its publics;

(h) to provide restrictions that would retain the responsibility for educational decision making in the jurisdiction of professional educators;

(i) to provide the principal with the responsibility for educational administration;

(j) to encourage the evaluation of the schools' programs by the principals;

(k) to assure that school principals would continue to be certified administrators;

(l) to develop better cooperation between parents, the students, and the principal by educating them in regard to the principal's duties and responsibilities.

The legislature intended to provide the principal with the legal authority to carry out the duties that were associated with the role of the principal. The principal's relationship with the superintendent and board of trustees was defined with the intention of providing a chain of responsibility for establishing role definitions. The legislation was intended to provide some specific responsibilities for principals and still allow for the flexibility to function in the varied environments within the schools. The
responsibilities for discipline and personnel management were specifically designated to the principal.

The legislation also was intended to cause principals to direct their attention to the planning of the instructional program and the evaluating of its success. The relationship of the parents, citizens, and students was intended to improve as a result of being educated in regard to the principal's duties.

The legislation further intended to define who could be principal. By requiring certification, the legislation was intended to insure that educational decisions would be made by professional educators.

2. The objective of Question II was to determine if the legislation had brought about added prestige to the high school principal. Items in the survey related to this objective indicated the following findings:

(a) Sixty-nine percent of all respondents indicated that H.B. 235, as the first legislation of its kind in Texas, significantly added to the prestige of the principal.

(b) Forty-six percent of the educators felt that the duties and responsibilities required of the principal by the legislation provided prestige higher than other professions requiring similar amounts of education and experience.
(c) Seventy-four percent of the educators felt that a greater emphasis on the selection of the high school principal had been brought about as a result of the responsibilities and duties placed upon the principal by the legislation.

It can be concluded that added prestige has resulted. Responses significant at the 65 percent level indicated that the landmark legislation significantly added to the principal's prestige and required a greater emphasis on the proper selection of a high school principal. A significant percentage did not feel that the principalship had prestige higher than similar professions.

3. Question III was designed to determine if the morale of the principal had been improved as a result of the legislation. Items in the survey related to this question indicated the following findings:

(a) Sixty-seven percent of the respondents indicated that the morale of the principal had been strengthened by the provisions of authority commensurate with position requirements.

(b) Fulfilling the provisions of H.B. 235 provided a higher job satisfaction for principals, according to only 48 percent of the educators.

(c) According to 68 percent of the educators, the fulfillment of the duties and responsibilities
outlined by the legislation has not changed the number of hours required in the principal's work week.

(d) Only 26 percent of the respondents indicated that compensations to principals were viewed as more satisfactory than before for carrying out their outlined duties and responsibilities.

The responses to items related to this question were not significant at the 65 percent level to indicate that the principal's morale had been improved. There were not significant reports of improvements or benefits in job satisfaction, hours required for work, or compensations to give a positive response to Question III. Only provision of commensurate authority added to the principal's morale, according to educators.

4. The objective of Question IV was to determine if the legislation had provided support for the legal position of the high school principal. Items related to this objective provided the following findings:

(a) Seventy-three percent of the educators indicated that the legislation had strengthened the legal position of the principal in cases of court litigation.

(b) Seventy-nine percent of the educators felt that the principal was in a stronger legal
position to face challenges to his authority from organizations and individuals who sought to control some aspect of school operations.

(c) The legislation has provided stronger assurance that the position of high school principal shall continue to require a certified school administrator, according to the responses of 77 percent of the educators.

All three items related to this subject received significant responses which indicated that the principal's legal position had been supported. Certification was insured, challenges to authority were defensed, and threat of court litigation was reduced.

5. The objective of Question V was to determine if the legislation had caused greater attention to be focused on instructional leadership. The items in the survey related to this objective provided the following findings:

(a) Sixty-five percent of the educators felt that the principal's responsibility for instructional leadership had been placed in a position of greater priority.

(b) Planning or implementing more innovative programs has resulted from this instructional leadership, according to 53 percent of the respondents.
(c) The principal's responsibility for the 
selection of instructional material appeared to 
be more important to 50 percent of the respon-
dents.

(d) Seventy-five percent of the educators 
indicated that instructional supervision should 
receive more emphasis from the principal as a 
result of the legislation.

(e) The responsibility of the principal for 
planning and evaluating the instructional program 
has received more emphasis, according to 78 per-
cent of the educators.

Three of the five items related to instructional leader-
ship indicated that this responsibility had received more 
attention. The priority for instructional leadership, 
emphasis on instructional supervision, and emphasis on pro-
gram planning and evaluating each received significant 
responses. At least half the educators, although not sig-
nificant at the 65 percent level, observed more innovative 
programs and more participation in selection of materials.

6. The objective of Question VI was to determine 
whether executive management operation had been facilitated 
by H.B. 235. Responses to items related to this objective 
indicated the following findings:

(a) Sixty-five percent of the educators 
indicated that the executive management role of
the high school principal is more effective as a result of the written job definitions provided by H.B. 235.

(b) The principal's involvement in establishing operational policies and procedures for fulfilling administrative responsibility has been influenced by the legislation, according to 73 percent of the educators.

(c) Just 40 percent of the respondents indicated that the problem of role conflict that arises because of the principal's allegiance to the superintendent and the principal's allegiance to the staff had been decreased by H.B. 235. Significant responses to two of the three items related to this question indicated that executive management had been facilitated by written job definitions and by involvement in establishing operational policies and procedures. A significant response did not indicate that "role conflict" had been decreased.

7. The objective of Question VII was to determine whether accountability for job performance by the principal had been assisted by the legislation. Responses to the items in the survey related to this objective produced the following findings:

(a) Accountability for job performance had been assisted by the procedure of outlining the
duties and responsibilities of the principal, according to 74 percent of the respondents.

(b) Fifty-seven percent of the educators indicated that H.B. 235 had provided more measures to the principal for establishing accountability.

(c) Principals who rate high in the performance of the duties and responsibilities defined by the legislation have, in effect, proven accountability for job performance, according to 74 percent of the respondents.

Accountability for job performance has been assisted according to two of the three items related to the activity. The outline of duties and responsibilities and the use of H.B. 235 as a measuring instrument received significantly favorable response.

8. The purpose of Question VIII was to determine whether the legislation had improved principals' relationship with the superintendents and the boards of trustees. Responses to the items in the survey related to this purpose provided the following findings:

(a) Fifty-two percent of the respondents indicated that the legislation had resulted in a strengthening of the relationship between the principal and the superintendent.
(b) According to 58 percent of the respondents, principals and superintendents have a closer involvement in planning sessions as the result of the legislation.

(c) Improved communications procedures between the principal and the superintendent and the board of trustees were perceived by 53 percent of the educators sampled.

(d) Only 48 percent of the educators perceived that the board of trustees had been caused to appraise the principal on a higher professional level as a result of the legislation.

(e) Only 28 percent of the respondents indicated that the legislation had caused the principal's relationship with the board of trustees to be more nearly equivalent to his relationship with the superintendent.

A majority of the educators approved three of the five items, and almost half approved the fourth item; however, this was not significant at the required 65 percent level of response. It cannot be concluded that the relationship has been improved.

9. The purpose of Question IX was to determine whether H.B. 235 had caused improved relationships between the principal and the building staff. The items in the survey related to this objective resulted in the following findings:
(a) Fifty-one percent of the respondents indicated that the principal's responsibilities for personnel management had been more clearly defined, thus his relationship with the staff was influenced.

(b) Improved principal-staff planning and evaluating of the instructional program have resulted from the legislation, according to 54 percent of the educators sampled.

(c) Only 49 percent of the educators perceived the development of improved channels of communication between the principal and the staff as a result of H.B. 235.

(d) A greater emphasis toward establishing satisfactory procedures for staff evaluation was viewed by 61 percent of the respondents as a result of the legislation.

(e) Only 42 percent of the respondents indicated that a strengthened relationship between the principal and the staff had resulted as an influence of the legislation.

Approximately half the educators approved each of the five items; however, this was not considered significant to conclude that the principal-staff relationship was improved.

10. The objective of Question X was to determine whether the legislation caused improved relationship between
the principal and the students. The following findings resulted from responses to the items in the survey related to this objective:

(a) Student discipline was more clearly established as the responsibility of the principal, according to 63 percent of the respondents.

(b) Only 33 percent of the educators indicated that the relationship between the principal and the students had been strengthened as a result of the legislation. Sixty-one percent indicated that changes had not resulted.

(c) The legislation has caused the development of improved channels of communication between the principal and the students, according to 35 percent of the educators. Twenty-eight percent disagreed and 36 percent were undecided.

(d) Thirty-four percent of the respondents perceived that participation between the principal and the students in planning and decision making has increased as a result of the legislation, while 60 percent felt that it remained the same.

According to the responses to the four items related to this question, there is not sufficient evidence that the principal's relationship with the students has been improved.
II. Question XI was designed to determine if the legislation had improved the principal's relationship with the parents and citizens. Findings that resulted from responses to items in the survey related to this question are as follows:

(a) Only 35 percent of the educators perceived that the principal's relationship with the parents and citizens had been strengthened as a result of H.B. 235.

(b) Improved planning sessions with parents and citizens and the principal were perceived by only 29 percent of the educators sampled, while 33 percent disagreed and 37 percent were undecided.

(c) Only 30 percent of the educators observed evidence that a more cooperative effort between the principal and the parents and citizens had resulted from the legislation. Sixty-four percent saw no change.

None of the three items related to this activity received positive responses at the 65 percent level of significance to indicate that the principal's relationship with the parents and citizens had been improved.

12. The objective of Question XII was to determine the weaknesses and limitations of the legislation apparent to the educators. The items in the survey related to this objective provided the following findings:
(a) When the list of areas that should have been influenced by legislation was compared to the list of areas that were influenced, the areas that have been influenced ranked at least within one level of the areas that should have been influenced, with few exceptions.

(b) The exceptions, shown by comparing what should have been influenced with what was influenced, showed relationship with superiors ranked fourth and seventh; relationship with students ranked eighth and eleventh; plant management ranked eleventh and thirteenth; budget operations ranked thirteenth and fifteenth.

(c) Some areas ranked higher on the list of what was influenced than on the list of what should have been influenced, as shown by the fact that prestige ranked sixth and fourth; morale ranked seventh and fifth; executive management ranked tenth and eighth.

(d) Legal status, instructional leadership, and accountability for job performance were the top three responses on both lists.

(e) The list of limitations showed that "lack of public understanding," "no means of enforcement," "not strong enough," and "lack of administrative push" were the top four responses.
The "short tenure of the statute," "lack of public support," and "lack of clarity" were next on the list, in that order.

Conclusions

The following conclusions were developed as partial results from the findings that were reported:

1. The findings and conclusions related to Question I allow for the following conclusions:

   (a) The state legislature will continue to accept its responsibility for public education and to attempt to relieve the dilemmas that arise from the state's attempt to provide quality education to all school age students.

   (b) The state legislature is sensitive to the needs of education and responsive to the influence of professional organizations.

   (c) The intent of the legislation has been fulfilled in many of its areas for a majority of the principals to a sufficient degree to provide encouragement to those who proposed it.

2. The findings related to Question II allow for the following conclusions:

   (a) The position of school principal has become more prestigious and therefore more
desirable as a result of this legislative action and the duties it prescribed.

(b) There is a need for the development of sound specifications for the position of high school principal and the establishment of manageable procedures for evaluating the criteria deemed important for candidates for the principalship.

(c) The high school principalship, regarded on the basis of prestige, can compete with other professions for the services of qualified professionals.

3. The findings related to Question III allow for the following conclusions:

(a) Providing professionals with authority commensurate with their responsibilities adds to their morale. The principalship is one example of educational positions that can be influenced by legislation.

(b) Morale can be improved by providing satisfactory duties and responsibilities, even though compensations are not increased and working hours are not decreased.

4. Findings related to Question IV allow for the following conclusions:

(a) The legislature continues to have ultimate authority for education and to transfer
legal designation of responsibilities to other agencies and individuals.

(b) The court justices, formal and informal organizations, groups, and individuals are influenced by legislative action. Challenges to the action of the principal when he is performing duties assigned by the legislature, the board of trustees, or the superintendent will have less impact and provide less threat to the operation of the school.

(c) Establishing legal status for other educational positions should provide satisfactory results.

5. The findings related to Question V allow for the following conclusions:

(a) Placing a greater emphasis on instructional leadership should cause a restructuring of priorities and a reorganization of procedures by the principal.

(b) Emphasizing the instructional leadership role of the principal will require the assistance of universities, educational service centers, and other agencies for direction and guidance of the principal's efforts.

6. The findings related to Question VI allow for the
(a) The provision of job definitions assist in fulfilling job expectations.
(b) The principals will assist in the development of policies they are expected to enforce.

7. The findings related to Question VII allow for the following conclusions:

(a) Principals can provide accountability for job performance if they successfully perform their duties and responsibilities outlined by the legislation.
(b) Other educators could establish accountability if their duties and responsibilities were outlined in a proper manner.
(c) Procedures for the evaluation of the principal's job performance need to be established. These procedures should include a measuring instrument and method of evaluation.

8. The findings related to Question VIII allow for the following conclusions:

(a) Principals and superintendents must establish procedures for working cooperatively together for the operation of the educational program.
(b) School districts should establish procedures for greater involvement and closer
participation between the principal, superintendent, and the board of trustees.

(c) Boards of trustees continue to maintain a unique relationship with the high school principals.

9. The findings related to Question IX allow for the following conclusions:

(a) Principals must establish satisfactory procedures for fulfilling the responsibilities for staff selection, assignment, evaluation, and recommendation. The establishment of evaluation procedures and an instrument for measuring performance are vital to the performance of the principal's duties.

(b) The educational program of the schools will be more the result of a cooperative effort of the principal and the staff. Staff members who have helped to develop school programs are more likely to feel a responsibility for their success.

(c) The provision of an approach to job definition would benefit teachers and other staff members of the school system.

10. The findings related to Question X allow for the following conclusions:
(a) Principals must develop guidelines that will assist in maintaining discipline within the school without infringing upon the rights of students or neglecting the needs of classroom teachers.

(b) Measures need to be established and evaluated to bring about closer involvement between the principal and the students.

(c) Teachers may expect more assistance in the area of class control and the students should be free of unreasonable demands by classroom teachers.

11. The findings related to Question XI allow for the following conclusions:

(a) Principals, superintendents, and boards of trustees must search for new ways to cause parents and citizens to work more closely with the high school principal in the planning and the implementation of the school program.

(b) Parents and citizens have not become familiar with the provisions of the legislation.

12. The findings related to Question XII allow for the following conclusions:

(a) Working with the public could bring even better results from the legislation.
(b) School administrators could receive better results from the legislation if they worked to implement it.

(c) The legislation will become even more effective with the passage of time.

(d) Educational agencies could assist the legislation by taking positive action.

Inferences

The following inferences have been suggested as results of the findings and conclusions:

1. Educational and legislative leaders can cooperatively plan new approaches to establishing educational responsibility.

2. The high school principalships will be staffed with personnel that have proper training and sufficient dedication to meet the tasks related to the needs of modern education.

3. There is a definite relationship between the transfer of authority and the efforts that are made to clearly define the responsibilities to be designated.

4. Time and money will be saved as a result of reducing challenges to authority, thus allowing more time and resources to be devoted to educational activities.

5. The selection of high school principals will be influenced by the candidates' leadership and preparation related to instructional competency.
6. Accountability for job performance can be considered an attainable goal and a practical reality, instead of an untenable theory.

7. The principal continues to have a unique relationship with the board of trustees.

8. The utilization of the job definition approach to job performance provides a practical and satisfactory system of performance-based evaluation.

9. The activities related to student discipline have not caused a deterioration in the relationship between principals and students.

10. The limiting factors associated with this legislation are related more to problems of communication and social process than to the statute as a product of the legislation.

Recommendations

It appears that, within the realm and scope of the study, the following recommendations may appropriately be made from the findings that were reported and the conclusions that were drawn:

1. Educational and governmental agencies at various levels should provide the public with an information source that will bring about a greater public awareness of the aspects of this legislation.

2. The Texas Education Agency should assume the responsibility for developing guidelines that will assist
principals in fulfilling the duties and responsibilities outlined in House Bill 235.

3. The Texas Education Agency should work cooperatively with boards of trustees, superintendents, and principals to evaluate the principal's performance for the personnel responsibility assigned by the legislature and approved by the governor.

4. The Texas State Teachers Association and other agencies responsible for public education should recommend to the legislature a form of legislation that would fix the responsibilities and duties for teachers in much the same manner that House Bill 235 established duties and responsibilities for principals.

5. The Texas Association of School Administrators and other high level agencies responsible for public education should recommend to the legislature a form of legislation that would fix the duties and responsibilities for superintendents in much the same manner that House Bill 235 established duties and responsibilities for principals.

6. Superintendents, principals, and boards of trustees should work together to establish written job definitions for principals and to establish an evaluation instrument to measure job performance for the principal of a given district.

7. Boards of trustees, superintendents, principals, and staff members should work together to establish written
job definitions for staff members and to develop evaluation instruments based on the job definitions, so that principals can fulfill their responsibilities.

8. Superintendents in larger school districts should recommend to boards of trustees that the position of high school principal be placed nearer the top of the administrative ladder so that quality personnel will choose to remain in this position.

9. Present and future consultation and negotiation agreements should be examined and evaluated in terms of their relationship to the duties and responsibilities of the high school principal.

10. A follow-up study should be conducted within a period of three years to determine whether the influences of the legislation have been continuous and to determine whether additional efforts have been made to cause the legislation to be even more effective.
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NINE MEMBER JURY FOR QUESTIONNAIRE VALIDATION

Dr. Tony Fillman, Principal
Sherman High School
Sherman, Texas

Dr. Clyde Greer, Principal
Westlake High School
Austin, Texas

Mr. Jack Kennedy, Principal
Beaumont High School
Beaumont, Texas

Mr. Mickey Koonce, Superintendent
Midlothian School District
Midlothian, Texas

Dr. John McFarland, Dean
Texas Women's University
Denton, Texas

Dr. Morgan Moses, Professor
Stephen F. Austin College
Nacogdoches, Texas

Dr. James Patterson, Professor
Southern Methodist University
Dallas, Texas

Dr. O. C. Taylor, Superintendent
Grapevine School District
Grapevine, Texas

Dr. Forrest Watson, Superintendent
Ennis School District
Ennis, Texas
Dear

Would you please assist in establishing the validity of a survey questionnaire to be used as a part of a doctoral dissertation at North Texas State University? This study is under the direction of Dr. E. Vaughn Huffstutler, Professor, Division of Administrative Leadership.

The problem of the study is the investigation of the development of H.B. 235 and its impact on the role of the high school principal in Texas. It will examine the effects of the legislation on the principal's:

1) prestige
2) morale
3) legal status
4) executive management
5) performance accountability
6) relationship with the staff
7) relationship with students
8) relationship with parents and citizens
9) relationship with the superintendent

The validated survey instrument will be mailed to a sampling of Texas high school principals, superintendents, and professors of educational administration. When returned to us, it should provide the information needed for the study.

Please evaluate each item on the questionnaire and determine its appropriateness and its ability to provide the necessary information. The numbers in the margin provide a rating scale. The number one (1) rates the item appropriate and clearly stated. The number two (2) indicates indecision as to the question's value. The number three (3) indicates the question is of little value, inappropriate and unclear. Please circle your choice. Obviously, some questions can be improved by changes in wording. Please use the space at the end of the questionnaire to provide suggestions for the improvement of questions of this nature.

Would you please return the questionnaire at your earliest convenience, using the self-addressed, stamped envelope?

Sincerely,

Scott Gene Chance
Principal
PANEL FOR ESTABLISHING THE SIGNIFICANCE OF RESPONSES

The following men are all professors at North Texas State University, are familiar with the study, and are involved in school administration:

Dr. E. V. Huffstutler    Dr. Walter Sandefur
Dr. Paul Smith           Dr. Harold Sunderman
Dr. Hoyt Watson
To:

From: Scott Gene Chance
Denison Senior High School

Purpose: To establish the ranges of responses that provide significance and major significance to the findings of the study.

Explanation: A Likert-type scale was used to provide responses to the survey items designed to determine the impact of H. B. 235 on the role of the high school principal. The responses indicate perceptions of changes in the forms of increased or decreased proportions, strengthened or weakened relationships, broadened or narrowed activities, or clarified or confused procedures.

To Be Determined: In order to provide significance or major significance to the findings, what percentage of the total sample of educators should choose the responses (for example, either "agree" or "strongly agree") that indicate support for the premise being tested by the survey item.

Instructions: Please circle two ranges of percentages, one for significance and one for major significance, and return this item in the envelope provided. Write in any number that seems appropriate but not listed.

0--5--10--15--20--25--30--35--40--45--50--*
55--60--65--70--75--80--85--90--95--100

Note: The ranges of responses recommended by this group of five experts will be used to determine whether the findings indicate major significance, significance, or lack of significance. The median of the ranges recommended will be used in each case.
ALPHABETICAL LISTING OF HIGH SCHOOLS THAT PROVIDED
THE PRINCIPALS FOR THE SAMPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>School Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alamo Heights (San Antonio) High School</td>
<td>Canyon High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany High School</td>
<td>Connally High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antelope High School</td>
<td>Cooper (Abilene) High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin (El Paso) High School</td>
<td>Cotton Center High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin (Houston) High School</td>
<td>Crawford High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avery High School</td>
<td>Crockett (Austin) High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bandera High School</td>
<td>Crosbyton High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blanco High School</td>
<td>Cushing High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloomburg High School</td>
<td>Dalhart High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blum High School</td>
<td>Darrouzett High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonham High School</td>
<td>Dawson High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breckenridge High School</td>
<td>De Soto High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenham High School</td>
<td>Denton High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brownwood High School</td>
<td>Dickinson High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruni High School</td>
<td>Dodd City High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burbank (San Antonio) High School</td>
<td>Dunbar (Lubbock) High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burleson High School</td>
<td>East Chambers High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caddo Mills High School</td>
<td>Eastland High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caldwell High School</td>
<td>Electra High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canutillo High School</td>
<td>Elysian Fields High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon High School</td>
<td>Eola High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carter-Riverside (Fort Worth) High School</td>
<td>Evant High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castleberry High School</td>
<td>Florence High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Hill High School</td>
<td>Floresville High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicota High School</td>
<td>Flower Grove High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chireno High School</td>
<td>Forney High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claude High School</td>
<td>Friendswood High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleburne High School</td>
<td>Friona High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coahoma High School</td>
<td>Galena Park High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goodrich High School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Granger High School</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Greenville High School
Gregory-Portland High School
Groveton High School
Harlingen High School
Henrietta High School
Hereford High School
Highland Park High School
Holliday High School
Honey Grove High School
Houston (San Antonio) High School
Hubbard High School
Hutto High School
Ingleside High School
Irving High School
Jacksboro High School
Jacksonville High School
Jefferson High School
Jefferson (Dallas) High School
Jefferson (San Antonio) High School
Johnson (Johnson City) High School
Junction High School
La Porte High School
Lanier (Austin) High School
Leggett High School
Lindale High School
Littlefield High School
Llano High School
Los Fresnos High School
Lubbock High School
Lueders-Avoca High School
Mac Arthur (San Antonio) High School
Madisonville High School
Marshall (San Antonio) High School
Martin (Laredo) High School
Mason High School
Mathis High School
McGregor High School
Merkel High School
Mirando City High School
Moran High School
Mount Vernon High School
Muenster High School
Muleshoe High School
Nacogdoches High School
Northside High School
Northwest High School
Novice High School
Oakwood High School
Oglesby High School
Olney High School
Paducah High School
Pampa High School
Paradise High School
Paris High School
Pawnee High School
Phillips High School
Plano High School
Poth High School
Pottsboro High School
Prairie Lea High School
Quitaque High School
Rains High School
Rayburn (Pasadena) High School
Reagan (Austin) High School
Richfield (Waco) High School
Richland (Birdville) High School
Richland Springs High School
Rider (Wichita Falls) High School
Rising Star High School
Roby High School
Rochelle High School
Sabine Pass High School
San Diego High School
San Marcos High School
San Perlita High School
Seagraves High School
Seymour High School
Shelbyville High School
Shepherd High School
Slocum High School
Smiley High School
South Grand Prairie (Grand Prairie) High School
Star High School
Sterling (Houston) High School
Stinnett High School
Tatum High School
Taylor High School
Terrell (Fort Worth) High School
Texarkana High School
Three Way High School
Toyah High School
Trent High School
Turner (Carrollton) High School
University (Waco) High School
Van Alstyne High School
Weatherford High School
Wheatley (Houston) High School
Whitesboro High School
Wichita Falls High School
Wink High School
Wolfe City High School
Woodsboro High School
Woodson High School
Wylie High School
Yates (Houston) High School
Yoakum High School
Ysleta (El Paso) High School
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ALPHABETICAL LISTING OF SCHOOL DISTRICTS THAT PROVIDED SUPERINTENDENTS FOR THE SAMPLE

Alamo Heights Independent School District
Albany Independent School District
Antelope Independent School District
Avery Independent School District
Bandera Independent School District
Blanco Independent School District
Bloomburg Rural High School District
Blum Independent School District
Bonham Independent School District
Breckenridge Independent School District
Brenham Independent School District
Brownwood Independent School District
Bruni Consolidated School District
Burleson Independent School District
Caddo Mills Independent School District
Caldwell Independent School District
Canutillo Independent School District
Carbon Independent School District
Carrollton (Farmers Branch) Independent School District
Castleberry Independent School District
Cedar Hill Independent School District
Chicota Independent School District
Chireno Independent School District
Claude Independent School District
Cleburne Independent School District
Coahoma Independent School District
Connally Independent School District
Cotton Center Independent School District
Crawford Independent School District
Crosbyton Independent School District
Cushing Independent School District
Dalhart Independent School District
Darrouzett Independent School District
Dawson Independent School District
De Soto Independent School District
Denton Independent School District
Dickinson Independent School District
Dodd City Rural High School District
East Chambers Independent School District
Eastland Independent School District
El Paso Independent School District
Electra Independent School District
Elysian Fields Independent School District
Eola Rural High School District
Evant Independent School District
Florence Independent School District
Floresville Independent School District
Flower Grove Independent School District
Forney Independent School District
Fort Worth Independent School District
Friendswood Independent School District
Friona Independent School District
Galena Park Independent School District
Goodrich Independent School District
Granger Independent School District
Greenville Independent School District
Gregory-Portland Independent School District
Groveton Independent School District
Henrietta Independent School District
Hereford Independent School District
Highland Park Independent School District
Holliday Independent School District
Honey Grove Independent School District
Hubbard Independent School District
Hutto Independent School District
Ingleside Independent School District
Jacksboro Independent School District
Jacksonville Independent School District
Jefferson Independent School District
Johnson City Independent School District
Junction Independent School District
La Porte Independent School District
Leggett Independent School District
Lindale Independent School District
Littlefield Independent School District
Ilano Independent School District
Los Fresnos Consolidated Independent School District
Lubbock Independent School District
Lueders-Avoca Independent School District
Madisonville Independent School District
Mason Independent School District
Mathis Independent School District
McGregor Independent School District
Merkel Independent School District
Miranda City Independent School District
Moran Independent School District
Mt. Vernon Independent School District
Muenster Independent School District
Muenster Independent School District
Northside (San Antonio) Independent School District
Northwest Independent School District
Novice Rural Independent School District
Oakwood Independent School District
Oglesby Independent School District
Olney Independent School District
Paducah Independent School District
Pampa Independent School District
Paradise Independent School District
Paris Independent School District
Pawnee Independent School District
Phillips Independent School District
Plano Independent School District
Poth Independent School District
Pottsboro Independent School District
Prairie Lea Independent School District
Quitaque Independent School District
Rains Independent School District
Richland Springs Independent School District
Rising Star Independent School District
Roby Independent School District
Rochelle Rural High School District
Sabine Pass Independent School District
San Diego Independent School District
San Marcos Independent School District
San Perlita Independent School District
Seagraves Independent School District
Seymour Rural High School District
Shelbyville Independent School District
Shepherd Independent School District
Slocum Independent School District
Smiley Independent School District
Star Independent School District
Stinnett Independent School District
Tatum Independent School District
Taylor Independent School District
Texarkana Independent School District
Three Way Independent School District
Toyah Independent School District
Trent Independent School District
Van Alstyne Independent School District
Weatherford Independent School District
Whitesboro Independent School District
Wichita Falls Independent School District
Wink Independent School District
Wolfe City Independent School District
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ALPHABETICAL LISTING OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES
THAT PROVIDED THE PROFESSORS FOR THE SAMPLE

Abilene Christian College
East Texas State University
North Texas State University
Sam Houston State University
South West Texas State University
Texas Agricultural and Industrial University
Texas Agricultural and Mechanical University
Texas Southern University
Texas Technical University
University of Houston
University of Texas at Austin
West Texas State University
Dear

I am involved in a doctoral study which attempts to investigate the impact of the "principal's duties and responsibilities bill" on the role of the high school principal. This study involves high school principals, superintendents, and university professors. The Dean of Education at your university submitted your name because you have the major responsibility for training high school principals. I would like to ask for your assistance.

Would you please respond to the survey instrument enclosed in this folder? The study is concerned with your perception of the influence of H. B. 235. It is understood that you might not have first hand knowledge of the actual conditions that exist within the schools. Your name will not be associated with your responses and I ask you to sign the instrument only as a means of certifying the responding schools.

Enclosed is your personal copy of this legislation. I appreciate your assistance in this study.

Sincerely,

Scott G. Chance
Principal

SGC:nr

Enclosure
May 26, 1972

Dear Fellow Educator:

I can realize and appreciate just how busy you are, because I'm in the same position you are in. Activities related to closing of school are taking up all of my time.

There is something that I think is important enough to be worth considering. This is our "principal's duties and responsibilities," outlined by House Bill 235. It has been a year since the Legislature of the State of Texas responded to the requests of TASSP and passed legislation to help us in our profession. I am attempting to evaluate this bill in a doctoral study. The only way we can benefit from this evaluation is to spend a little time and participate in this study. It will be only as effective as the responses we receive.

Educators have always been able to meet the tasks before them. I appreciate your help for this one.

Sincerely,

Scott C. Chance
Principal

SCC:nr
A Study of H. B. 235 and its Impact

The Role of the High School Principal as Perceived by Selected Educators

TO: Texas High School Principals, Superintendents, and Professors

FROM: S. Gene Chance, Principal, Denison Senior High School
Denison, Texas 75020

DATE: May 22, 1972

PURPOSE: This questionnaire is part of a doctoral study at North Texas State University to investigate H. B. 235 and its impact on the role of the high school principal in Texas

RESPONDENT:
1) Name
2) School
3) Address
4) Would you like a copy of the final report?

DIRECTIONS: Please mark your response in the circle representing the answer that most nearly suits your perception of this legislation. Please consider the influence of H. B. 235.

Only a few questions will allow more than a single response. These will be clearly designated.

I would greatly appreciate your prompt attention to answering and returning this questionnaire. Enclosed is your personal copy of H. B. 235.

Sincerely,

S. Gene Chance
A QUESTIONNAIRE DESIGNED TO DETERMINE THE IMPACT OF H. B. 235
ON THE ROLE OF THE HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPAL IN TEXAS

Directions: Please check the one choice that fits your perception of the most appropriate response to complete the statement, answer the question, or respond to the statement.

This study is interested in the impact of the "principal's responsibilities and duties bill." Please keep this legislation foremost in your mind as you respond to the items.

THE FOLLOWING GROUP OF QUESTIONS IS DESIGNED TO DETERMINE WHETHER OR NOT H. B. 235 ADDED TO THE PRESTIGE OF THE HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPAL.

1. H. B. 235, as the first legislation of its kind in Texas, significantly adds to the prestige of the principal.

0 - strongly agree
0 - agree
0 - undecided
0 - disagree
0 - strongly disagree

2. Prestige of the principalship outlined by H. B. 235, when compared to other professions requiring similar amounts of education and experience, ranks

0 - much higher
0 - higher
0 - undecided
0 - lower
0 - much lower

3. The fulfillment of the duties and responsibilities outlined by H. B. 235 places a greater emphasis on the proper selection of a high school principal.

0 - strongly agree
0 - agree
0 - undecided
0 - disagree
0 - strongly disagree

THE FOLLOWING GROUP OF QUESTIONS IS DESIGNED TO DETERMINE WHETHER OR NOT H. B. 235 IMPROVED THE MORALE OF THE HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPAL.

4. The morale of the principal is significantly strengthened by H. B. 235 as it provides authority commensurate with position requirements.

0 - strongly agree
0 - agree
0 - undecided
0 - disagree
0 - strongly disagree
5. Job satisfaction provided to the principal for fulfilling the provisions of H. B. 235 is

0 - much higher than before
0 - higher than before
0 - the same as before
0 - lower than before
0 - much lower than before

6. To fulfill the duties and responsibilities of H. B. 235 the principal is required to work

0 - substantially more hours than before
0 - more hours than before
0 - the same hours as before
0 - fewer hours than before
0 - substantially fewer hours than before

7. Compensations, especially in the form of salary, vacation, holidays and sick leave, for the execution of the defined duties and responsibilities, appear now to be

0 - much more satisfactory than before
0 - more satisfactory than before
0 - neither more nor less satisfactory than before
0 - less satisfactory than before
0 - much less satisfactory than before

The following group of questions is designed to determine whether or not H. B. 235 strengthened the legal status of the high school principal.

8. In case of court litigation, H. B. 235 places the legal status of the principal in

0 - a much stronger position than before
0 - a stronger position than before
0 - the same position as before
0 - a weaker position than before
0 - a much weaker position than before

9. As a result of H. B. 235, the principal is in a stronger legal position to face challenges to authority from organizations and other individuals.

0 - strongly agree
0 - agree
0 - undecided
0 - disagree
0 - strongly disagree

10. H. B. 235 provides stronger assurance that certification will continue to be a requirement for the principal.

0 - strongly agree
THE FOLLOWING GROUP OF QUESTIONS IS DESIGNED TO DETERMINE WHETHER OR NOT H. B. 235 CAUSES GREATER ATTENTION TO BE FOCUSED ON THE INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP OF THE HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPAL.

11. **H. B. 235 places the principal's responsibility for instructional leadership in a position of**

- substantially greater priority
- greater priority
- the same priority
- lesser priority
- substantially lesser priority

12. **H. B. 235 has caused the principal, as Instructional leader, to implement, or plan to implement, more innovative programs.**

- strongly agree
- agree
- undecided
- disagree
- strongly disagree

13. **Resulting from the enactment of H. B. 235, the principal's responsibility for the selection of instructional material appears to be**

- much more important
- more important
- unchanged
- less important
- much less important

14. **Since the passage of H. B. 235, instructional supervision as a responsibility of the principal should receive**

- much more emphasis
- more emphasis
- the same emphasis
- less emphasis
- much less emphasis

15. **H. B. 235 places more emphasis on the position of the principal for planning and evaluating the instructional program.**

- strongly agree
- agree
- undecided
- disagree
- strongly disagree
THE FOLLOWING GROUP OF QUESTIONS IS DESIGNED TO DETERMINE WHETHER OR NOT THE EXECUTIVE MANAGEMENT OPERATIONS HAS BEEN FACILITATED FOR THE HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPAL.

16. The executive management role in high school operations is more effective because of the written job definitions provided by H. B. 235.
0 - strongly agree  
0 - agree  
0 - undecided  
0 - disagree  
0 - strongly disagree

17. H. B. 235 influences the involvement of the principal in establishing operational policies and procedures for fulfilling administrative responsibility.
0 - strongly agree  
0 - agree  
0 - undecided  
0 - disagree  
0 - strongly disagree

18. H. B. 235 affects the problem of "role conflict" that arises because of the principal's allegiance to the superintendent and the principal's allegiance to his staff by
0 - substantially decreasing the problem  
0 - decreasing the problem  
0 - neither increasing nor decreasing the problem  
0 - increasing the problem  
0 - substantially increasing the problem

THE FOLLOWING GROUP OF QUESTIONS IS DESIGNED TO DETERMINE WHETHER OR NOT ACCOUNTABILITY FOR JOB PERFORMANCE BY THE HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPAL HAS BEEN ASSISTED.

0 - strongly agree  
0 - agree  
0 - undecided  
0 - disagree  
0 - strongly disagree

20. H. B. 235 influences accountability to the extent that
0 - substantially more accountability measures are available  
0 - more accountability measures are available  
0 - accountability measures are neither increased nor decreased  
0 - fewer accountability measures are available  
0 - substantially fewer accountability measures are available
21. Principals who rate high in the performance of the duties and responsibilities defined by H. B. 235 have satisfactorily proven accountability for job performance.

0 - strongly agree
0 - agree
0 - undecided
0 - disagree
0 - strongly disagree

THE FOLLOWING GROUP OF QUESTIONS IS DESIGNED TO DETERMINE WHETHER OR NOT H. B. 235 CAUSED IMPROVED RELATIONSHIP WITH THE HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPAL AND THE SUPERINTENDENT AND BOARD OF TRUSTEES.

22. H. B. 235, as it relates to the superintendent, affects the principal-superintendent relationship by

0 - substantially strengthening the relationship
0 - strengthening the relationship
0 - causing no change in the relationship
0 - weakening the relationship
0 - substantially weakening the relationship

23. H. B. 235 has caused the principal and the superintendent to have closer involvement in planning sessions.

0 - strongly agree
0 - agree
0 - undecided
0 - disagree
0 - strongly disagree

24. H. B. 235 has caused improved communication procedures between the principal and the superintendent and the board of trustees.

0 - strongly agree
0 - agree
0 - undecided
0 - disagree
0 - strongly disagree

25. H. B. 235 causes the board of trustees to appraise the principal on a professional level

0 - much higher than before
0 - higher than before
0 - the same as before
0 - lower than before
0 - much lower than before
26. H. B. 235 causes the principal's relationship with the board of trustees to be more nearly equivalent to his relationship with the superintendent.

0 - strongly agree
0 - agree
0 - undecided
0 - disagree
0 - strongly disagree

The following group of questions is designed to determine whether or not H. B. 235 improved the relationship of the high school principal and his staff.

27. H. B. 235 affects the principal-staff relationship because personnel management is defined as

0 - a substantially greater responsibility than before
0 - a greater responsibility than before
0 - the same responsibility as before
0 - a lesser responsibility than before
0 - a substantially lesser responsibility than before

28. H. B. 235 has brought about improved principal-staff planning and evaluating of the instructional program.

0 - strongly agree
0 - agree
0 - undecided
0 - disagree
0 - strongly disagree

29. H. B. 235 caused the development of improved channels of communication between the principal and the staff.

0 - strongly agree
0 - agree
0 - undecided
0 - disagree
0 - strongly disagree

30. H. B. 235 has caused greater emphasis toward establishing satisfactory procedures for staff evaluation.

0 - strongly agree
0 - agree
0 - undecided
0 - disagree
0 - strongly disagree
31. To what extent has H. B. 235 influenced the relationship between the principal and his staff?

0 - substantially strengthened the relationship
0 - strengthened the relationship
0 - neither strengthened nor weakened the relationship
0 - weakened the relationship
0 - substantially weakened the relationship

THE FOLLOWING GROUP OF QUESTIONS IS DESIGNED TO DETERMINE WHETHER OR NOT H. B. 235 IMPROVED THE HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPAL'S RELATIONSHIP WITH STUDENTS.

32. H. B. 235 more clearly establishes that student discipline is the responsibility of the principal.

0 - strongly agree
0 - agree
0 - undecided
0 - disagree
0 - strongly disagree

33. To what extent has H. B. 235 influenced the relationship between the principal and the students?

0 - substantially strengthened the relationship
0 - strengthened the relationship
0 - neither strengthened nor weakened the relationship
0 - weakened the relationship
0 - substantially weakened the relationship

34. H. B. 235 has caused the development of improved channels of communications between the principal and the students.

0 - strongly agree
0 - agree
0 - undecided
0 - disagree
0 - strongly disagree

35. As a result of H. B. 235, participation between the principal and the students in planning and decision making has

0 - substantially increased
0 - increased
0 - remained the same
0 - decreased
0 - substantially decreased

THE FOLLOWING GROUP OF QUESTIONS IS DESIGNED TO DETERMINE WHETHER OR NOT H. B. 235 HAS IMPROVED THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPAL AND THE PARENTS AND CITIZENS.
36. As a result of H. B. 235, the relationship between the principal and the parents and citizens has been

0 - substantially strengthened
0 - strengthened
0 - neither strengthened nor weakened
0 - weakened
0 - substantially weakened

37. Generally improved planning sessions with parents and citizens and the principal are evidence of influence resulting from H. B. 235.

0 - strongly agree
0 - agree
0 - undecided
0 - disagree
0 - strongly disagree

38. H. B. 235 has influenced the principal's relationship with the parents and citizens as evidenced by

0 - substantially more cooperative effort
0 - more cooperative effort
0 - neither more nor less cooperative effort
0 - less cooperative effort
0 - substantially less cooperative effort

The previous questions have been designed to determine strengths of H. B. 235. The following items are designed to investigate its weaknesses and limitations.

Directions: Select all the choices that fit your perception of correct responses and write in any additional responses.

39. From the list below, select the areas that in your opinion should have been influenced by legislation

0 - legal status
0 - fiscal management
0 - professional consultations
0 - instructional leadership
0 - plant management
0 - prestige
0 - morale
0 - budget operations
0 - other

0 - relationship with the staff
0 - relationship with students
0 - special services operations
0 - executive management
0 - relationship with parents
0 - extra-curricular operation
0 - accountability for performance
0 - relationship with superiors
0 - other
40. From the list below, select the areas that in your opinion have been influenced significantly by H. B. 235.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0 - budget operations</th>
<th>0 - executive management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - prestige</td>
<td>0 - relationship with parents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - plant management</td>
<td>0 - extra-curricular operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - legal status</td>
<td>0 - relationship with superiors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - morale</td>
<td>0 - special services operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - instructional leadership</td>
<td>0 - accountability for performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - professional consultations</td>
<td>0 - relationship with the staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - fiscal management</td>
<td>0 - relationship with students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - other</td>
<td>0 - other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

41. If you have perceived that H. B. 235 has some limitations at this time, please select limitations as they appear best stated in the list below. Restate or add other limitations if you desire. Select as many as needed to properly respond.

| 0 - lack of public understanding | 0 - short tenure of the statute |
| 0 - no means for enforcement    | 0 - lack of administrative push |
| 0 - undesirable legislation    | 0 - failure of principals to comply |
| 0 - lack of clarity             | 0 - contradictory to traditions |
| 0 - lack of public support      | 0 - courts fail to comply |
| 0 - not strong enough           | 0 - too ambiguous |
| 0 - other                       | 0 - other |
Section 1. Chapter 16, Texas Education Code, is hereby amended by adding thereto a new Section to be numbered and described as Section 16.08, such new Section to read as follows:

"Section 16.08. Duties of Public School Principals.

Public school principals, who shall hold valid administrative certificates, shall be responsible for:

"(a) assuming administrative responsibility and instructional leadership, under the supervision of the superintendent, for discipline, and the planning, operation, supervision, and evaluation of the educational program of the attendance area in which he is assigned;

"(b) submitting recommendations to the superintendent concerning assignment, evaluation, promotion, and dismissal of all personnel assigned to the attendance center; and

"(c) performing any other duties assigned by the superintendent pursuant to school board policy.

"(d) Nothing herein shall be construed as a limitation on the powers, responsibilities and obligations of the school board as now prescribed by law."

Section 2. The crowded condition of the calendars and the fact that recent challenges to the authority of school principals have created uncertainty in the operation of public schools create an emergency and an imperative public necessity that the Constitutional Rule requiring bills to be read on three several days be suspended, and the same is hereby suspended, and that this Act shall take effect and be in force from and after its passage, and it is so enacted.

Passed by the House on March 2, 1971: Yeas 140, Nays 1; passed by the Senate on March 25, 1971: Yeas 31, Nays 0.

Approved April 1, 1971.
Effective April 1, 1971.
To:

I hope you had a successful school year and are enjoying a pleasant summer. As for me, my time is being spent with a stack of papers that represent a doctoral study.

Early in June I sent a packet to your school. This represents your opportunity to participate in this study involving our "principal's responsibilities and duties" legislation. I realize that we do not all keep the same schedule, and I feel that I must have missed you at school. Before sending out another packet I wanted to use this means of communicating with you and enlisting your support for the study. If you can possibly respond to the survey instrument sent to your school I will be able to work on it during the summer. Should I fail to hear from you I will send another packet to your school, just in case you failed to receive the first one.

The responses already received certainly cause me to feel a closer association with principals and superintendents throughout the state, and justify my choice of this legislation as a problem for study.

I hope to hear from you soon.

Sincerely,

Scott Gene Chance
Principal

SGC:nr
July 3, 1972

Dear

I recently sent a letter to your home asking for your assistance. Realizing that school men are called upon at all times to participate in various activities, I felt that you would not object too much to being disturbed at home.

I have received good response from the previous letter; however, I realize that some administrators did not have the information that I needed readily available. I have taken the liberty of sending you a copy to your home. Please accept my apology for asking you to take your personal time to respond to this questionnaire.

Responses already received have justified our efforts to evaluate this legislation. Our executive secretary of TASSP, Harold Massey, and our legislators have been most cooperative.

Would you assist a fellow educator and respond to the questionnaire and return it in the envelope provided. Your responses will be anonymous and your signature is requested only to provide an accounting procedure.

I hope that I can be of service to you some day.

Sincerely,

Scott G. Chance
Principal

SGC:mr
September 16, 1972

Dear Fellow Educator:

Enclosed is a letter and a survey instrument that was sent to selected principals, superintendents, and university professors as a part of a doctoral study. This final attempt is being made to make the study as valid as possible, by including every selected educator who would care to respond.

I am asking for your help in making this study worthwhile. At the risk of additional expense to me and of being overly persuasive to you, I would encourage you to respond to the instrument and return it. If you have already sent in a copy or if you don't feel you have time to devote to this, would you please fill out the cover sheet with your name and address and indicate whether you would like to have the results of the study sent to you. Please do this today so that it does not interfere with your regular work load. My projected deadline is October 8, 1972. As the principal of a high school with 1300 students and 70 staff members, I know how busy you are; however, would you please do this for me. Maybe I can return the favor some day.

Sincerely,

Scott G. Chance
Principal

SGC:nr
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