

Old Dominion University

## ODU Digital Commons

---

Theses and Dissertations in Urban Services -  
Urban Education

College of Education & Professional Studies  
(Darden)

---

Summer 1995

# An Examination of the Role of the Assistant Principal in High schools in Virginia That Are Restructuring

Teresa K. Mizelle  
*Old Dominion University*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/urbanservices\\_education\\_etds](https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/urbanservices_education_etds)



Part of the [Elementary and Middle and Secondary Education Administration Commons](#), and the [Secondary Education Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Mizelle, Teresa K.. "An Examination of the Role of the Assistant Principal in High schools in Virginia That Are Restructuring" (1995). Doctor of Philosophy (PhD), Dissertation, , Old Dominion University, DOI: 10.25777/tx4k-8079  
[https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/urbanservices\\_education\\_etds/39](https://digitalcommons.odu.edu/urbanservices_education_etds/39)

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Education & Professional Studies (Darden) at ODU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations in Urban Services - Urban Education by an authorized administrator of ODU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [digitalcommons@odu.edu](mailto:digitalcommons@odu.edu).

An Examination of the Role of the Assistant Principal  
in High Schools in Virginia That Are Restructuring

by

Teresa K. Mizelle

B.A. May 1978, Virginia Wesleyan College  
M.A. August 1981, Old Dominion University  
C.A.S. August 1987, Old Dominion University

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of  
Old Dominion University in Partial Fulfillment of the  
Requirements for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

URBAN SERVICES

OLD DOMINION UNIVERSITY

August, 1995

Approved by:

Dr. Jack E. Robinson, Chair

Dr. Benjamin I. Troutman, Member

Dr. Jane M. Hager, /  
Concentration Area Director

Dr. W. Randolph Nichols, Member

Dr. Donna B. Evans, Dean

### **Abstract**

#### **An Examination of the Role of the Assistant Principal in High Schools in Virginia That Are Restructuring**

Teresa K. Mizelle

Old Dominion University, 1995

This study examined the assistant principalship in urban public high schools in Virginia that were restructuring. The study was designed to determine the role of the assistant principal, to identify how the role had changed as a result of restructuring, to identify concerns and issues to be considered for redefining the role, and to identify modifications to enhance the role.

The literature review revealed that the role in general and in schools that were restructuring had been ignored. Themes identified for exploration included role definition, ambiguity, and conflict; changing relationships; decision making; shared leadership; job satisfaction; and career goals.

A qualitative research design was employed. Four schools serving students in grades 9-12 participated. The primary method of data collection was interviews with 34 participants, including 4 principals, 12 assistant principals, and 18 teachers. Data were also collected through site visits and document analysis.

Findings showed that the primary duties and responsibilities were curriculum/instruction, pupil personnel, and school management, with varying levels of involvement in other areas. In contrast to the literature, administrators identified instruction as the primary duty. They prioritized curriculum/instruction first in importance, followed by pupil personnel, reversing rankings reported in previous research. Teachers identified instruction and discipline as equally important.

Other findings were (1) diversity in the role, (2) an increased

workload, (3) more collegial relationships, and (4) a flattened hierarchy. Teacher participation in decision making strongly affected the role. Assistants' attitudes toward risk-taking were important, and the assistant principal was becoming a *leader of leaders*. Concerns about role ambiguity and conflict were replaced by an orientation toward collaboration, shared decision making, shared vision, and student learning. Restructuring did not lead to greater dissatisfactions, perhaps because of the reorientation toward a shared vision. Assistant principals believed their role in attaining the goals of restructuring was related to supervising and monitoring instruction, having high expectations, being team players, creating an environment conducive to teaching and learning, and building trust.

Among the implications are that (1) principals should consult assistants to identify experiences that tap their potential and to establish the assistant principalship as vital to school restructuring, and (2) early as well as ongoing training is essential.

## Acknowledgements

Most individuals attain their goals only with the support, assistance, or guidance of others. I am indeed grateful to the following individuals who have given of themselves to help me achieve this goal:

**Dr. Jack E. Robinson**, who not only served as chair of my dissertation committee but also guided me with patience, encouraged me with understanding, challenged me with different perspectives on my topic, and above all became a personal and professional role model

**Dr. Benjamin I. Troutman**, who served as a member of my committee, who was instrumental in assuring the timeliness of my topic, and who offered his unwavering support at all times

**Dr. W. Randolph Nichols**, who inspired me to pursue a goal I had postponed, who exemplified that outstanding educators instill in others a desire to achieve excellence, who sacrificed precious hours to be my mentor, and who maintained steadfast faith in my ability to reach my goal

**My parents, Edward and Margaret Mizelle**, who taught me many years ago that one can find success through hard work, honest effort, and faith in God

**My sister Patricia**, who willingly sacrificed more than I ever expected; who served as an unlimited source of encouragement, advice, and strength; and without whom I would not have been able to complete this project

Above all, I give the credit for this project to God, from whom comes all wisdom and understanding.

## Table of Contents

Acknowledgements . . . . .	ii
List of Tables . . . . .	vii
1. Introduction . . . . .	1
Background . . . . .	2
Statement of Problem . . . . .	6
Significance of Study . . . . .	6
Definition of Terms . . . . .	10
Limitations . . . . .	11
2. Review of Related Literature . . . . .	12
Organizational Roles . . . . .	12
Assistant Principalship . . . . .	15
Role Definition and Ambiguity . . . . .	15
Role Conflict . . . . .	21
Career Mobility . . . . .	23
Job Satisfaction . . . . .	26
Summary . . . . .	28
Restructuring . . . . .	29
Impetus . . . . .	29
Definition . . . . .	31
Players . . . . .	38
Urban Agenda . . . . .	44
Summary . . . . .	48
Summary . . . . .	48
3. Methodology . . . . .	53
Purpose of the Study . . . . .	53

Design of the Study . . . . .	53
Procedures for Data Collection . . . . .	54
Selection of Sites and Participants . . . . .	54
Use of Instruments . . . . .	61
School Restructuring Survey . . . . .	61
Interview guides . . . . .	62
Collection of Data . . . . .	64
Method of Data Analysis . . . . .	66
 4. Restructuring and the Assistant Principalship . . . . .	 71
Profiles of School Restructuring . . . . .	72
Assumptions from the Literature . . . . .	72
Profiles of Four Schools . . . . .	73
School A . . . . .	75
School B . . . . .	77
School C . . . . .	79
School D . . . . .	82
Duties of the Assistant Principal . . . . .	86
Curriculum and Instruction . . . . .	87
Pupil Personnel . . . . .	94
Staff/Personnel . . . . .	95
School Management . . . . .	97
Community Relations . . . . .	99
Student Activities . . . . .	101
Degree of Importance . . . . .	103
Effects of Restructuring on the Assistant Principalship . . . .	110
Effects on Responsibilities . . . . .	110
Relationships with School and Community . . . . .	115
Processes for Decision Making . . . . .	119
The participants . . . . .	119
The time . . . . .	124

The rationale . . . . .	125
Obligations for Leadership . . . . .	128
Role of Support . . . . .	132
Distribution of Power . . . . .	137
Identification of Concerns, Issues, and Recommended	
Modifications . . . . .	142
Role Definition . . . . .	143
Diversity . . . . .	147
Training . . . . .	150
Support . . . . .	153
Power . . . . .	157
Job Satisfaction . . . . .	160
Career Goals . . . . .	161
Role of the Assistant Principal in Attaining Goals . . . . .	163
5. Conclusions and Recommendations . . . . .	168
Summary of the Study . . . . .	168
Conclusions from the Study . . . . .	177
Methodological Concerns . . . . .	182
Recommendations for Further Research . . . . .	183
Implications for Practice . . . . .	184
References . . . . .	186
Appendixes . . . . .	197
A. School Restructuring Survey . . . . .	198
B. Consent for Research Study . . . . .	202
C. Interview Guide for Principals . . . . .	203
D. Principal's Biographical Sketch . . . . .	206
E. Question Codes . . . . .	207
F. Duties Codes . . . . .	209

G.	Codes for Emerging Themes . . . . .	211
H.	Perceptions of the Goals of Restructuring . . . . .	212
I.	Role of the Assistant Principal in Attaining the Goals of Restructuring . . . . .	221

## List of Tables

### Table

1. Characteristics of Participants . . . . .	59
2. Most Meaningful or Worthwhile Responsibilities As Reported by Assistant Principals . . . . .	107
3. Frequency Distribution of Stated Goals of Restructuring Categorized by Dimension . . . . .	166

## **Chapter 1**

### **Introduction**

Since the opening of the first public school in the United States, the school has become an increasingly complex organization that must continually respond to rapidly changing societal and individual needs. School divisions are now expected to assume many responsibilities once perceived as outside the realm of the educational setting. The increasing demand for a broad range of services at the school level has led to an increasing need for administrators to maximize the utilization of their professional knowledge and skills. At the same time, school administrators face unprecedented demands for meaningful change through "restructuring" schools.

According to a report of the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) Commission on Restructuring (1992), "at the center of all the demands for change stands the secondary school principal" (p. 1). The principalship is among the most important administrative positions and has many dimensions. In fact, the increasing demands of the principalship led to the creation of the role of the assistant principal in the 1920s (Glanz, 1994). Although the number of assistant principals has increased, the role of the assistant principal remains ambiguous and often ignored (Black, 1980; Calabrese & Adams, 1987; Greenfield, 1985b; Marshall, 1992; Panyako & Rorie, 1987; Potter, 1980; Reed & Conners, 1982).

Traditionally viewed as a stepping stone for advancement (Ortiz, 1982), the secondary assistant principalship has grown in numbers and responsibilities (Norton & Kriekard, 1987). Assistant principals perform many of the same functions as principals but typically depend upon the

principal--who has position, power, and status--for delineation of their specific tasks (Marshall, 1992). The assistant principal is essential to the functioning of larger secondary schools; still, the position has remained a "forgotten stepchild so far as administrative study and research are concerned" (Austin & Brown, 1970, p. 1; see also Marshall, 1992). As schools become committed to restructuring, ensuring that the assistant principal is no longer a forgotten stepchild is crucial. Indeed, the opportunity to redefine the role of the assistant principal in a meaningful way has never been greater than during this period of school restructuring.

### Background

In contrast to the body of research on the principalship, research on the assistant principal is limited. In the first book written on the assistant principalship, Marshall (1992) stated that "few have noticed the person, the position, and the crucial processes that occur in it" (p. ix). Because most principals begin their administrative careers as assistant principals, the role is critical, for it is the place where school leaders form their values (Richardson, 1993). Regardless of their career goals, assistant principals can make significant contributions to the school organization.

A landmark study of the secondary assistant principalship by Austin and Brown (1970) included three substudies--a normative study, a career study, and a shadow study. The normative study involved more than 1200 principals and 1100 assistant principals representing various secondary school size classifications in seven regions of the country. Among the findings were that the assistant principal was involved in almost all aspects of school activities and that principals had more positive perceptions of the importance of the role than did the assistant principals. Students and teachers viewed the role as more important in the overall school setting than did either the principal or the assistant principal. In addition to noting the negative tone

accompanying the duties of student discipline and attendance, the researchers analyzed job satisfaction. The low levels of satisfaction in comparison with satisfactions experienced in other assignments, e.g., teaching, were associated with the ambiguities of the position and other negative stresses, such as the time spent on trivial tasks that offer little fulfillment.

Subsequent to Austin and Brown's (1970) investigation, other studies of the assistant principalship have been conducted. Using a sample of highly urbanized assistant principals in Houston, Texas, and a sample of more rural assistant principals in Kansas, Croft and Morton (1977) examined satisfaction with the assistant principalship and investigated the relationship between career stability/mobility and job satisfaction. In contrast to Austin and Brown, Croft and Morton reported higher levels of job satisfaction. Administrative scheduling and decision-making responsibilities emerged in regression analyses as a predictor of satisfaction. Only a few respondents planned to remain in the assistant principalship, so Croft and Morton noted that "the quandry continues for assistant principals" (p. 41).

Marshall (1992) has suggested that "no one really understands the complexities, lack of satisfaction, and dilemmas" (p. 2) of the role. Many have described the role as ambiguous (Black, 1980; Calabrese & Adams, 1987; Greenfield, 1985b; Marshall, 1992; Panyako & Rorie, 1987; Potter, 1980; Reed & Conners, 1982); others have reported varying levels of ambiguity (Forcella, 1991; Lacey, 1992). A study of selected secondary school districts in Mississippi noted the "continued lack of uniformity of duties" and reported the prevalence of conflicts and inconsistencies in role assignment (Davidson, 1991/1992, p. 61). Lacey found that assistant principals in Chicago public high schools understood their individual responsibilities and believed they served their schools efficiently and effectively; however, they criticized the lack of an official definition of the position's duties and

responsibilities. In Forcella's study of the relationships among general job satisfaction, role ambiguity, and role conflict, assistant principals in Massachusetts public high schools reported low levels of role ambiguity and relatively low levels of role conflict in general; however, career stable assistant principals had significantly higher levels of general job satisfaction and significantly lower levels of ambiguity and conflict than did career mobile assistant principals.

According to Calabrese and Adams (1987), similarities exist between the negative characteristics of assistant principal's role and other work conditions in which a high degree of job dissatisfaction is directly related to alienation. Alienation is a multidimensional concept composed of (1) social isolation, or separation from the group process; (2) powerlessness, or the attempt to complete a task without the authority to do so; (3) normlessness, or the feeling that organizational rules are no longer useful; and (4) meaninglessness, or lack of hope in the future or in one's current status (Dean, 1961). Using the Dean Alienation Scale, Calabrese and Adams assessed the levels of alienation experienced by school administrators and found that assistant principals had a greater sense of alienation and powerlessness than principals. The researchers therefore suggested altering the role of the assistant principal or restructuring the public secondary school organization to reduce the sense of powerlessness and alienation experienced by assistant principals.

*Restructuring the Role of the Assistant Principal*, a 1991 statement by NASSP's Council on the Assistant Principalship, points toward the increasing importance of understanding the role of the assistant principal. The report asserts that "the assistant principalship is an important and dynamic resource in the continuing improvement of education for youth" and identifies "the underutilized ability of the assistant principal" (p. v) as a vital resource in that effort. School boards, superintendents and central office personnel,

principals, teachers, parents and community members, and assistant principals will have a part in shaping the "emerging role" of the assistant principal.

A potential but relatively unexplored influence on the role of the assistant principal is the restructuring movement that has taken "center stage" (Murphy, 1993, p. 20) nationwide. Change is not a new concept for educators, but "the newest and most profound word in the educator's dictionary is 'restructuring'" (NASSP Commission, 1992, p. 1).

Restructuring began appearing as a separate subject on meeting agendas of organizations such as the National Governors' Association (NGA) and the Education Commission of the States (ECS) in 1987 (Lewis, 1989). Visits to large high schools across the nation led to reports of low expectations, unfavorable conditions, and inadequate support for education, especially in urban high schools (Maeroff, 1988;Sizer, 1984). Groups such as the National Coalition of Advocates for Students and the Council of Chief State School Officers reassessed education for at-risk students and emphasized the need for radical changes in current school structures (Lewis, 1989). According to studies conducted by the RAND Corporation, the Carnegie Foundation, and the Center for Policy Research in Education, the urban agenda clearly includes an emphasis on restructuring of large, inner-city school divisions to improve urban education (Lewis, 1989).

In spite of the serious social and economic conditions that plague urban communities, proponents of various forms of restructuring contend that a climate for meaningful change can foster dramatic improvements in urban schools (Weinholtz, 1991). Much attention has been directed toward urban schools as "the most visible 'proving ground' for school restructuring" (O'Neil, 1990, p. 6), and full utilization of the knowledge and skills of educational leaders is critical to its success. Lewis (1989) has stated, "Restructuring is carving new tools as well as new roles for people" (p. 192). While the literature on restructuring is

replete with references to the roles of superintendents, principals, teachers, and parents (e.g., Gideonse, 1990; Hallinger & Hausman, 1993; Hallinger, Murphy, & Hausman, 1992; Johnson, 1990; McCarthy & Still, 1993; Murphy, 1991; Murphy, Evertson, & Radnofsky, 1991; Newmann, 1991b; Palanki, 1991; Prestine, 1993; Short & Greer, 1993; Slavin, Madden, Shaw, Mainzer, & Donnelly, 1993; Webb, Corbett, & Wilson, 1993), noticeably absent are references to assistant principals. The "window of opportunity" now exists for redefining the role of the high school assistant principal within the framework of restructuring.

#### Statement of Problem

The purpose of this study was to examine the role of the assistant principal in urban public high schools in Virginia that are restructuring. The following research questions guided the study:

1. What is the current role of the assistant principal in high schools that are restructuring?
2. How has the role of the assistant principal changed as a result of restructuring?
3. What concerns and issues need to be considered for redefining the role of the assistant principal in high schools that are restructuring?
4. What modifications might be offered to enhance the role of the assistant principal in high schools that are restructuring?

#### Significance of Study

In contrast to the abundant material on superintendents and principals, research on the assistant principal is limited (NASSP's Council, 1991). According to Greenfield (1985b), most studies on the assistant principalship are "status reports" that fail "to reveal potentially instructive differences or similarities in perceptions among various groups of respondents" (p. 9). For the most part, the traditional role has been custodial--handling student discipline and

attendance and monitoring student and teacher noninstructional activities (Calabrese & Adams, 1987; Glanz, 1994; Panyako & Rorie, 1987; Pfeffer, 1955; Reed & Himmler, 1985). In a study of the job responsibilities of secondary assistant principals nationwide, McElveen (1989/1990) found that the assistant principalship "is not a dynamic, changing role" (p. 74), providing support for Brottman's (1981) contention that it has barely changed during the past fifty years. Rather than evolving as a clearly defined role, the position has been associated with ambiguity, conflict, and powerlessness (Davidson, 1991/1992; Greenfield, 1985b; Iannacone & Podorf, 1984; Lacey, 1992; Marshall, 1992). With the exception of increased responsibilities for teacher evaluation and teacher selection, more similarities than differences appeared in a national profile comparing the role of the high school assistant principal in 1987 with the role in 1965 (Pellicer, Anderson, Keefe, Kelley, & McCleary, 1988).

Although the precise nature of the role remains unclear, what is clear is that assistant principals are important administrators in senior high schools for a number of reasons. First, the assistant principalship serves as a training ground for some individuals or as a career alternative for others (Greenfield, 1985b; Marshall, 1992, 1993). Second, assistant principals mediate conflicts, whether they are among students, staff, or community members. At times these conflicts arise from the requirements established by federal, state, and local policies (Marshall, 1992). Finally, "assistant principals *maintain the norms and rules of the school culture*" (Marshall, 1992, p. 2). They deal with the most challenging discipline problems and experience firsthand the influences of social issues such as poverty, racism, and family disruption on the individual student and on the school environment. What is more important in considering such problems is that "urban is different" (Louis & Miles, 1990, p. 11). In examining the territory for case studies of five urban high schools, Louis and Miles noted that

urban high schools face problems that "differ from those in other settings not so much in type as in scope and intensity. Most of these differences revolve around the vast diversity of the student body and in the local environment" (p. 11). The daily lives of assistant principals in urban high schools are strongly influenced by these issues. Marshall (1992) has concluded:

Their day is a microcosm representing the array of issues that arise when children bring society inside the schools' walls. As a result, they have developed as a prime group of individuals who could, if asked, generate a unique picture of the existing condition of public education. (p. 2)

Although the importance of the assistant principalship is generally acknowledged by the education profession in general, the professional knowledge and skills of assistant principals have been underutilized (Bricker, 1991; Greenfield, 1985b; McElveen, 1989/1990; Panyako and Rorie, 1987). Greenfield (1985a) and Smith (1987) have suggested the increased involvement of assistant principals in the areas of curriculum and instruction and professional development. Simply reshaping the role in the traditionally structured high school, however, may no longer be appropriate. In light of inadequate pay and limited opportunities for advancement, Pellicer and Stevenson (1991) have asserted that, unless the position can be a legitimate career alternative, increasingly fewer qualified individuals will apply for positions as assistants. A key question remains, "If the assistant principalship is such an important component in the leadership team in the modern secondary school, what can be done to enhance its character, to make it more than a position to be endured?" (Austin & Brown, 1970, p. 81).

A recent report on roles in schools that are restructuring stated, "The traditional role of the assistant principal is antithetical to school reform" (Meyers, 1995, p. 9). The era of school restructuring may

provide the framework within which to redefine the assistant principalship. Several researchers have noted the scarcity of empirical literature on school restructuring (Hallinger & Hausman, 1993; Short & Greer, 1993), and some have suggested that "researchers and practitioners will benefit from rich descriptions of efforts in progress" (Hallinger & Hausman, 1993, p. 119). As high schools launch restructuring initiatives and the roles of principals undergo changes, research on any concomitant changes in the role of high school assistant principals is important. Previous studies on the assistant principalship have investigated topics such as the real and ideal roles of assistant principals (Davidson, 1991/1992; Norton & Kriekard, 1987; Patton, 1987), job satisfaction (Austin & Brown, 1970; Edison, 1992/1993; Forcella, 1991; Garawski, 1978), role ambiguity and role conflict (Forcella, 1991; Lacey, 1992), and career mobility (Forcella, 1991; Marshall, 1993; McElveen, 1989/1990; Mitchell, 1987/1988). Few studies (e.g., Sherman, 1991/1992) have examined the assistant principalship in public high schools that are restructuring.

Understanding the assistant principalship is crucial to educators who desire to become building level administrators, to those charged with the responsibility for selecting individuals for administrative positions, and to others committed to promoting quality educational leadership. This investigation of the role of the assistant principal in high schools that are restructuring contributes to "the possibility of a systematic and useful body of knowledge informing the field's understanding of the assistant principal role and career in education" (Greenfield, 1985b, p. 15) in several ways. First, this study describes the current role of the assistant principal in high schools that are restructuring using the voices of principals, assistant principals, and teachers. It adds to the field's knowledge by examining changes in the assistant principalship that have occurred during high school restructuring. Areas examined include duties and responsibilities,

relationships with school and community, decision making, leadership, and distribution of power. The study also provides insights on concerns and issues associated with the assistant principalship that may need to be considered by high schools that are restructuring. It examines the influence of restructuring, if any, on role definition, role ambiguity, role conflict, relationships with others, power structures, job satisfaction, and career goals. The study seeks to contribute to practice by recommending modifications for enhancing the role of the assistant principal in high schools that are restructuring. Finally, by broadening the research base on the role of the high school assistant principal, it is beneficial (1) in clarifying the expectations relative to the assistant principal's role in high schools that are restructuring, (2) by confirming the need for more meaningful professional development activities to enhance the role, (3) by providing insights to decision makers responsible for approving changes in administrative positions and, most important, (4) by providing knowledge that will enable assistant principals to enhance their performance and make significant contributions to teaching and learning in the urban high school setting.

#### Definition of Terms

Terms relevant to this research study are defined below.

1. High School - For the purposes of this study, this term refers to any public secondary school serving students in grades 9 through 12.
2. Restructuring - For the purposes of this study, the definition formulated by the NASSP Commission on Restructuring (1992) was used; that is,
  - the reforming of school organizational interrelationships and processes to increase student learning and performance, with a focus on:
    - a. The quality of learning experiences and outcomes

- b. The professional role and performance of teachers
  - c. Collaborative leadership and management
  - d. Redefined and integrated curriculum
  - e. Systematic planning and measurement of results
  - f. Multiple learning sites and school schedules
  - g. Coordination of community resources, human and fiscal
  - h. Equity, fairness, and inclusion for all students (p. 3)
3. Urban high school - For the purposes of sample selection, this term refers to public high schools with populations representative of any combination of the following urban characteristics: ethnic minority or diversity, at-risk students, increased dropout rate, increased student absenteeism, low achievement/test scores, crime/violence and discipline problems, or eligibility for free or reduced-price meals.

#### Limitations

This study was limited to selected urban public high schools serving students in grades 9-12 in large school divisions (enrollment above 30,000) in southeastern Virginia during the 1994-1995 year.

## Chapter 2

### Review of Related Literature

The purpose of this chapter is to present a review of the literature pertinent to this study and to establish a framework for investigation of the research problem. The review is presented in three sections: organizational roles, the assistant principalship, and restructuring. The first section discusses the literature on organizational roles as a foundation for examining the role of the assistant principal. The second section explores the literature on the assistant principalship with particular attention to research on role definition and ambiguity, role conflict, career mobility, and job satisfaction. The third section summarizes the research on restructuring, from the impetus for the movement to its application in the urban setting. The chapter concludes with a summary of the research questions and themes identified for examination in the study.

#### Organizational Roles

The success of the school is dependent in part upon the performance of the individuals who comprise the organization. Pellicer and Stevenson (1991) have contended that "it is difficult to imagine how most high schools could operate effectively without the day-to-day contributions of their assistant principals" (p. 59). The role of the high school assistant principal was therefore analyzed within the theoretical framework relative to organizational roles.

An organization is defined as "an open, dynamic system . . . characterized by a continuing process of input, transformation, and output" (Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, & Snoek, 1964, p. 12). The two dimensions of activity that affect social behavior within an organization are the

normative (nomothetic) dimension and the personal (idiographic) dimension (Getzels, Lipham, & Campbell, 1968). Although the personal dimension, which includes the personalities and needs of individuals, is important, according to Getzels et al., the most important unit in the normative dimension is the role.

Role theory is "concerned with the study of behaviors that are characteristic of persons within contexts and with various processes that presumably produce, explain, or are affected by those behaviors" (Biddle, 1979, p. 4). A role may be defined in terms of the following: (1) role set, or others in the organization who influence the role incumbent's behavior; (2) role expectations, or the beliefs and attitudes of others in the organization regarding what the role incumbent should and should not do, regardless of the job description; (3) role pressures, or efforts by others to make the role incumbent demonstrate expected behaviors (Kahn et al., 1964). Biddle contends that if the role requirements are incomplete or provide insufficient information about what should be done, the role is ambiguous. Similarly, role ambiguity is defined by Kahn et al. (1964) as follows:

To summarize, role ambiguity is conceived as the degree to which required information is available to a given organizational position. To the extent that such information is communicated clearly and consistently to a focal person, it will tend to induce in him an experience of certainty with respect to his role requirements and his place in the organization. To the extent that such information is lacking, he will experience ambiguity.

(pp. 25-26)

In addition to role ambiguity, role conflicts may occur. Role conflicts occur when "the performance of one set of duties makes performance of another set impossible, or at least difficult" (Getzels et al., 1968, p. 113). Individuals who are required simultaneously to fulfill a variety of mutually exclusive, contradictory, or inconsistent

expectations experience role conflicts (Getzels & Guba, 1954); such simultaneous requirements are labelled as "sent role conflict" by Kahn et al. (1964). One theoretical model of the factors associated with role conflict and ambiguity identifies several types of conflict:

- (1) Intra-sender conflict - different prescriptions and proscriptions from a single member of the role set may be incompatible
- (2) Inter-sender conflict - pressures from one role sender oppose pressures from one or more other senders
- (3) Inter-role conflict - pressures associated with membership in one organization are in conflict with pressures stemming from membership in other groups
- (4) Person-role conflict - the person's needs and aspirations may lead to behaviors which are unacceptable to members of his role set. (Kahn et al., 1964, pp. 19-20)

Besides the basic types of conflict, a more complex type of role conflict may occur in the form of role overload, i.e., a situation in which an individual is legitimately expected to perform a wide variety of compatible tasks which are impossible to complete within given time limits (Kahn et al., 1964). When any of these conflicts occur, the individual must choose one of several alternatives, e.g., fulfillment of one role, compromise between roles, or withdrawal from all roles. Failure to meet the expectations of various roles for a long period of time means that those defining the roles will judge the individual to be ineffective in role management (Getzels & Guba, 1954).

Although individuals differ in their levels of tolerance for conflict, role conflict generally has been associated with negative effects such as loss of morale and lowered productivity (Biddle, 1979). Kahn et al. (1964) asserted that "role conflict and ambiguity exact a price, both in terms of individual well-being and organizational

effectiveness" (p. 53). The literature therefore suggested the importance of reducing ambiguity and conflict in organizational roles.

### Assistant Principalship

#### Role Definition and Ambiguity

Since the creation of the assistant principalship, assistant principals have been hired in increasing numbers to aid principals in meeting the demands of school administration. Administrators who are subordinate to the principal have been given various titles, including assistant principal, dean, vice-principal, and administrative assistant; however, the preferred title is assistant principal (Coppedge, 1968; Croft & Morton, 1977; Knezevich, 1984; Reed & Himmeler, 1985; Smith, 1987). The assistant principal is viewed as the person who actually keeps the school going (Austin & Brown, 1970; Black, 1980); therefore, in secondary schools the assistant principalship "is not well labelled by titling it 'assistant' to anyone or anything" (Austin & Brown, 1970, p. 23). Like the job title which has been in flux, the position itself has been "ill-defined even in the best professional literature" (Austin, 1972, p. 68; see also Black, 1980; Lacey, 1992; Marshall, 1992; Reed & Conners, 1982; Wells, Nelson, & Johnsen, 1965). Much of the literature has suggested that the role of the assistant principal remains ambiguous and often ignored (Black, 1980; Calabrese & Adams, 1987; Greenfield, 1985b; Marshall, 1992; Panyako & Rorie, 1987; Potter, 1980; Reed & Conners, 1982).

According to Gillespie (1961), the position of assistant principal developed "without an adequate sense of direction or underlying philosophy" (p. 59); expediency, rather than careful planning, influenced the development of the duties and responsibilities of the position. The landmark study of the assistant principalship by Austin and Brown (1970) included three substudies--a normative study, a career study, and a shadow study. In their shadow study of assistant principals in 16 secondary schools, the researchers noted that comprehensive and

carefully delineated job descriptions were "practically non-existent" (p. 17). Historically duties have been determined by the principal (Coppedge, 1968; Hurley, 1965; Jarrett, 1958; Kelly, 1987). Assistants have been assigned tasks the principal deemed undesirable (Shockley & Smith, 1981), whatever the principal wanted them to do (Marshall, 1985), or "anything and everything that he [the principal] did not want to do" (Potter, 1980, p. 10). Studies by Croft and Morton (1977), Patton (1987), Bricker (1991), and Pellicer et al. (1988) found that the principal alone decided the duties of the assistant principal 35%, 38%, 49%, and 29% of the time, respectively; the assistant principal was consulted approximately 40%, 35%, 39%, and slightly more than 50% of the time, respectively. One of the "most shocking findings" (p. 64) for Pellicer and Stevenson (1991) was that nearly half of the assistants were not consulted when their duties were determined.

The literature reveals much inconsistency in the existence and format of job descriptions. Lacey (1992) reported that 47% of the assistant principals in Chicago did not have written job descriptions. Written descriptions for the other 53% were, for the most part, lists of specific duties assigned to individuals rather than job descriptions for the position itself. Scott (1989/1990) reported similar findings. Although individual assistant principals in Lacey's study appeared to understand their duties and responsibilities, both those with and those without job descriptions "did decry the lack of an 'official' definition of the position's duties and responsibilities" (p. 345). In a qualitative study of eight assistant principals in two states, Mitchell (1987/1988) reported that assistants had formal, written job descriptions provided by the district and specific lists of duties developed at the school. However, areas of responsibility sometimes overlapped and, according to an assistant principal, school staff "don't know what is whose area of responsibility" (Mitchell, 1987/1988,

p. 213). Assistant principals in Davidson's (1991/1992) study believed they needed a clearer description of their role.

From its inception the secondary assistant principalship has been closely identified with discipline, resulting in the description of the assistant principal as the "hatchet man" (Hurley, 1965, p. 15), "truant officer," "disciplinarian" (Coppedge, 1968, p. 284), or "drill sergeant" (Marshall, 1992, p. 37). In many cases the assistant principal's time was "abused beyond reason with individual discipline problems" (Coppedge, 1968, p. 285). Coupled with the disciplinary focus, the emphasis on student attendance left little time for responsibilities that exercised or challenged the professional qualifications of those in the position. Although two common job responsibilities of assistant principals have been discipline and attendance (Austin, 1972; Austin & Brown, 1970; Bricker, 1991; Coppedge, 1968; Gorton, 1987; Hurley, 1965; Kelly, 1987; Pellicer et al., 1988; Pfeffer, 1955; Reed & Himmler, 1985; Smith, 1987), concerns have been expressed about the overall ambiguity of the role:

The assistant principalship, originally established to handle clerical duties, has evolved in a haphazard manner, with ambiguous job descriptions, and a lack of role clarity. Consequently, the secondary assistant principal lacks a niche in the web of school administration. (Black, 1980, p. 33)

The duties of the assistant principal have often been divided into six categories: pupil personnel, school management, staff/personnel, instruction, student activities, and community relations (Austin & Brown, 1970; Bricker, 1991; Davidson, 1991/1992; Norton & Kriekard, 1987; Patton, 1987; Pellicer & Stevenson, 1991). The traditional role, however, has been custodial--handling student discipline and attendance and monitoring student and teacher noninstructional activities (Calabrese & Adams, 1987; Glanz, 1994; Panyako & Rorie, 1987; Pfeffer, 1955; Reed & Himmler, 1985). Secondary assistant principals in the state

of Washington reported that their duties and responsibilities included tasks such as supervising student behavior, dealing with student discipline, assisting with attendance, supervising athletic activities, visiting classrooms to supervise teachers, consulting with guidance counselors, supervising non-athletic student activities, and helping to organize the school schedule (Smith, 1987). In a national study Pellicer et al. (1988) identified 30 duties "considered important for understanding the role of the assistant principal in the functioning principalship" (p. 39). These duties were grouped in six areas defined as follows:

1. *School Management*: A classification encompassing the day-to-day practical tasks of organizing and running the school and providing operational resources for the educational program.  
[Specific duties are] school policies, special arrangements at start and close of school year, graduation activities, emergency arrangements, building use--school related, school calendars, daily school bulletins, clerical services.
2. *Staff/Personnel*: Duties relating directly to securing and maintaining the human resources necessary to carry out the school's program.  
[Specific duties are] teacher "duty" rosters, orientation programs for new teachers, faculty meetings, substitute teachers, teacher selection, teacher incentives/motivation.
3. *Curriculum and Instruction*: Activities linked to the courses of study and instruction offered by the school, the improvement of instruction through supervision of the instructional staff, the revision of curricula, and staff inservice.  
[Specific duties are] teacher evaluation, school master schedule, instructional methods, curriculum development, staff inservice, [and] innovations, experiments, and research.

4. *Community Relations:* Duties associated with giving and receiving information about the school and its programs, and about students and staff.  
[Specific duties are] administrative representation at community functions, school public relations program, liaison with community youth-serving agencies.
  5. *Student Activities:* Responsibility for the non-classroom activities of students.  
[Specific duties are] assemblies, school dances, school club programs.
  6. *Student Services:* Duties associated with student problems and concerns, and with the personal and physical well-being.  
[Specific duties are] student discipline, student attendance, orientation program for new students.
- (pp. 39-40)

After analyzing similarities and differences in the roles of secondary assistant principals in Baltimore, Maryland, Black (1980) defined the assistant principal as "'jack of all trades and master of none'" (p. 38). A decade prior to Black's study, Austin and Brown (1970) surveyed more than 1200 principals and 1100 assistant principals representing various secondary public school size classifications in seven regions of the country regarding 59 administrative tasks. One finding was that principals had more positive perceptions of the importance of the role of the assistant principal than did the assistant principals themselves. Findings of the shadow study suggested that students and teachers viewed the role as more important in the overall school setting than did either the principal or the assistant principal. The low levels of job satisfaction reported by assistant principals in comparison with satisfactions they experienced in other job assignments, e.g., teaching, were associated with the ambiguities of the position and other negative stresses, such as the inability to see things through and

the time spent on trivial tasks that offered little sense of fulfillment.

Patton (1987) used revised versions of Austin and Brown's (1970) survey instruments in a study to describe the role and function of assistant principals in urban, suburban, and rural senior high schools in Virginia. Fifty-four percent of the 521 senior high school assistant principals responded to a survey regarding their degree of responsibility for 65 tasks. Of the six categories in which specific tasks were identified, assistant principals reported their highest degree of responsibility in the student services functions, particularly discipline and attendance, followed by staff and personnel, especially teacher evaluation. Community relations, curriculum and instruction, and school management were rated equally, and student activities was rated last. The student services functions were also ranked most important, followed by five other functions: staff and personnel (e.g., teacher evaluation), school management (e.g., emergency activities), community relations, student activities (e.g., graduation), and curriculum and instruction (e.g., development of the master schedule). Patton's findings were consistent with those of Pellicer et al. (1988), who reported the student discipline ranked first in importance in 1965 and again in 1987.

Assistant principals' ratings on their administrative duties for greatest degree of importance are fairly consistent, but findings on the ambiguity associated with the assistant principalship are inconsistent. In a reexamination of the data from Austin and Brown's (1970) report, Austin (1972) indicated that some large school systems may have better role definitions than smaller school systems. In the Detroit school system the role was well defined, and assistant principals with positive perceptions of job or task structure tended to view their duties "as simple, repetitive, and unambiguous" (Edison, 1992/1993, p. 92). Lacey (1992) found that the position in Chicago public high schools was "not

well defined organizationally" (p. 351) and recommended addressing the ambiguity associated with the assistant principalship because it places limitations on the status and authority of assistant principals. Like Lacey, Marshall (1992) contends that attention should be given to the effects of ambiguity, for "when assistants' roles are ambiguous, some important functions may be given short shrift" (p. 85).

### Role Conflict

As the responsibilities have expanded, assistant principals-- "bombarded from all directions during the course of a day" (Black, 1980, p. 38)--have experienced higher levels of frustration associated with the lack of time for accomplishing tasks. Their work, especially pertaining to student discipline, is physically and emotionally exhausting because they are constantly moving during the school day and are continually exposed to problems that may not have immediate solutions (Reed & Himmler, 1985). Recommendations have been made for changing the roles of the secondary assistant principal to reflect present job descriptions, or for changing the job descriptions to match present roles to reduce conflicts (Black, 1980).

Several studies are informative in identifying the duties of assistant principals. In a study of assistant principals from six states, Norton and Kriekard (1987) identified the *real* and *ideal* competencies for inclusion in the job description of a secondary assistant principal. Real competencies were defined as those actually performed by secondary assistant principals; ideal competencies, as those that should be performed in order for secondary assistant principals to accomplish their jobs more effectively. Assistant principals who participated in the study validated 59 *real* competencies and 91 *ideal* competencies in six areas: management of school, leader in staff personnel, community relations, instructional leader, student activities, and pupil personnel. More important, they "viewed every

competency as below the level that ideally would make the position more effective" (p. 29).

While Norton and Kriekard (1987) used quantitative methods to collect their data, Reed and Himmler (1985) used qualitative methods to study a small sample of assistant principals in large, comprehensive public high schools. The researchers found that high school assistant principals were responsible for establishing and maintaining organizational stability through tasks such as developing the master schedule, maintaining the activity calendar, and supervising students when they were not under the direct supervision of teachers. The need to maintain order in a sometimes turbulent environment has been documented elsewhere (Lacey, 1992; Marshall, 1992; Mitchell, 1987/1988; Reed & Connors, 1982). Further findings suggested that the assistant principalship was characterized by role conflict, since "work associated with master schedules, student activities, and athletic direction is typically sandwiched in among activities associated with student discipline or delayed" (Reed & Himmler, 1985, p. 64; see also Black, 1980). Lacey similarly reported that Chicago assistant principals suffered from "task overload" (p. 340) due to the number of school safety, clerical, managerial, and supervisory duties. Studies such as those of Reed and Himmler and Lacey indicate that some high school assistant principals experience role overload.

In addition to hectic daily schedules, high school assistant principals must cope with contrasting expectations; that is, supporting the "'positive side of the school'" while spending most of their time with the "'negative side of the school'" (Reed & Himmler, 1985; see also Iannacone & Podorf, 1984). If discipline problems continue in spite of their efforts, they have to defend their skills as effective administrators.

In contrast to some earlier studies, Forcella (1991) reported that high school assistant principals exhibited relatively low levels of role

conflict, but significant differences were found between males and females and between career mobile and career stable assistants. Females had higher levels of role conflict than did males. Career mobile assistant principals exhibited significantly higher levels of role ambiguity and role conflict than did career stable assistant principals. Role conflict was also reported to covary negatively with general job satisfaction for assistant principals. Marshall (1992) has suggested that assistant principals may experience role conflict and overload when the job responsibilities require so much time that they have to sacrifice personal and professional goals.

A review of the literature revealed that the assistant principalship has been associated with role ambiguity and role conflict. This study therefore examined ambiguity and conflict related to the role of the assistant principal in high schools that are restructuring.

#### Career Mobility

The literature on the career mobility of assistant principals reflected two views: the assistant principalship as a training ground for the principalship (Austin, 1972; Black, 1980; Bricker, 1991; Croft & Morton, 1977; Fulton, 1987; Howley, 1985; Smith, 1987), and the assistant principalship as a career choice (Gillespie, 1961; Iannacone & Podorf, 1984; Marshall, 1993; Pellicer & Stevenson, 1991). Early literature on the assistant principalship indicated that the focus on discipline and attendance not only would maintain the position as a stepping-stone to the other positions but also would make the position itself professionally undesirable (Coppedge, 1968). Ortiz (1982) agreed that "it is not likely that a career can be established on this position" (p. 10).

Various studies have indicated that the principalship is a career goal for most assistant principals. In a career study of the occupational mobility of 419 former assistant principals, Austin and Brown (1970) noted that 56% of the urban respondents were late entry (at

least 11 years' experience before the first assistant principalship) and average departure (4 to 10 years in the assistant principalship before career advancement). The researchers found that most administrators had a better chance of promotion in school districts in which they were already employed; however, urban respondents sometimes sought promotions in smaller communities. Like Austin and Brown, Croft and Morton (1977) found that the majority of the assistant principals in Texas and Kansas who participated in their study planned to seek higher administrative positions. Eighty-three percent of the assistant principals participating in Black's (1980) investigation reported that their position was transitory. In Patton's (1987) study of Virginia senior high school assistant principals, 43% of the respondents aspired to be principals, while 20% desired to be central office administrators. Only 15% wanted to remain assistant principals, and 17% planned to retire within five years.

Austin and Brown (1970) reported that the rapidly mobile (early entry/early departure) respondents in their study were more likely than others to believe that educational administration would allow opportunities for using special abilities, creative talents, and leadership skills. In some schools, however, the assistant principalship has not offered such opportunities. Since assistants in Chicago high schools often spent their time addressing safety/order concerns, they had little time for activities that provided varied administrative and school management experiences (Lacey, 1992). In fact, the study found limited mobility in the assistant principalship:

Because of the limited upward mobility opportunities provided in education, assistants do not appear to move up the administrative hierarchy easily, and the assistant principalship has become a career position. This tends to lock out younger persons with new ideas, methods, and innovative thought concerning the direction of education and educational practice. Individuals with many years of

service in the position appear to be content to "ride out" their years as assistants rather than take on the difficult job of principalship. (p. 142)

Other researchers have suggested that the assistant principalship should be a career alternative for some administrators. In 1988, the National Association of Secondary School Principals studied the relationship between the high school assistant principalship and the principalship by examining both roles concurrently. A major conclusion was that "the assistant principalship is a vital part of the school leadership team, and for many, must become a legitimate terminal career alternative" (Pellicer & Stevenson, 1991, p. 60). The position must be enhanced, however, if it is to be a viable alternative (McElveen, 1989/1990; Patton, 1987).

Several factors may contribute to the move toward the assistant principalship as a career goal for some administrators: (1) individuals who are now being appointed to the principalship are more experienced than those in the past; (2) individuals currently serving as principals are remaining in their positions for longer periods of time than in the past; (3) high school principals are more satisfied than ever before with their positions and have little desire to change positions; and (4) assistant principals are almost as old as principals, so the principalship may not be available for these administrators (Pellicer & Stevenson, 1991). Iannacone and Podorf (1984) noted that declining enrollments and diminishing opportunities for advancement have led some assistants to view their jobs as career positions. Marshall (1993) reported that many assistant principals are content in their current roles as career assistant principals.

Regardless of their career goals, assistant principals need opportunities for a broad range of professional experiences (Potter, 1980). With increasingly diverse student populations and needs, the role

of the high school assistant principal may become increasingly important (Pellicer & Stevenson, 1991).

### Job Satisfaction

A wealth of research has been conducted on job satisfaction in general. Among the specific findings of research on organizational stress is that task ambiguity may produce feelings of hopelessness and dissatisfaction with a job. Furthermore, the effects of ambiguity and role conflict are similar. The two occur independently, so it is primarily by chance that an individual will work in an environment with both ambiguity and conflict. When this occurs, the stresses are typically no more severe than those associated with either conflict or ambiguity alone (Kahn et al., 1964).

A number of studies on the assistant principalship have examined job satisfaction. In 1970, Austin and Brown reported the satisfactions in the assistant principalship to be "few and unimpressive" (p. 78). More important, the satisfactions and dissatisfactions were basic to the career decisions. Responding to nine questions, participants in Austin and Brown's career study assessed the degree of satisfaction ("very satisfied," "satisfied," or "dissatisfied") they had experienced as teachers, as assistant principals, or in other positions. Seventy percent were "very satisfied" as teachers when considering the expectations they had when they originally accepted the job; only forty-eight percent were "very satisfied" as assistant principals. Fifty-two percent were "very satisfied" with the results they achieved as teachers; only thirty-five percent, with the results they achieved as assistant principals. Only in the areas of salary and the amount of assistance received from immediate superior(s) were the respondents more satisfied as assistant principals (24% and 46%, respectively) than as teachers (8% and 40%, respectively). The findings were summarized as follows:

What is noteworthy (and depressing) about the facts . . . is the rather low level of satisfaction that these men and women realized in their tenure as assistant principals compared with the satisfaction gained during those years spent in other assignments. In only two categories does the level of satisfaction in other positions drop below that for the assistant principalship. (p. 72)

Secondary assistant principals have shared "a sense of frustration" (Black, 1980, p. 38) at the lack of adequate time to complete assigned tasks. Their job orientation often has been that of crisis, rather than security and stability (Austin, 1972). According to Kahn et al. (1964), low job satisfaction, low confidence in the organization, and a high-degree of job-related tension are among the emotional costs of role conflict. Assistant principals have been most happy when their tasks were enjoyable or relevant (Smith, 1987) and when they were making important contributions to the education of students (Lacey, 1992).

Forcella (1991) examined career mobility, job satisfaction, role ambiguity, and role conflict for 119 assistant principals in Massachusetts public high schools. Respondents were self-identified as either career mobile, i.e., "seeking or planned on pursuing a new administrative position," or career stable, i.e., having "no plans for a change in administrative position presently or in the foreseeable future" (p. 12). The House, Rizzo and Lirtzman Role Ambiguity and Role Conflict Scales and the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire--Short Form (MSQ-SF) were administered to all participants. Career stable assistant principals had significantly higher levels of general job satisfaction and significantly lower levels of role ambiguity and role conflict than did career mobile assistant principals. Also, both role ambiguity and role conflict were found to covary negatively with job satisfaction for the total group, career mobile assistant principals, and career stable assistant principals. As role ambiguity increased, job satisfaction

decreased; as role ambiguity decreased, job satisfaction increased. The generally low levels of job dissatisfaction were contrary to Austin & Brown's (1970) findings.

Also in contrast to Austin and Brown's (1970) national study, findings from Patton's (1987) study indicated that Virginia senior high school assistant principals were generally satisfied with their jobs. Respondents reported the greatest satisfaction in their rapport with students. Job satisfaction was lowest in the areas of (1) salary and (2) the time requirements for completing job responsibilities. While Patton noted that the scope of duties for Virginia's assistant principals appeared to be broader than the traditional function of discipline, she concluded: "The number of tasks assigned to assistant principals cannot continue to increase if the assistant principalship is to reflect instructional leadership, or if it is to be enhanced as a career position" (p. 79).

#### Summary

For more than two decades the literature has identified various concerns such as the need to increase the assistant principal's involvement in instruction (Austin & Brown, 1970; Brottman, 1981; Coppedge, 1968; Greenfield, 1985a; Hess, 1985; Jarrett, 1958; Kelly, 1987; Smith, 1987), a "need for a major redefinition of the work load and functions of the assistant principalship" (Hess, 1985, p. 256), and a need "for analysis to identify ways to redefine and restructure the assistant principalship" (Marshall, 1985, p. 57). The review of the literature raised several basic questions regarding the effects restructuring might have on the assistant principalship. Specifically, what has been the effect, if any, of restructuring on role definition, i.e., the duties and responsibilities of the assistant principal? Are assistant principals in schools that are restructuring experiencing role ambiguity and role conflict? Has restructuring affected the job satisfaction of assistant principals? Will restructuring affect the

career goals of assistant principals? Since the purpose of this study was to address such questions within the framework of high school restructuring, the next section reviews the literature on restructuring.

### Restructuring

#### Impetus

In 1992 the NASSP Commission on Restructuring issued a report to provide educational leaders with guidance on school restructuring. The nationwide focus on restructuring actually began as a response to criticisms of the educational reform efforts of the early 1980s (Conley, 1991; Lewis, 1989; Murphy, 1991, 1993; Raywid, 1990). Critics argued that these reform efforts were unsuccessful in healing the educational system because they were slow and inadequate (Lewis, 1989), they were following "the road of the quick fix, and [they] were using inappropriate policy tools to improve schooling, especially mandates from the top" (Murphy, 1991, p. ix). With the publication of three reform documents in 1986 (Carnegie Task Force, 1986; Holmes Group, 1986; National Governors' Association, 1986), the focus of educational reform shifted from repair to restructuring (Murphy, Evertson, & Radnofsky, 1991). Among the arguments promoted by the reformers were that changes were needed in the organization and governance of educational systems, in the roles of adults in schools, and in the processes for teaching students (Murphy, 1991).

Although the call for restructuring is echoing at every level of schooling, a primary concern is at the high school level. During the past decade several widely publicized studies have focused attention on criticisms of America's high schools (Boyer, 1983; Goodlad, 1984; Lightfoot, 1983; Sizer, 1984). Sponsored by nine organizations, Cawelti's (1994) national study of high school restructuring captured the essence of these criticisms:

- Low student achievement, both on tests of basic skills and on tests of general knowledge in core subjects.

- The need to move beyond only teaching basic skills and factual information to developing higher-order intellectual skills such as critical thinking and problem solving, and to provide classroom learning experiences that help students derive their own meaning from learning.
- Curriculum fragmentation, which prevents students from seeing the connections between school subjects and real life.
- The impersonality of large high schools, in which many students feel little or no sense of belonging to the institution.
- The failure to provide learning experiences that provide students with the skills needed for transition to meaningful jobs in the work world after graduation.
- The predominance of students as passive learners and the failure to actively engage them in the learning process.
- Failure to provide the challenging curriculum needed by language-minority students and a culturally diverse student population. (pp. 1, 2)

Newmann (1991a) has identified two key issues that are typically dealt with by reformers: (1) the large segment of students, especially low-income, minority students, with failing grades and poor scores on nationally standardized tests, and (2) the portion of students who have passing grades and acceptable standardized test scores but who "have not been educated to cope successfully with the demands of personal, vocational, and civic life in contemporary society" (p. 459). In response to changes in society, schools now have a new mission--to enable all students to learn at high levels (Darling-Hammond, 1993). The model for achieving this mission requires a shift "from *designing controls* intended to direct the system to *developing the capacity* of schools and teachers to be responsible for student learning and

responsive to student and community needs, interests, and concerns" (Darling-Hammond, 1993, p. 754).

### Definition

The restructuring movement currently has taken "center stage" (Murphy, 1993, p. 20) in school improvement efforts, but an understanding of this phenomenon "remains somewhat cloudy" (Murphy, 1993, p. vii; see also Conley, 1991; Newmann, 1991a, 1991b). The NASSP Commission on Restructuring (1992) has indicated that there are as many definitions of restructuring "as there are commentators on education's problems" (p. 2). Still, Murphy has suggested that the lack of a precise, formal definition may not be as problematical as widely believed. Although an official definition of restructuring is nonexistent (Brandt, 1990), seven basic elements are common to most definitions:

1. [Restructuring] is student- and teacher-centered;
2. changes the way students learn and teachers teach, requiring both to assume greater initiative;
3. applies to all students and all schools, not just the disadvantaged;
4. affects curriculum as well as organization;
5. needs a central vision within a school to which all involved subscribe;
6. requires becoming "unstuck" from many current reforms and from a built-up centralized bureaucracy;
7. is advocated by diverse interests in society. (Lewis, 1989, p. 6)

The seven elements appear in various forms in definitions developed by the National Governors' Association (O'Neil, 1990), the National Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools (Newmann, 1991b), the American Association of School Administrators (Lewis, 1989), and the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP

Commission, 1992). The National Governors' Association (NGA) framework for restructuring includes a focus on curriculum and instruction, authority and decision making, new staff roles, and accountability systems (O'Neil, 1990). The four arenas identified by the National Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools are student experiences (e.g., instructional activities, methods of grouping students, and discipline procedures); professional life of teachers (e.g., relationships with various stakeholders and professional development activities); school governance, management and leadership (e.g., changes in authority and power of various stakeholders and new procedures for decision making about staff, budget, and curriculum); and coordination of community resources (Newmann, 1991b). After more than a year of study, the American Association of School Administrators (AASA) concluded that restructuring is student- and teacher-centered and might include

changes in curriculum (what we teach); modifications in the way we organize for instruction; variations in federal-state-local relationships; increased participation in decision-making; "school-based management"; reform in the systems for preparing, certifying, and compensating educators; taking a hard look at the governance or financing structures; dealing more effectively with at-risk students; or simply fostering changes in the way people think. (Lewis, 1989, p. iv)

In 1992 the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) published a special report of the NASSP Commission on School Restructuring. Included in the report was the comprehensive definition formulated by the Commission to serve as the basis for NASSP's restructuring efforts. Restructuring was defined as

the reforming of school organizational interrelationships and processes to increase student learning and performance, with a focus on

1. The quality of learning experiences and outcomes
2. The professional role and performance of teachers
3. Collaborative leadership and management
4. Redefined and integrated curriculum
5. Systematic planning and measurement of results
6. Multiple learning sites and school schedules
7. Coordination of community resources, human and fiscal
8. Equity, fairness, and inclusion for all students (p. 3)

David Conley has conducted studies of schools involved in restructuring, has served as a consultant on restructuring for schools and districts, and has spoken and written extensively on restructuring. He uses this definition: "Activities that change fundamental assumptions, practices, and relationships, both within the organization and between the organization and the outside world, in ways that lead to improved student learning outcomes" (Conley, 1991, p. 49). Conley's (1992) emerging trends in school restructuring correspond to concepts found elsewhere in the literature: redesigning curriculum to encourage active involvement of learners; focusing on the needs, motivations, and abilities of the learners; assessing learning continually; integrating technology; redefining the learning environment, e.g., using block scheduling in high schools; making parent and community involvement an integral component of the school vision; and developing new governance structures with changing roles for teachers and administrators. Newmann (1991a) has cautioned that "to avoid the costly mistakes of previous efforts, we must resist the tendency to institute administrative changes devoid of fresh educational vision" (p. 463).

Strategies such as school-based management and teacher empowerment have received much attention (Murphy, Evertson, & Radnofsky, 1991), and

the move to decentralization to increase authority at the school site has been perhaps the most widely discussed element of restructuring (Murphy, 1991, p. 36). Four categories of decentralization are "changes between levels of the organization (school-based management), changes among roles at the school level (shared decision making), changes between the school and its regulatory environment (e.g., waivers), and changes between the school and the larger community" (Murphy, 1991, p. 36). Restructuring also affects what Murphy (1991) calls "the core technology." The core technology includes the areas of student as worker, curriculum, instruction, equity, and delivery services. The "student as worker" concept emphasizes the need to engage students in their learning, thus breaking the cycle of students who disengage themselves by dropping out of school, by attending school sporadically, or by negotiating with their teachers an exchange of "attendance and compliant behavior for academic expectations" (Murphy, 1991, p. 52). Curricular changes may include a core curriculum for all students, an increased interdisciplinary focus, a greater focus on higher order thinking skills, and expanded methods of assessment (Murphy, 1991; Newmann, 1991a). Instruction in schools that are restructuring has been characterized by greater use of techniques such as cooperative learning and team teaching (Murphy, 1991, Newmann, 1991a). In the area of equity, restructuring places an emphasis on the education of all students, especially those who have been labelled "at risk" in the past (Murphy, 1991). Finally, schools that are restructuring have made changes in the structures through which services are delivered; for example, flexibility in the ways students are organized for learning (Murphy, 1991; Newmann, 1991a).

To assess current reform initiatives in the nation's high schools, Cawelti (1994) conducted a national survey of the more than 10,000 regionally accredited public and private high schools in the United States. For the study the five key components of high school

restructuring were identified as curriculum/teaching, school organization, community outreach, technology, and monetary incentives. Cawelti's definition of school restructuring reflects each of the five components:

The central goal of high school restructuring is improving student performance on important outcomes contained in the curriculum of the future. Thus, restructuring involves designing fundamental changes in the expectations, content, and learning experiences for a curriculum appropriate to tomorrow's world. To achieve this goal, restructuring utilizes creative incentives, different organization structures, new and improved instructional technologies, and broader collaboration with community agencies and parents. (Cawelti, 1994, p. 3)

The five major components were further defined by the 38 specific elements included in the final survey instrument developed for the study. Elements such as the following were included:

(1) curriculum/teaching--interdisciplinary teaching, national mathematics standards, thinking skills, alternative assessment techniques, school-to-work transition, staff development, cooperative learning; (2) school organization--site-based management, teacher-advisee system, school-within-a-school, block schedule; (3) community outreach--community school, business/industry alliances, allied youth services, school/college partnerships; (4) technology--distance learning, integrated learning system, word processing applications, computer literacy, CD ROM technology, modems, multimedia systems; and (5) monetary incentives--teacher incentive pay, administrator incentive pay, group incentive pay, career ladder plan.

Regardless of the terminology used to identify the components of restructuring, "*schools* must do the job of restructuring" (NASSP Commission, 1992, p. vii). The emphasis on *schools* indicates that individual schools should have the autonomy to restructure in ways that

best meet the needs of their students. Deliberate "departures from conventional practice" are important and may involve "a great variety of changes, but there is no particular combination or minimum set of changes dictated or implied by the concept of school restructuring" (Newmann, 1991b). The NASSP Commission does emphasize the need for leadership. Strong leadership will be necessary as schools are restructured, but the leadership will shift from central control by the principal to collegial power with others. Because restructuring involves incremental and systematic change, a local plan must be developed with the collaboration and approval of school staff. In developing plans, school site councils must keep in mind the purpose of restructuring, as stated by Lee Shulman of Stanford University:

For too many people, restructuring has become an end in itself. They've lost sight of the fact that the purpose of restructuring is not empowerment, but enablement. It's not to give teachers more power; it's to give them the ability to respond appropriately to kids. (NASSP Commission, 1992, p. 39)

Newmann (1991a) has argued that several structural conditions appear to be necessary for authentic student achievement: collaboration among students, teachers, and other adult authorities; student access to tools and resources; some degree of student discretion and ownership of learning opportunities; and flexible use of instructional time. The National Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools has stated a critical point: "We view restructuring not as a single categorical property, but in multiple dimensions, each considered on a continuum" (Newmann, 1991b). Newmann continues,

The degree of restructuring at a school, however, is far less important than the ends or qualities that the school promotes. It would be foolish for a school to adopt a restructuring plan that attempted to implement the 38 criteria as if adding separate

ingredients to a recipe. The school must first build a foundation - by clarifying the educational ends it seeks, assessing its unique needs, and analyzing how it must change to serve the ends. The criteria will be useful only in suggesting departures from conventional practice that could help to address some of the problems. (Newmann, 1991b, p. 4)

Just as various definitions of restructuring share broad components, those who are studying the movement generally agree that not every element will appear in every program for restructuring (Cawelti, 1994; Conley, 1992; Newmann, 1991b). The history and circumstances in each district are unique, and the path to restructuring in each district is also unique (David, 1990). Following a three-year study of four Illinois schools participating in the essential schools restructuring initiative, the analysis of data gathered through interviews, observations, participation, and document analysis led Prestine (1992) to note the following implication:

There is no silver bullet, no template that can be mapped out from one school's experience to serve for others. While there is an overall progression of development, each school's journey over the turbulent waters of restructuring, by necessity, will be different in important ways. (p. 60)

Of the 3,380 schools that responded to Cawelti's (1994) survey, only seven reported general use of the seven indicator elements of a high degree of restructuring. Although the study alluded to the lack of research evidence on the relative importance and problems of "piecemeal vs. comprehensive change," it further noted that "what is known is that either route requires several years of work, and that school improvement is a continuing process that must be continually maintained to sustain the changes" (Cawelti, 1994, p. 61).

### **Players**

Organizational structures can be explained as the roles, rules, and relationships that affect the performance of individuals within an organization (Newmann, 1991b). Restructuring clearly includes changes in the relationships among the players in education (Cohen, 1990; David, 1990; Louis & Miles, 1990; Murphy, 1991; Ornstein, 1991). But who are these players? The literature (Hallinger & Hausman, 1993; Lewis, 1989; Murphy, 1991, 1993, 1994; Ornstein, 1991; Prestine, 1993; Raywid, 1990; Webb et al., 1993) suggests that the key players are state officials, superintendents, principals, parents, teachers, and students.

Restructuring usually "encompasses systemic changes in one or more of the following: work roles and organizational setting; organizational and governance structures, including connections among the school and its larger environment; and core technology" (Murphy, 1991, p. 15). David (1990) also describes restructuring as a systemic and comprehensive process intended to alter school organization and the definitions of individual roles (p. 224). Rather than schools and educators maintaining the traditionally dominant role in relation to the public, the two are developing relationships more akin to partnerships (Murphy, 1991, p.17).

Just as the relationships will change, "restructuring will necessitate major changes in the roles and responsibilities of building administrators" (Murphy, 1991, p. 26). Principals are facing more complex and demanding jobs--responsibilities are being added, but few are being eliminated (Hallinger & Hausman, 1993; Murphy, 1991; Murphy & Louis, 1994). In schools that are restructuring, new metaphors replace old metaphors, e.g., the principal as facilitator replaces the principal as manager (Johnson, 1990; Murphy, 1991). David (1990) reported that principals in the Poway Unified School District, which has implemented school-site budgeting and shared decision making, are "now required to participate in professional development, instructional practices, and

clinical supervision, as well as leadership and management skills" (p. 232). In schools that are restructuring, the principal is a *leader of leaders* who is capable of engaging others as leaders (Hallinger & Hausman, 1993), as suggested by Leithwood (1992):

"Instructional leadership" is an idea that has served many schools well throughout the 1980s and 1990s. But in light of current restructuring initiatives designed to take schools into the 21st century, "instructional leadership" no longer appears to capture the heart of what school administration will have to become.

"Transformational leadership" evokes a more appropriate range of practice. (p. 8)

An elementary principal in Houston, Texas, whose school has changed from "one of the most dismal schools in the district to one of the most exciting and successful schools" (McCarthy & Still, 1993, p. 63) described the changes in the principalship:

It was really difficult at first to let teachers make mistakes. I really had to fight the urge to tell them, "That's not the best way to do that." I had to let them analyze their own problems, come up with their own solutions, and then try them out and see if they worked. When they didn't work, I had to resist the urge to jump in and fix it. But the benefits of this have really been overwhelming. These teachers are now running the school. They are self-confident, assertive, and innovative risk-takers. (p. 73)

In spite of the benefits, Murphy and Louis (1994) have cited evidence from several studies that "a nearly universal concern is the expanded workload confronting principals in restructuring schools" (p. 7). The role of the principal has been fundamentally altered and, like the traditional role of the assistant principal, may now be accompanied by role overload and role ambiguity. Four primary changes in the role of the principal are identified by Murphy and Louis: (1) the principal leads from the center, i.e., delegates leadership responsibilities and

empowers others, develops collaborative decision-making processes, and brings shared authority to life as an equal participant and facilitator; (2) the principal enables and supports teacher success, i.e., helps formulate a shared vision, cultivates a network of relationships, allocates resources in support of the vision, and promotes teacher development; (3) the principal manages reform, sometimes at the expense of instructional leadership; and (4) the principal extends the school community, i.e., promotes the school, works with school councils, and involves parents. These changes have created several dilemmas, according to Murphy and Louis. For example, the overwhelming workload has made it difficult for some principals to find adequate time to perform their duties. Some principals have suggested that conflicting expectations of various players in the change process have left them caught in the middle. Another concern has been the need for in-service opportunities to develop new knowledge and skills, because "principals are being asked to reconceptualize radically their roles, while few resources are provided to help them" (p. 32).

Like the roles of principals, the roles of teachers have also changed. Teachers have assumed responsibilities once "the province of others, especially administrators" (Murphy, 1991, p. 29). The "teacher as leader" has replaced the "teacher as worker," and teaching and learning have also been reoriented to place greater emphasis on higher order thinking skills, active learning, cooperative learning, and educational outcomes for all children (Murphy, 1991). Although school staffs in the Poway Unified School District and the Dade County schools do not have complete control over staffing, they have options to hire several part-time specialists instead of a teacher or to replace an assistant principal with two part-time teachers (David, 1990).

What has been learned about the changing roles and perspectives of these players? In 1991, Murphy, Evertson, and Radnofsky--"puzzled by the lack of teacher voices in the discussion about restructuring" (p. 136)--

published the results of an exploratory study that examined teachers' views on the restructuring movement in general. As part of a larger investigation of the effects of restructuring on teaching and learning, the researchers interviewed fourteen teachers representing diverse roles in elementary, middle, and secondary schools. A scheduled interview protocol developed from their own studies and from reviews of the literature was used to gain in-depth perspectives and to develop rich descriptions of the teachers' views on restructuring. Individual interviews, which lasted approximately an hour each, were audio taped and later transcribed for analysis. The results of the study included the following:

1. In terms of their own roles in restructured schools, teachers envisioned shared leadership, a greater sense of responsibility, and shared ownership in the new educational enterprise. They anticipated new roles, redesigned jobs and responsibilities, and more collaborative work with their peers. Although most of them anticipated positive changes for teachers, a number were concerned about possible increases in pressure, the potential for mistrust, and additional paperwork.
2. There were two distinct perceptions about how restructuring would influence the administration of schools. . . . One group of teachers wanted the role of administrators deemphasized and their influence greatly reduced. They believed that decision making should be handed over to the teaching staff and that principals should maintain their administrative duties and leave teachers alone. A second group believed that principals should be given more power to do their jobs . . . and that principals should devote substantially more energy to working with teachers on the

important issues of schooling (e.g., the curriculum).

(Murphy, Evertson, & Radnofsky, 1991, p. 139)

Several themes emerged from the transcripts in Murphy, Evertson, and Radnofsky's (1991) study. First, teachers saw the need for an interdisciplinary curriculum and anticipated a greater role for teachers in developing the new curriculum. A second theme, climate, surfaced in their belief that a sense of belonging and unity would be fostered in restructured schools. Teachers also predicted that discipline problems and some of the existing racial tensions would decrease. In the area of teacher work, teachers wanted the flexibility to determine what was best for their students. Time for professional development for teachers and administrators was critical. In the area of interpersonal dynamics, teachers and students were viewed as partners in the educational process. Fifth, in terms of organizing for learning and managing behavior, the belief was that uniform rules would be consistently reinforced throughout a restructured school. The interview questions about managing student behavior "left most teachers searching for more and different things they themselves could do, such as providing positive reinforcement, seeking training in discipline techniques, improving their teaching." (p. 143). A sixth theme emerged on supporting structure. Although teachers reportedly had difficulty believing they would have some control over resources, their priorities were additional instructional materials, supplies, and support personnel (e.g., teacher aides, departmental secretaries).

In another study of three restructuring school districts, several themes emerged:

1. The goal of school restructuring is long-term, comprehensive change guided by a conception of schools as stimulating workplaces and learning environments.
2. School staff members need the skills, authority, and time to create new roles and environments appropriate for them.

3. Restructuring schools requires building new coalitions and support and creating new conceptions of accountability.

(David, 1990, pp. 223-224)

According to David (1990), the school is the appropriate organizational level for meaningful change, but the amount of authority that is given to the individual schools is not fixed. Rather, there is an "ebb and flow of authority" (David, 1990, p. 288). Approaches such as school-based budgeting and shared decision making are no longer viewed as ends in themselves (David, 1990). Such approaches not only allow the development of new roles for central office administrators, school administrators, and teachers but also change the ways in which individuals think about these roles and relationships (David, 1990). Recognizing that creating and fostering the development of new roles may be limited by inadequate time, information, and skills, school districts in Poway, Jefferson County, and Dade County have identified ways to provide adequate time for new roles and to promote professional development for teachers and principals (David, 1990).

To provide a mid-point assessment of a five-year initiative for restructuring a group of urban schools to address the problems of at-risk students, Wehlage, Smith, and Lipman (1992) used quantitative and qualitative methods, including management information system data on key student outcomes and site visits to conduct observations and interviews. Participating schools had implemented the Annie E. Casey Foundation's New Futures Initiative. The data indicated that the schools had not yet implemented the kind of comprehensive restructuring needed to better serve at-risk pupils. Many interventions targeted only a few at-risk students, little interest was shown in opportunities for changing curriculum and instruction, and only limited efforts were made to involve teachers in decision making. Basically, "most students, teachers, and administrators carried out their day-to-day activities in much the same way they had before [restructuring]" (p. 79). A positive

outcome of the initiative, however, was that major stakeholders in each community joined together, and findings of the study led to a reconsideration of how to restructure the schools to achieve success.

The existing literature on school restructuring to some extent addresses the roles of principals and teachers. Murphy (1991) asserts that "one of the key ingredients of school restructuring is a redefinition of roles and responsibilities of professional staff" (p. 22) and devotes an entire chapter to the topic of work redesign for "each of the professional actors" in these schools. Included are the district office, the principal, and the teachers; however, assistant principals are noticeably absent from the discussion.

### Urban Agenda

Although school restructuring has gained attention nationwide, some researchers believe that the movement has its roots "in the problems of the nation's larger cities" (Heck, 1992, p. 217). These problems include demographic changes, overcrowding, changing job markets, and increasing financial needs for government--especially education (Heck, 1992). The opportunity to restructure existing systems is evident, but Louis and Miles (1990) have cautioned that elementary schools, not high schools, have been the focus of many studies on educational change. They have further noted that approaches which succeed at the elementary level may not be successful when implemented in the more complicated high school environment, especially in the urban setting.

Urban high schools face the same types of problems as those in other settings, but the problems differ in scope and intensity (Louis & Miles, 1990). Among the characteristics of urban schools are the following:

- Cultural diversity is a fact of life in almost all urban high schools.

- It is not uncommon for faculty to estimate that 25 percent or more of the students have serious learning disabilities, although federal and local regulations often prevent classifying so many students in that category. Finally, each school also harbors talented students of exceptional promise, and programs must be devised to fit them as well.
- Minority-majority differences are compounded by the presence of many students who come from very poor backgrounds . . . or who do not speak English well or at all.
- The urban high school is a complex organization embedded in an even more complex organization--the district. Urban district offices . . . are large bureaucracies, often employing hundreds of people. In many cases the middle-level personnel are deeply entrenched specialists and administrators who have worked their way out of the schools in the same district.
- Finally, there are strong pressures for school uniformity. Big districts tend to have wide variations in the quality and performance of schools within their boundaries, but, for a variety of reasons, often treat them as if they were all the same. (Louis & Miles, 1990, pp. 11-13)

In *Improving the Urban High School: What Works and Why*, Louis and Miles (1990) state: "Our focus is on urban high schools, but the discussion is relevant for any secondary school that exists in a complex setting or has 'urban-like' features" (p. 16). In fact, Alameda High School, one of the five case study schools, has problems that are "genuinely urban" although its setting is the "semi-urban sprawl of southeastern Los Angeles County" (p. 79). Schools with urban problems share similar concerns in implementing and sustaining change efforts. Such problems stem from three sources: (1) the structure and process of the change program itself; (2) the individuals involved, as they

"interact in their traditional and change-impacted roles," (p. 269) and (3) the relationship between the organizational setting and the environment itself.

Because of the increasing ethnic diversity and mobilization of the population in large urban areas, governance structures in education have been changed (Heck, 1992). Newmann (1991a) has identified "at least two grounds for seriously entertaining the prospect of fundamental organizational change" (p. 459). First, schools face the problem of "pervasive disengagement"; that is, the constant challenge of engaging students in serious academic pursuits. Second, schools have traditionally attempted to cover "a virtually limitless list of fragmented pieces of declarative knowledge" (p. 459). Newmann has argued that the problems of pervasive disengagement and excessive focus on coverage of information "exact their most tragic toll on students who, because of low income, cultural background, or lack of social support, do not succeed in schools as they are currently organized" (p. 459). High school students who exhibit disruptive behavior often view education as "something that is done to them rather than something they do" (Newmann, 1991, p. 22). These students have little or no involvement in the school. This lack of involvement perpetuates "a pervasive feeling of disconnectedness" (p. 22; see also Elmore, 1990), which is the leading cause of disruptive behavior in many high schools.

Cawelti's (1994) study of restructuring found deep involvement in restructuring activities in many of the nation's high schools but also reported that many criticisms of high schools have yet to be addressed. Various reasons may explain why more high schools have not embraced serious restructuring initiatives, including the overall resistance to change. In general, "the public has been repeatedly reminded by some politicians that 'you can't improve schools by throwing money at them,' but this pronouncement is hard to reconcile in an urban high school with deteriorating facilities, transient teachers, little technology, and

outdated textbooks" (Cawelti, 1994, p. 67). According to Louis and Miles (1990), "Implementing serious change in urban high schools is a problem-rich enterprise" (p. 271). Among the methods identified for addressing problems were training and developing people, empowering/team building, and role redesign.

Urban school districts with large bureaucratic structures are prime candidates for adopting site-based management to address the needs of their students (Reitzug & Cross, 1994). On the basis of preliminary findings from a study of six urban schools in two school systems, Reitzug and Cross identified seven key lessons from the emerging themes:

- Education professionals care a great deal about children and the quality of education provided in their schools.
- Parents and community members are committed to contributing to the work of the school.
- All relationships need to be challenged.
- Maintaining old relationships is problematic and may undermine developing new relationships.
- A milieu of trust and respect is essential beyond having a voice and a vote.
- An opportunity to have a voice is not equivalent to structures that solicit participation, views, and ideas.
- The legitimacy of decision making has to be established over time. (pp. 21-23)

Another study, conducted by the RAND Corporation, examined progress as a result of restructuring in urban schools with disadvantaged student populations (as cited in Lewis, 1989). This study stressed the importance of the role of the superintendent and, like the research of Reitzug and Cross (1994), emphasized the need for community involvement. The superintendent and the community, however, are not the only players whose roles must change. In *Improving Inner-City Schools: Current Directions in Urban District Reform*, Oakes comments: "These

promising strategies diverge from traditional urban school practice, and their widespread implementation will require urban educators to assume new roles and responsibilities and to restructure schools and learning" (as cited in Lewis, 1989). Based upon evidence in the literature that principals, students, teachers, parents, and superintendents "will find their roles fundamentally redefined in districts undergoing restructuring efforts" (Murphy, 1994), the present study examined the possibility that the role of the assistant principal would also be redefined.

### Summary

The review of the literature on school restructuring raised several questions regarding the possible effects of restructuring on the assistant principalship. Several themes or questions identified in studies on the changing roles of principals, teachers, or superintendents were potentially applicable to assistant principals as well. Specifically, how have changes in the role of the principal affected the assistant principalship? Has the workload changed? Have relationships changed? How have changes in the role of the teacher affected the role of the assistant principal? How do teachers view the assistant's role? If schools are restructuring in ways that best meet the needs of their students, has the role of the assistant principal also changed to reflect differences among schools? Have the assistant principal's processes for decision making changed? Does the assistant principal have a role in school leadership? Does the assistant principal have a role in attaining the goals of restructuring? Questions such as these were blended with those from the review of the literature on the assistant principalship to prepare a more detailed set of research questions to guide the study.

### Summary

Studies on ongoing efforts in restructuring have indicated that changing one piece of the puzzle affects neighboring pieces (David,

1990). David's study began with a telephone survey of more than a hundred school districts "to locate those that best represented districts whose actions have led to new roles and relationships and organizational arrangements" (p. 211). Three school districts were then selected for more intensive research: the Dade County Public Schools in Miami, Florida; the Jefferson County Public Schools in Louisville, Kentucky; and the Poway Unified School District in Poway, California. Interviews were conducted with central office and school staff in each district and visits were made to selected schools. From these pioneering districts, one lesson was that school-based management should be viewed as only one component for creating productive learning environments. School districts must also ensure that teachers are involved in decision making, that schools are granted waivers from restrictive rules, and that teachers and administrators are afforded not only opportunities to gain new knowledge and skills but also the time and resources to use their newfound knowledge and skills.

In an effort to capture what has been learned to date about restructuring schools, Murphy (1991) has stated:

Looking in multiple directions, or using multiple frames, to understand the phenomenon of restructuring schools enhances the portrait we are able to paint. At one level, the use of multiple perspectives helps guarantee that all the parts are included in the picture. At a second level, it ensures that subtle differences and contrasts are faithfully captured. Finally, it helps make explicit the tensions and rough edges likely to be overlooked when only one or two perspectives are employed. (p. x)

Similarly, the present study examined another dimension of the portrait of restructuring--the assistant principalship.

The findings of a national study of school restructuring led Cawelti (1994) to conclude that "a sense of urgency about restructuring the nation's high schools is essential to continued improvement"

(p. 68). The necessity of examining the principalship as high schools become involved in restructuring is obvious. "Less obvious, but at least as important, is the need to examine the concerns of school leaders other than the principal" since "[principals'] effectiveness will be mediated to a significant degree by the capacities of those with whom they work" (Hallinger & Hausman, 1993, p. 140). Few studies have been conducted on the role of the assistant principal, and "very little critical or creative thinking has been done regarding that role and its relationship to the roles of principal [and] teacher" (Greenfield, 1985b, p. 7; see also Marshall, 1992). Whereas the literature on school restructuring addresses the roles and perceptions of superintendents, principals, teachers, parents, and students, less attention has been given to the assistant principalship in the age of school reform (Glanz, 1994; Sherman, 1991/1992). An exception is Sherman's study (1991/1992) of the perceptions of senior high school assistant principals on the impact of shared decision-making in a Los Angeles school district. Of the 20 high school assistant principals participating in the study, 50% reported positive attitudes toward shared decision making/site-based management, while 40% reported negative feelings. More important, the assistant principals expressed a desire to be a part of the change and a strong belief that, given the opportunity, they have much to offer.

In summary, the review of the literature on the assistant principalship and on school restructuring revealed a need to examine the role of the high school assistant principal in this era of change. Traditionally viewed as a stepping stone to higher administrative positions, the assistant principalship may become a career alternative for some educators. Both ambiguity and conflict appear to have been associated not only with the position itself but also with the levels of job satisfaction experienced by assistant principals. As schools are restructured and the roles of principals and teachers are changed, the risk is that the assistant principal will remain the forgotten

stepchild. Limited research has been conducted on the assistant principal in restructured schools; therefore, sufficient support was found for an examination of the role of the assistant principal in high schools that are restructuring. The following questions therefore guided the study:

1. What is the current role of the assistant principal in high schools that are restructuring?
  - a. What are the primary duties and responsibilities of the assistant principal?
  - b. Is the assistant principal involved in the six traditional areas of responsibility: pupil personnel, curriculum and instruction, school management, staff/personnel, student activities, and community relations?
  - c. In which areas does the assistant principal have the greatest or most important responsibility?
  - d. In which areas does the assistant principal have the least responsibility?
  - e. Does the assistant principal have a written job description?
2. How has the role of the assistant principal changed as a result of restructuring?
  - a. How have the duties and responsibilities changed?
  - b. Has the workload changed?
  - c. Has restructuring affected relationships with others (principal, teachers, community)?
  - d. How have changes in the role of the principal, especially in terms of leadership and the power structure, affected the role of the assistant principal?
  - e. Have changes in the role of the teacher affected the role of the assistant principal?
  - f. How has the making of decisions changed?

3. What concerns and issues need to be considered for redefining the role of the assistant principal in high schools that are restructuring?
  - a. Does the assistant principal experience role ambiguity?
  - b. Does the assistant principal experience role conflict?
  - c. Has the assistant principal received the appropriate training for the role?
4. What modifications might be offered to enhance the role of the assistant principal in high schools that are restructuring?
5. Has restructuring affected the job satisfaction of the assistant principal?
6. Will restructuring affect the career goals of the assistant principal?
7. If schools are restructuring in ways that best meet the needs of their students, has the role of the assistant principal also changed to reflect differences among schools?

### **Chapter 3**

#### **Methodology**

This chapter provides a description of the methods employed in conducting this research study. The chapter is presented in four parts: purpose of the study, design of the study, procedures for data collection, and method of data analysis.

##### **Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to examine the role of the assistant principal in urban public high schools in Virginia that were restructuring. Specifically, the study was designed to determine the role of the assistant principal in high schools that were restructuring, to identify how the role of the assistant principal had changed as a result of restructuring, to identify concerns and issues that needed to be considered for redefining the role of the assistant principal in high schools that were restructuring, and to identify modifications that might be offered to enhance the role of the assistant principal in high schools that were restructuring.

##### **Design of the Study**

A qualitative research design was employed for this study. The purpose of qualitative research is "to describe and develop a special kind of understanding for a particular social situation, event, role, group, or interaction" (Locke, Spirduso, & Silverman, 1987). According to Bogdan and Biklen (1992), "the worth of a study is the degree to which it generates theory, description, or understanding" (p. 46). This study sought to understand the role of the high school assistant principal within the framework of restructuring. Since the NASSP

Commission on Restructuring (1992) stated that "real restructuring can only take place school by school," it was believed that an understanding of the role of the assistant principal could be gained most effectively through in-depth exploration of the assistant principalship in a small sample of high schools engaged in restructuring.

Successful restructuring initiatives require the involvement of all members of the school community. An underlying assumption of this research was that restructuring either would foster the development of vital roles for assistant principals or would exacerbate the ambiguities and dissatisfactions of the role.

#### Procedures for Data Collection

Qualitative research procedures may be judged on three criteria: (1) *informational adequacy*, the extent to which the strategy elicits the sought-after information, (2) *efficiency*, the extent to which the plan allows data collection at the least cost in terms of time, access, and cost to participants, and (3) *ethical considerations*, the extent to which the strategy avoids violations of privacy or unnecessary disruptions of the lives of the participants (Marshall & Rossman, 1989). In accordance with these criteria, the following procedures for data collection were identified.

#### Selection of Sites and Participants

The era of restructuring provided the context in which this study examined the role of the assistant principal; therefore, only southeastern Virginia public high schools involved in restructuring were identified. Since attention had been directed toward urban schools as "the most visible 'proving ground' for school restructuring" (O'Neil, 1990, p. 6), four schools were selected from among urban high schools serving students in grades 9-12. The identification process included four steps: (1) contacts with experts who were familiar with restructuring initiatives in southeastern Virginia and who could identify school divisions or schools involved in restructuring,

(2) contacts with the identified school divisions to confirm the existence of district support for restructuring initiatives, (3) analyses of responses to the School Restructuring Survey (see Appendix A), which was completed by each principal and which was designed to determine whether selected elements of school restructuring had been implemented, and (4) an interview with the principal to discuss restructuring initiatives.

The first step in the identification process was to contact experts familiar with restructuring initiatives in Virginia. Contacts included representatives from the Virginia Department of Education (VDOE), the Virginia Association of Secondary School Principals (VASSP), and the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP). The director of a doctoral program at another university also served as a key resource. This professor/consultant was deemed knowledgeable about restructuring on the basis of his past experiences with and ongoing involvement in providing in-service activities for school divisions that were restructuring. From the list of school divisions and schools recognized by these experts for their restructuring efforts, purposive sampling was used to select five urban high schools in Virginia. The sites were also selected in accordance with more practical criteria identified by Bogdan and Biklen (1992); that is, consideration was given both to the time and resources available and to selecting sites within the geographical constraints of the researcher to promote access to and involvement with the data sources.

All study sites were comprehensive secondary schools serving students in grades 9 through 12. The schools were in school divisions enrolling more than 30,000 students, and each school division was located in an urbanized area as defined by the United States Census Bureau. The student enrollment at each site was between 1500 and 2000, with minority enrollments ranging from 39 percent to 68 percent. The schools selected were public high schools with populations

representative of any combination of the following urban characteristics: ethnic minority or diversity, at-risk students, increased dropout rate, increased student absenteeism, low achievement/test scores, crime/violence and discipline problems, or eligibility for free or reduced-price meals.

Following identification of five sites through expert nomination, contacts were made with central office administrators in each school division to discuss the research project and to confirm the existence of district support for restructuring initiatives. Such support was confirmed through conversations with central office administrators and, in some cases, by obtaining written documents presenting restructuring initiatives. Documents included strategic plans, task force reports, and school board resolutions. The required application to conduct research was subsequently submitted to the office of research for each school division. Although the office of research in each district granted permission to involve the identified schools in the study, actual participation was contingent upon the approval of the principal of each school.

After appropriate central office administrators granted permission to contact the selected schools, each principal was contacted by telephone to request participation in the study. The intent of the contact also was to introduce the purpose of the research and explain the phases of the study. Immediately following each contact, a follow-up letter including both the School Restructuring Survey (see Appendix A) and the Consent for Research Study (see Appendix B) was mailed to the principal. The principal was requested to complete the School Restructuring Survey, which was designed to determine whether selected elements of school restructuring had been implemented. Each survey was coded for follow-up and mailed, along with a self-addressed, stamped envelope, to the principal.

Following completion of the restructuring surveys, four of the five principals agreed for their schools to participate in the study. After receiving each completed School Restructuring Survey, the researcher scheduled an interview with each principal. In all cases, a signed Consent for Research Study form was obtained from the participant prior to the interview. The interview was designed to provide a greater understanding of the elements of restructuring already implemented at the school site. In addition to interviews, written documents produced at the school site were obtained to confirm the commitment to restructuring.

Although this research focused on the assistant principalship, the role of the assistant principal is influenced by others within the school setting. Therefore, three phases of interviews were scheduled: (1) principals, (2) assistant principals, and (3) teachers. The selection of the sites determined the subsequent selection of participants for the first phase of the study. Because the purpose of the first phase was to examine the assistant principalship from the perspective of the principal, the population for this phase included only the building principals from the four sites.

The selection of the site also predetermined the population for the second phase of the study, which involved interviews with assistant principals. Nevertheless, attention was given to ensuring that the participants were diverse in ethnicity, sex, and administrative experience. All assistant principals at each site were invited to participate in the study, and twelve of the fourteen assistant principals actually participated.

The third phase of the study involved teacher interviews at each site. Although the selection of site and the selection of participants for this phase were intertwined to some extent, purposive sampling was used to identify lead teachers--including department chairpersons--who had at least five years of teaching experience and whose interaction

with assistant principals was judged to give them some insight on the role of the assistant principal. Between three and eight teacher interviewees at each school were identified with the assistance of the principal and invited to participate in individual interviews. Eighteen teachers participated in the study.

Table 1 presents the characteristics of the participants by position (principal, assistant principal, teacher). These characteristics include sex, age, ethnicity, highest degree received, and experience in education.

Table 1

Characteristics of Participants

Group	Position			Percentage
	Principal <sup>a</sup>	Assistant Principal. <sup>b</sup>	Teacher <sup>c</sup>	
Sex				
Male	3	8	5	47%
Female	1	4	13	53%
Age				
30-39		2	5	21%
40-49	2	4	11	50%
50-59	1	4	2	21%
60 +	1	2		8%
Ethnicity				
Caucasian	4	8	15	79%
Black <sup>d</sup>		3	3	18%
Other		1		3%
Highest degree				
B.A./B.S.			5	15%
M.A./M.S.	2	6	11	56%
Advanced <sup>e</sup>	1	4	2	21%
Ed.D./Ph.D.	1	2		8%
(table continues)				

Group	Position			Percentage
	Principal <sup>a</sup>	Assistant Principal <sup>b</sup>	Teacher <sup>c</sup>	
Years experience				
5-10			5	15%
11-20		2	8	30%
21-30	3	8	5	47%
31 +	1	2		8%

Note.  $N = 34$ .

<sup>a</sup> $n = 4$ . <sup>b</sup> $n = 12$ . <sup>c</sup> $n = 18$ . The teacher group includes department chairpersons. <sup>d</sup>Two additional minority assistant principals and three additional minority teachers were selected for the study but were unable to participate. <sup>e</sup>Includes Ed.S., C.A.S., and C.A.G.S.

### Use of Instruments

School Restructuring Survey. The sample for this study was identified through several methods, including responses to a survey on school restructuring. Permission was requested to use or adapt the NASSP Quick Survey on School Restructuring (NASSP Commission, 1992). After the director of publications and marketing for the National Association of Secondary School Principals granted this permission, this survey was used as the basis for developing a school restructuring survey specifically for this study. Items were adapted from the NASSP survey, from Elmore and Associates' (1990) summary of actions taken by restructuring districts, and from a review of the literature on school restructuring.

The survey was first reviewed by an expert who had ongoing involvement with districts that were restructuring. Recommended changes in the format, wording, and content of the survey were made. Items on the survey were also compared with those included in a survey developed for the National Study of High School Restructuring conducted by the Educational Research Service (Cawelti, 1994) and with the criteria developed by the National Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools (1991). As a result of these comparisons, an item pertaining to technology was added. A pilot of the survey was then conducted with the principal of a high school widely recognized in Virginia for its initiatives in school restructuring. Suggestions pertaining to the format of the survey were used to further refine the School Restructuring Survey. The primary change was to provide for separate responses to components of selected statements rather than to restrict all components to a single response. For example, three response lines (labelled a, b, c) were provided for the components in the statement, "My school has building-level control of (a) the instructional program, (b) budget, and (c) staffing." The second change was to provide space at

the end of the survey for comments regarding other ways in which the school was restructuring. The final instrument was a 22-item survey.

Interview guides. The primary method of data collection was the semistructured interview, a method that is "generally most appropriate for interview studies in education" (Borg and Gall, 1989, p. 452). This interview method "provides a desirable combination of objectivity and depth and often permits gathering valuable data that could not be successfully obtained by any other approach" (Borg and Gall, 1989, p. 452).

Four interview guides were developed for the study. The Interview Guide for Principals (see Appendix C) was developed both from a review of the literature on the assistant principalship and restructuring and from contacts with key informants in these two areas. With written permission, selected items were also adapted from the reflective worksheet used in Murphy's (1994) study of the changing role of superintendents in restructuring districts. The preliminary interview guide for principals was analyzed by educators involved in restructuring and the assistant principalship and was tested during a pilot interview to determine if the questions would elicit information relative to the purpose of this study. Questions were grouped in six areas: (1) background, (2) present roles and responsibilities of assistant principals, (3) changes in roles, responsibilities, and relationships as a result of restructuring, (4) the future, (5) goals of restructuring, and (6) a final note. Nineteen questions were developed around the six broad areas. Specific questions also probed for themes from the literature, such as decision making, job satisfaction, and career goals. With the exception of the background questions, all questions were open-ended. Possible probes were prepared and were used to further clarify questions or to solicit explanatory information from participants. Additionally, a biographical sketch sheet (see Appendix D) was prepared

for obtaining information on sex, age, ethnicity, degrees earned, and experiences in education.

The interview guide for assistant principals was based upon the guide for principals. The nineteen questions in the six areas were modified to reflect the perspective of the assistant principal. For example, "What do you see as the primary duties and responsibilities of your assistant principals?" was changed to "What do you see as your primary duties and responsibilities as an assistant principal?" Two additional questions were added to the survey to solicit further information about assistant principals' perceptions of their duties. The first was, "Which of your current responsibilities do you find most meaningful or worthwhile, and why?" The second pertained to the least meaningful responsibilities. A biographical sketch similar to the Principal's Biographical Sketch was also developed. A pilot interview with an assistant principal from a high school in Virginia widely recognized for its restructuring initiatives was conducted for the purpose of refining content and wording.

A preliminary interview guide for teachers was developed prior to the beginning of any data collection, but the guide was revised after interviews had been conducted with nine administrators. The revised guide was reviewed by a panel of three experienced educators--two English teachers and one mathematics department chairperson--from two high schools. The members of the review panel analyzed the teacher interview guide for content, format, and wording. Based upon the responses from this panel, one question was deleted. A teacher from one of the study schools also participated in a pilot interview. Fourteen questions were included in the final teacher interview guide, along with corresponding probes.

### Collection of Data

The primary method of data collection was in-depth interviews with principals, assistant principals, and teachers. Thirty-four participants were interviewed at the school sites at times convenient to the interviewees between November 1994 and June 1995. Initial interviews were scheduled to last from 1 to 1½ hours with administrators and from 30 to 45 minutes with teachers. The following procedures were used in planning and conducting interviews:

1. Each individual was contacted by telephone or in person to request participation. A follow-up letter was mailed to confirm the appointment. Each subject received a copy of the Consent for Research Study (see Appendix B), which provided written notification of the purpose of the study, the procedures involving the interviewee, the length of time involving interviewees, and issues pertaining to confidentiality. The length of time involving interviewees was modified appropriately on the consent forms for teachers.
2. The signed Consent for Research Study form was obtained prior to the interview. Permission was also requested to tape record each interview.
3. Each participant was interviewed as scheduled at the school. The appropriate interview schedule for principals, assistant principals, or teachers was used as a guide. Predetermined case numbers were assigned to interview schedules and audio tapes, and the interview was recorded for accuracy of data collection. At the conclusion of the interview, the participant was asked to provide demographic data to be used in describing the sample for the study.
4. Within one week of the interview, each participant received a thank-you letter which also included a reminder that a

follow-up contact might be made during the data analysis phase of the research.

Four schools participated in this study, and all participants were unknown to the researcher prior to the research. An underlying assumption of qualitative research--that is, that "the participant's perspective . . . should unfold as the participant views it, not as the researcher views it" (Marshall & Rossman, 1989, p. 82)--demanded flexibility in the interview process. Because of the emergent nature of qualitative research, the data collection in each school was conducted in three phases. The first phase involved the interview with the principal. The second phase consisted of individual interviews with the assistant principals. The third phase included individual teacher interviews. It is important to note that interviews with all administrators in the first study school were completed before interviews were conducted with administrators in other schools. A similar process was used to conduct teacher interviews.

All interviews were conducted by visits to the schools at times and in locations convenient to the participants. Actual interviews ranged from 45 minutes to 2 hours with administrators and from 20 minutes to 1½ hours with teachers. With one exception as requested by the interviewee, interviews were tape recorded for accuracy of data collection. After the completion of each interview, the researcher used a portable computer to prepare fieldnotes as recommended by Bogdan and Biklen (1992). Brief descriptions of the setting, key points pertaining to the research questions, and possible themes were noted.

The use of triangulation (Jick, 1983; Miles & Huberman, 1994) to check internal consistency was achieved by interviewing different groups (principals, assistant principals, and teachers). In addition to interviews, written documents such as school profile sheets, faculty handbooks, student handbooks, school-based and divisionwide strategic plans, task force reports, and minutes of faculty council meetings were

obtained and analyzed. The researcher also attended both a faculty council meeting and a school planning council meeting at one research site.

Data collection was dependent upon the cooperation of a small sample of participants, and accuracy was dependent upon the honesty of interviewees. Nevertheless, the value of the interview method outweighed its limitations for this research study. Individual interviews allowed for the collection of a substantial amount of data from participants with knowledge of the assistant principalship and for immediate clarification as needed.

### **Method of Data Analysis**

The purpose of this study was to examine the role of the assistant principal in high schools that were restructuring. The data analysis addressed the four broad research questions:

1. What is the current role of the assistant principal in high schools that are restructuring?
2. How has the role of the assistant principal changed as a result of restructuring?
3. What concerns and issues need to be considered for redefining the role of the assistant principal in high schools that are restructuring?
4. What modifications might be offered to enhance the role of the assistant principal in high schools that are restructuring?

Two "start lists" of descriptive codes for data-labeling and data-retrieval were created prior to fieldwork (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 65). One set of codes--Question Codes--was developed to correspond to specific interview questions and groups of respondents (see Appendix E). Key words from the questions were used to develop the codes, each of which was followed by a period and an extension to identify the group (p = principal, ap = assistant principal, t = teacher). For example, any unit of data corresponding to the question, What do you see as your

primary duties and responsibilities as an assistant principal? was coded *dutp.ap*. Responses by principals and teachers to a question on the same topic were coded *dutp.p* and *dutp.t*, respectively. A second set of codes--Duties Codes--was developed to correspond to specific duties of the assistant principal previously identified in the literature. For example, staff/personnel was coded *per*. Major area codes were broken into related subcodes by using periods and extensions. For example, in the area of staff/personnel, teacher selection/interviewing was coded *per.int*. Codes were used to analyze pilot interviews. Then the coding system was revised to include 46 codes, a number which falls within Bogdan and Biklen's (1992) recommended range of codes. The revised set of codes appears in Appendix F.

During early phases of the study, the researcher completely transcribed all interviews (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992). In accordance with Bogdan and Biklen's suggestion, transcriptions of later interviews were "more sensitively selective" (p. 131).

Like the study itself, coding of the data was ongoing and conducted in phases. Coding "is a form of early (and continuing) analysis" (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 65), so first-level coding of words, sentences, and paragraphs began following the completion of the interviews with four administrators in the first study school. To ensure consistency in coding, interview transcripts were hand-coded using the Question Codes. During second-level coding, codes consistent with the duties of the assistant principal were utilized. Because there were 27 codes for these duties, a computer search for key words corresponding to specific duties was also conducted. All codes were then typed in italics in the appropriate places in the transcripts. This procedure facilitated rapid retrieval of segments of the data.

Through repeated reviews of the coded data and fieldnotes, emerging themes were identified. A tentative list of codes for emerging themes was developed following interviews with principals and assistant

principals at two sites and checked in the next phase of data collection (Miles & Huberman, 1994). These codes were based on themes from the literature and the data. For instance, decision making, role ambiguity, and changing relationships were anticipated themes. To distinguish theme codes from previous codes, each began with a T. The code for decision making was *T-DEC*, the code for role ambiguity was *T-AMB*, and the code for changing relationships was *T-REL*. A few codes were deleted and added as data collection progressed. The codes for emerging themes--Theme Codes--are presented in Appendix G. The theme codes were used for third-level coding.

Miles and Huberman (1994) recommend that check-coding be used as a reliability check when the researcher is the only individual coding the data. In accordance with this recommendation, the researcher performed check-coding on the first interview transcript within a few days of coding. Based upon Miles and Huberman's formula for reliability, the initial code-recode reliability was 83.3 percent. Several weeks later, another transcript was used for check-coding during data collection in the second school. The results indicated that the code-recode reliability was 94.6 percent.

After data collection and coding were complete, a computer search and retrieval process was used to sort the data by sites, groups, or themes for within-case and cross-case analyses. Copies of transcripts and data display tables were reviewed repeatedly. Tactics such as counting and noting patterns/themes were used to make sense of the data. Display methods (e.g., clustered summary tables) recommended by Miles & Huberman (1994) were also used for analysis topics and themes.

Several tactics recommended by Miles and Huberman (1994) for testing or confirming findings were used. One risk with qualitative research is that the researcher may believe early "findings" to be typical without evidence that the findings are representative. Miles and Huberman therefore recommend checking for representativeness through

techniques such as increasing the number of cases. The original research proposal included three high schools and proposed interviews with all principals, all assistant principals, and two to three teachers at each site. The total number of teacher interviews was more than doubled, and a fourth school was added to test findings from the three original sites and to identify additional findings. Second, Miles and Huberman recommend checking for researcher effects to avoid biases stemming from researcher effects on the site or from the effects of the site on the researcher. Methods of minimizing these biases included (1) ensuring that the participants knew exactly why the researcher was at the site, what was being studied, how information would be collected, and how the information was to be used; (2) attending faculty council and school council meetings to "fit into the landscape" (p. 266); and (3) using data collection methods besides interviewing to understand the setting. Triangulation was a third tactic for confirming findings. Triangulation of data source (across sites and groups) and data method (interviews and documents) was used. The data were examined not only for corroboration but also for inconsistencies. Fourth, consideration was given to weighting the evidence; that is, recognizing that some data were stronger or weaker than others. Circumstances of data collection may have strengthened the quality of the data, for example, with data collected later yielding stronger evidence. A fifth technique was to check the meaning of outliers. One case appeared to be an outlier in that some data were discrepant with data from other sites. A review of the data from the site participants revealed a distinction between the degree of restructuring at that site and at the other three sites. A more advanced version of looking for outliers was looking for negative evidence; that is, determining whether any data opposed various conclusions. Replicating findings was the final tactic to test the explanations. Miles and Huberman suggest that looking at multiple cases provides a "stiffer test" (p. 273) since patterns found in a cross-case

display are tracked through all cases to see if patterns are repeated. An examination of patterns across the four cases yielded variations along time lines associated with restructuring.

Finally, Miles and Huberman's (1994) standards for the quality of conclusions were used to examine the internal validity and external validity of the conclusions. Queries for internal validity pertained to areas such as the extent to which the descriptions were rich and meaningful, the degree of plausibility, the use of triangulation among data methods and data sources, the willingness to look for negative evidence, and the replication of findings. Queries for external validity pertained to areas such as the extent to which the original sample of participants and sites was described to enable comparisons with other samples, the extent to which "thick description" was provided to enable others to determine transferability to other settings, and suggestions about where "findings could be fruitfully tested further" (p. 279).

The next chapter details the findings of the study. Because participants were assured that the names of individuals, schools, and school divisions would not be used in reporting the findings, participants are identified by position and an accompanying number or letter. Any names used in this study are pseudonyms assigned to protect anonymity.

## **Chapter 4**

### **Restructuring and the Assistant Principalship**

This chapter provides a discussion of the findings of the study relative to restructuring and the assistant principalship. The primary method of data collection was through interviews with 34 participants, including 4 principals, 12 assistant principals, and 18 teachers. Data were also collected through site visits, attendance at school and faculty council meetings, and document analysis. These sources provided data to address the research questions that guided the study:

1. What is the current role of the assistant principal in high schools that are restructuring?
2. How has the role of the assistant principal changed as a result of restructuring?
3. What concerns and issues need to be considered for redefining the role of the assistant principal in high schools that are restructuring?
4. What modifications might be offered to enhance the role of the assistant principal in high schools that are restructuring?

The review of the literature provided in Chapter 2 revealed potential themes pertaining to role definition, duties and responsibilities, changing relationships, decision making, role conflict, role ambiguity, shared leadership, job satisfaction, and career goals. The research questions and anticipated themes were used to develop two sets of descriptive codes for early data analysis. As data collection progressed and themes emerged more clearly, a set of theme codes was developed. Following the completion of all three levels of coding, the codes were used to retrieve and organize the data in various

displays for further analysis. This chapter presents an analysis of the findings and juxtaposes the findings with interpretations based upon the review of the literature.

The findings are presented in five sections. The first section presents profiles of school restructuring at the four sites. The findings pertaining to the role of the assistant principal are then presented in four sections: duties of the assistant principal; effects of restructuring on the assistant principalship; identification of concerns, issues, and modifications; and the role of the assistant principal in attaining the goals of restructuring.

#### Profiles of School Restructuring

This section presents a discussion of restructuring initiatives at the four schools. Following a summary of five assumptions drawn from the review of the literature, individual school restructuring profiles are provided.

#### Assumptions from the Literature

The review of the literature suggested that certain assumptions can be made about school restructuring. The first assumption is that a primary goal of restructuring is to increase student learning and achievement. The second assumption is that although there are many definitions of restructuring, schools that are restructuring share some similar characteristics. The third assumption is that individual schools must restructure in the ways which best meet the needs of their students; that is, no two schools are restructuring in the same way. The fourth assumption is that very few schools have reported a high degree of restructuring because it is an ongoing process that requires time and commitment over a period of years. The final assumption is that restructuring leads to changes in the roles and relationships at the school level.

### Profiles of Four Schools

Our climate very much has changed. I think all of us believe that in order to make our school better, we have to find solutions to our problems and we have to have the courage to take responsibility to make suggestions. . . . Two years ago the purpose was not block scheduling. It was really the last year and a half that we started to look at real impediments, things that hold schools back, and we found that the schedule was one of those things. (Principal, School D)

Once we started . . . some folks were having some problems, so the chairman of the [site-based management] team came to me and said, "I'd like to hold a meeting and not have any of the administrators come to the meeting, only the faculty." So he held his meeting, and he went in there and had a chest protector on, a catcher's mask on, and said, "O.K., throw them at me." And [he later told me that] everybody laughed a little, and that was a good thing. That got them to communicate. They did have the opportunity to identify some problems and deal with them, to come up with some solutions. I didn't see any problem with me and the administrative staff not being there, and it didn't create any problems. I've always found that the chairman and the principal have to have a good working relationship, and he was able to share with me all the things confidentially that they were concerned about. . . . (Principal, School C)

Prior to participating in individual interviews, each of the principals completed the School Restructuring Survey (see Appendix A) developed for this study. Statements on the survey pertained to elements of restructuring, such as shared development of mission statement and goals; building-level control of instructional program, budget, and personnel; shared decision making; ownership of school improvement; new

roles for teachers; monitoring student, teacher, and parent perceptions of school climate; experimentation, risk taking, and innovative problem solving; use of current research; flexible scheduling of student time; magnet programs, alternative education, school-within-a-school concept, and special education; technology; interdisciplinary curriculum; alternative assessment; systematic data collection; and alliances with community agencies/businesses. The response categories were "extensively," "considerably," "moderately," "slightly," or "not at all."

The survey findings were analyzed for each school and for the total population. For School A, 9% of the responses were marked "extensively"; 6%, "considerably"; 60%, "moderately"; and 25%, "slightly." For School B, 17% of the responses were marked "extensively"; 29%, "considerably"; 46%, "moderately"; and 8%, "slightly." For School C, 40% of the responses were marked "extensively"; 51%, "considerably"; 6%, "moderately"; and 3%, "slightly." For School D, 18% of the responses were marked "extensively"; 68%, "considerably"; 8%, "moderately"; 3%, "slightly," and 3%, "not at all." These results indicated that Schools C, D, and B had achieved a higher degree of restructuring than School A. An analysis of responses from the total population (21%, "extensively"; 39%, "considerably"; 30%, "moderately"; 9%, "slightly," and 1%, "not at all") showed that principals believed their schools had accomplished considerable to extensive restructuring.

An analysis of responses across cases showed that the highest ratings were for the items pertaining to shared development of the mission statement and goals for the school, shared decision making, and teacher ownership of school improvement. Among the three schools reporting the most progress in restructuring, a pattern (all marked either "extensively" or "considerably") emerged in responses to four specific items: promoting the creation of new roles for teachers;

encouraging experimentation, risk taking, and innovative problem solving; using alternative assessments to evaluate student work; and making staff development decisions at the building level.

After the surveys were analyzed, a richer understanding of restructuring in each school was developed during interviews with the principals. The next section presents profiles developed from these interviews.

### School A

Well, my vision for the school is for it to be known as the best high school in [our school division]. By the best, I mean to have the highest academic expectations, to have children exceed their habitual working levels and push themselves to work harder, and for every student to be successful. For every teacher to view his or her school as the best and to have the highest expectations of every child and do everything he or she can to make every child successful. To have teachers be free to experiment and to have trust of me and the system that they can take risks with student learning and curriculum and what's going on in the classroom, and to feel like we have formed a collaborative working relationship. With that kind of vision . . . we are just slightly off the line. We are 10% toward the vision. (Principal, School A)

School A was in its third year of restructuring, a process that began with the formation of a school planning council charged with the responsibility of developing the school's mission statement and governing values. Based upon internal and external analyses of the school's strengths and weaknesses, the council developed the framework of a strategic plan for improvement in specific areas, such as attendance and parental involvement. Teams comprised of faculty members, parents, students, and community representatives were then convened to develop specific strategies for implementation.

Support for school restructuring at School A came from the district as well as the local school community. At the district level, the school board made a commitment to school-based management and shared decision making. At the school level, teams of individuals studied initiatives for school improvement. For example, the principal stated that one team was working with innovative technology programs while another was examining school scheduling--e.g., a block schedule--as a way of "delivering the instructional program so children will be more successful." Other teachers were involved in prototypes using portfolio assessment, interdisciplinary teaming, cooperative learning, and inclusion. Research-based decisions became increasingly important, and school staff were collecting various kinds of data to assess progress. The school had also established two partnerships with two elementary schools. One partnership was established with the most rural of the elementary schools in the division primarily because School A was "real urban and [played] as an inner city school." A department chairperson stated: "I think there's something wonderful, even in this depressed area with a public housing project and a low-income project, . . . about . . . teaching children of the children that I've taught. I can't help but think that that is some stability." According to the principal, the high school-elementary school partnership provided the elementary children with "the benefit of an urban school perspective and our children can have the benefit of a rural school perspective."

Restructuring had also revitalized staff development programs because it had moved "from everybody doing the same thing on in-service days to people applying to go to conferences and applying to do individual things." Some in-service activities were still conducted for the entire faculty, but "most of the money will be spent on persons doing things that are going to help them in their particular curriculum or in their development as a teacher." At the same time, further training was needed to ensure that all teachers--not just those on

faculty and school councils or specific teams--understood their roles in restructuring. According to the principal, the commitment of teachers was crucial:

The whole idea of restructuring is to find teachers who get on fire and have ideas like Melinda Jarrett and Dawana Simpson did; they have restructured their teaching styles so children are in charge of the classroom--pure learner taking control of learning. It's a wonderful thing to watch.

#### School B

If you were involved in the [school planning council] meeting, you'd see that there was open dialogue, and the parents and community members had as much input as the faculty council, and each opinion weighed equally. It wasn't a matter of the faculty saying, "We're gonna do this" as principals used to say, "We're gonna do this." So there wasn't a move to do anything special. Everybody pretty much agreed on where we were going, and when I say everybody, I mean faculty council, parents, and community agreed where this school needed to go. There wasn't any doubt about it. (Principal, School B)

Like School A, School B was in its third year of restructuring and had the same district support for school-based management and shared decision making. Using a process similar to that of School A, School B began with extensive involvement of teachers, parents, and community members in developing mission statement, goals, and objectives for the school. In contrast to the principal of School A, however, the principal of School B appeared to have taken a less direct leadership role in overseeing the school planning council. He commented, "I think if you're gonna buy into shared decision making you buy into it hook, line, and sinker, or you don't buy into it all, so I have chosen not to be chairperson--and I'm really not chairperson of either [school or faculty council] group. I think that gives flavor to administrative direction

and I don't want that type of flavor." An assistant principal facilitated school planning council meetings, and a faculty member who was elected by the group chaired faculty council meetings.

The school's internal analysis identified various strengths, such as emphasis on academics, positive recognition programs, low staff turnover, strong leadership of principal, and the diverse student population. The analysis also identified areas of weakness to be addressed by the strategic plan. These areas included low standardized test scores, high failure rate, high dropout rate, poor attendance, influences of drug and alcohol abuse on students, low socioeconomic background of students, lack of programs for at-risk students, lack of parental involvement, and lack of staff development programs.

According to the principal, changes that had been implemented had evolved from the objectives established by the school planning council, and these changes had become increasingly data driven. For instance, when the data revealed that the failure rate for ninth grade students approached 40%, a school-within-a-school program was designed to serve between 250 and 300 ninth grade students. Another special program for students with poor achievement and high failure rates was implemented after the school requested and received a waiver from the central office on certain course requirements for these students to increase the focus on core courses. An inclusion model enabled special education students to be served in regular classroom settings because special education teachers "co-op out into classrooms" to work collaboratively with teachers and students.

The principal acknowledged that budget control ranged from "moderately" to "considerably" in comparison to what a full school-based management model would be, but with a chuckle he emphatically stated that school-based management and shared decision making had enabled the school to get things done in a more timely manner, "Much more!" Under a different type of management in some traditional school divisions,

there was always an excess amount [of money], so the favorite cows--whoever they were, be it schools or principals or programs--always got what they wanted even though they didn't especially need it, and the have's got 'haver' and the have not's got more 'have not.' This way, everybody is equitable.

In contrast to past practice, the faculty council now controlled some of the instructional funds. Programs, departments, or individual teachers could submit requests "for moderate to big ticket items" to the faculty council, which in turn prioritized requests for final approval.

Support for programs and equipment was just one facet of the changes occurring as a result of restructuring. When asked if there were other areas of the school program that had been influenced by restructuring initiatives, the principal immediately responded, "Staff development." The faculty had total responsibility for staff development initiatives, with an administrator serving as a liaison to resources such as the central office or the community. The faculty even conducted follow-up surveys to assess the success of staff development programs. In this school teachers had ownership of school improvement and had a vital role in guiding the direction of the school.

The faculty council had a viable position in the organizational structure of the school. Issues addressed by the council were those that affected instruction. For example, the school climate was assessed by both formal and informal means, ranging from written surveys to conversations with students. Results from formal perception surveys were presented directly the faculty council, which then developed an appropriate plan of action. Feedback on the implementation of the plan and subsequent outcomes was provided to the entire faculty.

### School C

So I said, "O.K. This is something that not's involving just me, but if we go to school-based management, we're involving the whole school." So I asked them [central office personnel] to make a

presentation to our staff, and luckily they bought into it. We've been in that now for about four years. (Principal, School C)

Like School A and School B, School C had the support of the school district in its implementation of school-based management and shared decision making, but this approach to school management was not mandated throughout the school division. The school faculty, not the administrative staff, made the decision to pursue this concept. A school planning team composed of faculty members, students, and parents was subsequently established, and training in consensus building was provided for all faculty members.

According to the principal, the faculty really bought into the school-based management concept when "we started making some money with this." With the approval of the central office administration, school staff selected certain accounts to be controlled at the school level. For example, while they decided not to assume responsibility for the textbook, building repairs, and cafeteria accounts, they chose through consensus to manage the substitute account. The focus of this decision was instruction, and "then when they saw things coming into the building--instructional things--that they were paying for themselves, that really was a selling point on school-based management."

Besides the schoolwide planning team, other support teams with diverse representation were responsible for developing plans to achieve specific goals in areas such as school climate, academics, staff development, or community involvement. School-based management was described by the principal as a "successful venture for us," but the school had also implemented other programs. Its teacher-advisor program, for example, enabled all teachers, librarians, and guidance counselors to have a homeroom with no more than approximately thirteen to fourteen students. The principal commented,

It gives them a chance to get to know the kids better and become more of a student advocate here at school. You know, we have kids

who--I'm sure all of the schools have these--who get up in the morning, fix their breakfast, come to school, go to class, eat lunch by themselves, go home in the afternoon and their parents are not home (still at work), fix their own dinner, and go to bed at night and haven't had a chance to converse with anybody or have anybody just speak to them. So we feel that that's been a good program.

Technology also had a role in the school's initiatives. In terms of instruction, the school offered a Tech Prep program, as well as an advanced technology preparation program for students. In terms of administration, computer technology was used to collect data regularly for a school management team. Such data were valuable to school administrators in working with both students and teachers to ensure school safety.

The impetus for new programs stemmed from internal and external support. While school-based improvement or advisory teams were studying alternative ways of scheduling students (e.g., block scheduling) to improve teaching and learning, faculty members were already implementing writing across the curriculum, working together to provide successful inclusion models for students in special education, and using alternative methods of assessing student performance (e.g., portfolio assessment). Community members were also encouraged to support school programs. Even the purpose of fund-raising activities extended beyond just raising money, according to the principal:

What I like about it too is people are coming to the school from out of the city--and they're elderly people, city fathers, whatever--and they see the kids and they get to see the school. They don't see barbed wire, and they say, "Wow, this is neat." And the community gets a positive perception of the school.

A final component of the overall program was evaluation. Various aspects of the school's program were evaluated yearly and the results

were sent to the school division's central administration. More important, the principal stressed the need to share feedback with faculty and staff members because "if you put it in the dust over there, it won't work."

#### School D

. . . whenever you have change, it has to be systemic. It can't just be a program. (Principal, School D)

Of the schools participating in this study, School D had been involved in the widest range of restructuring initiatives for the longest period of time. According to the principal, the school had "pretty much been a leader in restructuring for the system, . . . and that started with creative teachers who approached the [previous] administration and saw a need to develop new courses." While the curriculum development piece of restructuring had been ongoing for approximately six years, the school's most far-reaching initiative was a project sponsored by several well-known partner organizations. Three years ago the staff had begun a year of planning for implementation of the project, which established K-12 learning communities and was comprehensive in design. Collaboration among stakeholders in the school and the community facilitated the development, implementation, and evaluation of strategies to promote improved teaching and learning. Students were expected to demonstrate an understanding of what they had learned through methods such as projects, portfolios, and exhibitions. The principal stated, "It's actually the notion that you have to have all the players coming together in order to make a school better and to progress."

Because the grant was comprehensive in nature, various components had been implemented at different times. The first year was devoted to planning--to preparing staff attitudes and to developing a climate for change. Appropriate stakeholders had been involved from the beginning. For instance, the mission statement was originally developed after input

was solicited from parents and staff during PTA meetings and public forums.

Teachers had considerable ownership of school improvement. They chaired study groups during the day, conducted peer observations, represented the administration at citywide meetings, and volunteered to provide staff development. In fact, the principal estimated that "about 70% of the staff development is presented by our teachers." Some faculty members also served on the 15-member school-based planning team, which was in its first full year of implementation. In contrast to the school-based management team at School C, School D's team voted not to become involved in budget matters. Although they recognized that financial decisions may be part of school improvement, the principal commented, "They believed they wanted to have a hand in making their school a better place, . . . [so] they would rather make some important instructional decisions and help the school."

Like the first three study schools, School D believed in the importance of the school climate. Whereas the school division collected data every two years, this school had chosen to assess its climate twice a year (e.g., in the fall and in the spring) using trained assessors from its partner organizations. Assessment strategies included shadowing, where educators from nationally recognized universities visited the school and shadowed students seven hours at a time. Feedback was used to monitor and adjust plans for improving school climate.

The instructional program was designed to meet the needs of diverse learners. For instance, groups of ninth grade students were clustered with teams of three teachers in a model similar to School B's school-within-a-school concept. Teachers at all grade levels used interdisciplinary teaching. An inclusion model allowed special education students to participate in regular education classes in accordance with their individualized education plans. In the past two years, training for the use of technology had been emphasized and the teachers were

ready to use it. The principal proudly said that the school was "moving very, very fast" and was probably a year ahead of its technology plan. At the same time, the principal stated: "We have technology, but it's not as much as anyone would need. Right now we're on hold. We have technology sitting in boxes and we're waiting for a power boost because we have so much technology coming in."

Data collection was an important part of the restructuring process. A host of people collected different kinds of data, ranging from information on community involvement (e.g., number of volunteer hours) to staff development (e.g., types of programs and number of staff development hours) to the number of low socioeconomic students completing rigorous academic courses. The data collection was directly related to the school programs, as described by the principal:

Any place that we have an area that we want to improve upon, there has to be a plan. You have to look at the data, and then you have to monitor your plan and adjust your plan. For at-risk students, we have students who attend a class--maybe rather than a study hall--that's a work preparation class with a certified teacher and a transition counselor to work with the students on job skills and more specifically on interviewing skills or preparing a resume.

The students do earn credit for it, but it's an elective credit. One component of restructuring was to identify various ways to work with at-risk students. Among the methods for meeting the needs of the at-risk population was the direct involvement of the administration, as described in the principal's words:

Another way we might work on helping at-risk students is I have "fireside" chats with students. Traditionally principals meet with academically gifted students who are school leaders and what have you, and I do that too, but if you really want to find out how your school is getting along and how you're doing, you have to talk to all kids. And we have a significant at-risk population at

[our school] because of where we sit and our socioeconomic background, so I have to include at-risk kids. Who are at-risk kids? It might be the kid who has been suspended four times since the school year began, and that's an important person in my fireside chats.

According to Cawelti's (1994) national study of high school restructuring, "school leaders are being encouraged to give more consideration to *systemic* change, meaning they should simultaneously restructure a number of the major elements that contribute to improving the quality of instruction in the classroom" (p. 59). Seven indicator elements of restructuring were identified: outcome based education, alternative assessment, interdisciplinary teaching, site-based management, block schedule, business/industry alliances, and modems. The profiles presented indicated that the four schools included in this study had adopted from three to five of the seven elements. This is not surprising since only 7 of the 3,380 high schools in Cawelti's study reported a high degree of restructuring, i.e., "general use" of all seven elements.

These profiles do provide a general overview of restructuring at the four sites, an overview that may be examined in light of assumptions formulated from the review of the literature. The first assumption was that the primary goal of restructuring is to increase student learning and achievement. All four schools had focused on students and teachers in an effort to improve student performance. This focus was evident in the mission statements, in the strategic plans, and in the organizational structures of the schools. The second assumption was that although there are many definitions of restructuring, schools that are restructuring share some similar characteristics. All four schools, for example, had implemented a form of collaborative leadership and school management. Emphases had been placed upon involving all stakeholders in identifying appropriate means of addressing weaknesses, especially those

influencing the instructional program and student achievement. Providing programs to meet the needs of all students was also emphasized.

The third assumption was that individual schools must restructure in the ways which best meet the needs of their students; that is, no two schools are restructuring in the same way. For instance, in contrast to Schools A and D, Schools B and C had developed a mechanism for faculty decision making regarding the budget. Schools A and D had established partnerships with local elementary schools, but School D had adopted a more comprehensive design that also included partners in other school divisions. The fourth assumption was that very few schools have reported a high degree of restructuring because it is an ongoing process that requires time and commitment over a period of years. The four schools were at different stages in their overall restructuring as well as with different components of their plans. Regardless of how much had been accomplished to date, school administrators and staff members at each site asserted that the change process takes time.

The final assumption was that restructuring leads to changes in the roles and relationships at the school level. With a specific focus on the assistant principalship, the next four sections explore this assumption.

#### Duties of the Assistant Principal

Data analysis began with the question that established the foundation for the study, What is the current role of the assistant principal in high schools that are restructuring? Related to this question were the following: What are the primary duties and responsibilities of the assistant principal? Is the assistant principal involved in the six traditional areas of responsibility: pupil personnel, curriculum and instruction, school management, staff/personnel, student activities, and community relations? The next six sections present the findings relative to these questions.

### Curriculum and Instruction

When asked to describe the primary duties and responsibilities of their assistant principals, three of the four principals emphasized both discipline and instruction within the first minute of response. The principal of School B, for example, stated that school climate was a primary concern so school climate and student discipline received particular attention. He continued:

The second and *equally as important* issue is instruction. I require each administrator to do X number of classroom observations every month, and it ranges by the degree of other responsibilities. . . . The bottom line is if you're an instructional leader, you . . . better be an instructional leader. We here pride ourselves on being what we say we are--and we are--we just are instructional leaders. (Principal, School B)

After brief remarks indicating that the number of discipline referrals per administrator varied in accordance with the assigned grade levels, the principal focused on instruction. Assistant principals, usually based upon their background, were assigned to departments by subject matter. They were completely responsible for scheduling and conducting teacher observations and evaluations, and they provided instructional guidance as needed. The principal did not get involved "unless they request it or there's a need to." If teachers needed further assistance, assistant principals could--and did--arrange for staff from the central office to assist them in ensuring that teachers "are doing what they're supposed to do with objectives in the curriculum." According to other principals, assistant principals oversaw all instructional areas, managed grants for school restructuring initiatives, monitored technology plans, supervised teachers and guidance counselors, participated in curriculum work, and coordinated Tech Prep programs. The principals from Schools B, C, and D particularly emphasized involving all assistants in a variety of areas:

Everybody needs to be very fluent, to be very knowledgeable constantly in all areas rather than saying one person is better in one area. We need to prepare all administrators to become administrators, to become principals. Instruction, one person is responsible for instruction [and] staff development; however, the other two do solo observations. They have to have their hands in everything. (Principal, School D)

When assistant principals identified their primary duties and responsibilities, seven of them gave initial responses related to instruction. Details regarding specific duties in curriculum and instruction were consistent with those of their principals. Seven assistants also reported an increase in the level or depth of their involvement in instruction during restructuring, an involvement that contrasted with the disciplinary focus in the literature. Findings showed that some assistants had experienced a noticeable increase in their instructional duties. One, for example, contrasted his current with his past experiences in the assistant principalship in another school division:

I did two teacher observations the entire 2 1/2 months . . . , and I had something like 55 teachers that I was responsible for. There was no hope that I would ever get them all done. And when I wasn't doing discipline, I was doing the building, because that was one of my responsibilities, too. It not only included custodians, but that was also the major facility . . . so it was constantly being booked by outsiders, and that took a fair amount of time--just the process of having all the forms signed, and doing the calendar, and so on. (Assistant Principal, #10)

This assistant further commented, "What I love to do is instruction and I've spent an awful lot of time trying to get some expertise in a number of curriculum areas." His current position had enabled him to become an instructional leader.

The focus on instruction for this assistant principal and for several others did not support previous findings in the literature. The literature reported that assistant principals spent much of their time with discipline but recommended an increase in instructional duties (Austin & Brown, 1970; Brottman, 1981; Coppedge, 1968; Greenfield, 1985a; Hess, 1985; Jarrett, 1958; Kelly, 1987; Smith, 1987). Although "few studies to date have focused on the assistant principal and instructional leadership" (Marshall, 1992, p. 65), Lacey (1992) found that assistants devoted little attention to curriculum and instruction because of "task overload" (p. 340) in their roles.

One assistant who accepted his position the year his school began restructuring said he left teaching to become an administrator because of instructional issues. He was concerned about some decisions that had been made in his subject area and believed he would have a greater role in making such decisions as an administrator. Like two of his colleagues, he saw his primary role as dealing with instruction and curriculum. His efforts had been successful, he stated, "because as an administrator you do have the opportunity to not only talk to people, but you can put the money where it counts." He had taken the lead in finding "alternative financing" for things really needed in departments for which he was responsible.

At least one assistant principal from each site had a lead role in a "Tech Prep" program, a school restructuring partnership with community colleges that offers a school-to-work transition program to prepare high school graduates for the world of work (Cawelti, 1994). An assistant from School A credited the program with "developing a relationship between departments and grade levels and teachers that has never been there before." High school teachers and departments had grown apart because of the academic or college-bound orientation. He continued, "The main emphasis of the instructional program is relevance, [making] what they're studying relevant to jobs now and their future. If that's

possible, we can motivate them to learn specific skills to get them where they want to be." He said he got excited because teachers were excited, and he was amazed when he saw kids who were excited and felt that they had found a home.

Although the assistant responsible for Tech Prep at another school likewise asserted that "the program speaks for itself," she stated, "Do I believe I'm the person to do Tech Prep? No, I don't. I like to work hard; I like to work really hard [but] I have a very full plate." On that plate were responsibilities such as being administrator for the entire ninth grade--discipline included, serving as liaison for the Parent/Teacher/Student Association (PTSA), overseeing the English and special education departments, participating in interviewing and hiring of teachers, conducting teacher observations and evaluations, working with staff development, and assisting with the master schedule. With a chuckle she also described how she and another assistant principal competed to exceed the principal's expectations for an established number of teacher observations each month. In contrast to Lacey's (1992) finding that assistants who experienced role overload failed to focus on instruction, this assistant viewed her primary role as instruction and, according to the teachers, regularly demonstrated that belief.

An important component of each school's instructional program was the master schedule. At School B, the master schedule was developed through the team effort of two assistant principals who received "basic philosophical guidance" from the principal. One of the assistants, who fondly described developing the master schedule as "like piecing a quilt," stated: "I like doing things like that. Can I work by myself? Sure. But I learn from him and he learns from me. I think it's a give and take. I know it benefits the teachers, and therefore it benefits the kids." In the other three schools, the master schedule was developed primarily by one assistant with input from other staff. According to the

principal of School A, the assistants

run the grade level, and I want them to make decisions for children and parents at the grade level to include discipline, decisions about curriculum, to work with counselors on the grade level, and cooperate with the various departments they've been assigned . . . , and to facilitate the making of the master schedule for those departments.

When all administrative duties were analyzed for degree of importance, Bricker (1991) and Pellicer et al. (1988) reported that the master schedule ranked among the top seven duties. In a study of assistant principals in Virginia senior high schools, the master schedule ranked first among duties in the category of curriculum and instruction (Patton, 1987). The emphasis on the master schedule was consistent with interview data from principals and assistant principals as well as lists of administrative duties from all four sites.

Scheduling the school day was given much attention in each school since the efficient use of teacher and student time related to school goals. Among Cawelti's (1994) ten elements for restructuring school organization was block scheduling. Converting a traditional schedule to a block schedule was one assistant's major responsibility, but the principal projected decreasing involvement as restructuring progressed:

There are a variety of ways to improve, to manage all that needs to be managed, and we're still in transition. Let me give you an example. One primarily is the scheduler; however, when we went to block scheduling, one of the things that we looked at was, Wouldn't it be nice if we didn't have to have an administrator spending so many months working on a schedule? I mean I'd rather have him in the classroom working with teachers and kids. Well, this is the first year [for implementation of the block schedule] and so it takes a lot of maintenance. . . . We've developed and designed our own schedule--it's not textbook--and so it takes a

lot of time. Traditionally that assistant was known as the scheduler, but we're looking soon for this person to be able to do a variety of things beyond scheduling. (Principal, School D)

An assistant at School C who had previously been responsible for the master schedule confirmed her principal's assertion that instructional duties were rotated. Her responsibility for the master schedule was soon transferring to another assistant and, like her principal, she believed that "everybody does need an opportunity of doing that."

An area in which duties and responsibilities had shifted for assistant principals at School B was staff development. As the school began restructuring, teachers became mainly responsible for identifying staff development needs and implementing appropriate activities to support restructuring initiatives. These included in-service meetings on topics such as instructional strategies and alternative assessment. Previous research indicated that principals and assistant principals assumed responsibility for staff inservice more than 50% of the time (Pellicer et al., 1988). Assistant principals still assisted with staff development initiatives, often as facilitators, but restructuring had transferred the primary responsibility for making decisions regarding staff development from the principal and the assistant principal to the faculty. With the exception of School D, which also had increased teacher involvement in staff development, the data showed that most assistant principals at the other sites had seen no change in their level of involvement.

An assistant who played a key role in facilitating staff development in a school more advanced in its restructuring described staff development as "all over the place initiated." The school was a "pioneer" in innovative instructional techniques, and much of the training was designed to support restructuring initiatives. He established a direct relationship between the "tremendous amounts of staff development" being provided and the administrators' increased

number of classroom observations to monitor and evaluate the success of the training provided.

Teachers' views of the primary duties of the assistant principal were not entirely congruent with those of principals and assistant principals. The administrators viewed instruction as the primary duty, but teachers viewed instruction and discipline as equally important duties. Several teachers focused on departmental supervision, scheduling, or general instructional duties, then shifted to supervision of student discipline. One described the assistant principal's importance to department chairpersons:

I see the role of the assistant principal as absolutely vital because that role, at least for me as department chair, is really my link with a bigger view, a world picture. But it also is the person for whom I can help narrow his or her world view, and I can show the view that I see on a daily basis. And so if that person, working with me and my department, can be an open, interested, knowledgeable, enthusiastic person, then the role is vital, can be absolutely helpful and encouraging and supportive. And at the same time, inspiring. (Teacher, #4)

The teacher expressed regret that recent changes in the administrative personnel had interrupted progress in restructuring, at least for the time being.

Several other teachers viewed the assistant principal in a supportive role. One commented, "I see them supporting the principal's policies, supporting the teachers as far as instructional assistance. We have two assistant principals who do a marvelous job with that, and we really rely on them." A teacher from another school concurred:

I think their primary duty is to support the principal [in] carrying out the jobs of the principal. And I think in a high school, to be realistic, the principal can't figure out what's going on in every classroom. He can't help the teachers

adequately--just one man or one woman--doing the jobs. They need to have the assistant principals doing that, going in and helping the teachers and giving support for the teachers. I think that's one of the primary things. (Teacher, #12)

In contrast to Hess's (1985) finding that the role was not "a critical one for the organization in terms of its direct contribution to the development of improved instructional and organizational practices," administrators and teachers agreed that assistant principals had an important role in the instructional program. As the next section indicates, they also had responsibilities in the area of pupil personnel.

#### Pupil Personnel

Along with instruction, the principals viewed discipline as an important responsibility. Of the 12 assistant principals, only 4 focused on discipline and dealing with students as their primary responsibilities. Of the 18 teachers, 7 focused on managing students, specifically discipline, then quickly turned to duties such as developing the master schedule, conducting teacher evaluations, supervising departments, and performing other instructional duties.

The literature revealed that assistant principals spent the majority of their time with student discipline (Austin & Brown, 1970; Coppedge, 1968; Davidson, 1991/1992; Hurley, 1965; Reed & Himmler, 1985; Smith, 1987). Both Patton (1987) and Pellicer et al. (1988) reported that student discipline ranked first in degree of importance. Findings in the school that had made the least progress in its restructuring efforts supported the literature. Discipline was divided by grade levels and assigned to all assistant principals. The principal lamented that assistants spent "in excess of 75% of their time with discipline, and that's one of the real problems with education--the system gets clogged because of referrals." Instruction was the key responsibility of one

assistant, but the consensus of the principal and the teachers was it should have been the major focus for all assistant principals.

In a qualitative study of the role of the assistant principal, Scott (1989/1990) reported that "the structure of discipline in each school was a result of the availability of personnel to service the student population rather the tightness or looseness of board policy or the desire of [administrators] to become involved in discipline" (p. 85). Scott's findings were supported in part by data from two schools. Both schools had an assistant who had full responsibility for the area of discipline and who supervised non-administrative disciplinary personnel, such as deans of students and full-time security monitors. These assistants also managed expulsion hearings and analyzed specific school data pertaining to pupil personnel (e.g., attendance, referrals, dropouts), along with teacher evaluations, supervision of the special education program, or various school management functions. Their colleagues focused on instructional duties, having no formal responsibility for discipline except periodically monitoring areas within the building. These assistants only dealt with "discipline as needed," which a principal said was "rare." It is important to note, however, that the assistant principals in charge of discipline also shared some responsibilities in instruction, including teacher evaluations.

#### Staff/Personnel

They do it all. I don't hire my teachers. I've hired three people since I've been here, all of them assistant principals. My assistant principals have interviewed and selected in the areas that they are responsible for. (Principal, School B)

Just as instruction and discipline are vital components of the total school program, a school's success is dependent in part upon its personnel. As in the past assistant principals developed teacher duty schedules, but were assistant principals involved in the recruitment and

selection of teachers? Three principals shared the responsibility for interviewing with their assistants. At School B, assistants confirmed that they "do it all." An assistant principal in charge of a committee for hiring practices conducted all teacher interviews, usually along with a department chairperson. If a job opening was not in his specific area of assignment, the administrator assigned to that department also participated in the interview. Their principal concluded:

They have hired quality people--they know what I want, they know what I'm looking for, and they know what I expect. I don't get in their way, and what I want is not personally what I want, it's what any administrator who's in his right mind wants, and it's a reflection of school needs through the strategic plan. (Principal, School B)

Forty-seven percent of the principals in 1987 reported shared responsibility with the assistant principal for teacher selection; only four percent reported that the assistant had full responsibility for teacher selection (Pellicer et al., 1988). What was the exception for most schools in the nation in 1987 was the norm at School B during restructuring.

Also in the area of staff/personnel was the responsibility for substitute teachers. Between 1965 and 1987, the assistant principal's degree of responsibility for teacher substitutes moved up in rank from 26th to 18th place (Pellicer, et al., 1988). During this same time period, the degree of importance remained the same (22nd rank). In two schools, teacher assistants were responsible for daily scheduling of substitutes and an assistant principal simply served as needed in an supervisory role. Several assistants stated that this enabled them to use their time more effectively for other duties. The greatest change was a school that had totally removed this responsibility from assistant principals, giving the site-based management team full responsibility for substitute teachers. Through a faculty-led and faculty-coordinated

program, teachers were able to save money in the substitute teacher account and then use their savings for instructional purposes.

### School Management

I think they're responsible for making sure that everything in the building runs smoothly, from managing teachers to managing content to managing students. I view them as the people that make everything go smoothly. . . . Basically, I look at them as the guiding force in the school. (Teacher, #11)

That's very easy. They definitely assist the principal . . . . There is no way that one person could actually run this school. And I'm just totally impressed with what they're able to do. (Teacher, #13)

The viewpoint expressed by teachers that the assistant is the person actually in charge was consistent with the literature (Austin & Brown, 1970). Assistant principals were the ones who ran the buildings and provided support for the principal, according to teachers in all schools. Interestingly, although interview data and written documents revealed that assistant principals were assigned selected school management duties at all four sites, principals gave limited attention to specific duties in this area during interviews. References were made to management of the facilities, school buses, and graduation plans; however, these duties were "not as time consuming, more minor day-to-day things." A few of these duties had also been reassigned to non-administrative personnel.

Prior to discussing duties related to discipline and instructional leadership for various departments, two assistant principals said all duties were equally important because "first of all, you have to take care of those ongoing, routine things that keep the system working productively." In contrast to most of the principals, however, several assistant principals described specific management opportunities that

came about during restructuring. One had used his expertise in the area of school management to identify possible services to improve student performance. He explained,

I think you are aware that [our school] had a high failure rate. . . . In my Saturday detention I asked the kids to tell me why they were failing so many classes, and basically they were telling they weren't doing their homework because they needed extra help. I asked them why they didn't stay after to get extra help, and their response was that they didn't have transportation home. So that led me to request two buses for those kids who need transportation home and also get the extra help that they need. Those buses are packed. They stay after for help. (Assistant Principal, #6)

Each school had an assistant who was in charge of the building in the absence of the principal, but one in particular detailed his involvement in school management:

I conduct all faculty meetings, call them when they're necessary, handle budget. We do site-based budgeting, certainly in consultation with [the principal]. Any aspect of managing a school he has allowed me to do. . . . It's been an experience for us. At first we were afraid to let go of the money. We came up with a budget, we assigned it, we let the faculty council see it almost for a stamp of approval, not really for input. But this past year, the year past, we tried a little bit of site-based decision making. We had in excess of \$13,000, turned it over to a faculty council subcommittee and allowed them to solicit from the teachers items and needs and prioritize them, to select them, and they spent the money. We got the final approval and were real satisfied with what they did. (Assistant Principal, #4)

Although this assistant worked with the budget, three principals identified the budget as the area in which their assistants had little

or no involvement. Some assistants did supervise departmental budgets or handle grants, but more involvement was recommended. Teachers in one school were more involved with the site-based management budget than were the assistant principals.

In a national survey of assistant principals, five duties in the area of school management ranked among the top ten in degree of responsibility--school policies, special arrangements at the start and close of the school year, graduation activities, emergency arrangements, and building use (Pellicer et al., 1988). In 1991 Bricker reported no school management duties among the top ten in importance. Findings from the present study showed that teacher participants generally viewed the assistant principal as the person who ran the building and who handled assorted management functions; however, few details were provided during interviews. Principals and assistant principals similarly acknowledged the management function but placed greater emphasis on the areas of instruction and pupil personnel.

#### Community Relations

The literature is inconsistent in rating the area of community relations in terms of actual involvement and in perceived degree of importance. Austin and Brown (1970) and Pellicer et al. (1988) found community relations to be less important than discipline, school management, instruction, and staff/personnel. In contrast, according to Mississippi principals participating in Davidson's (1991/1992) study, assistant principals' involvement in community relations ranked second only to student discipline, and Bricker (1991) found that school public relations programs ranked first in degree of importance. Responsibilities for community relations were similarly mixed in the study schools. Several assistants had community relations duties, such as coordinating PTA meetings and preparing parent/community newsletters, but the principal assumed responsibility for the school newsletter at one school. At another school a faculty member produced school

newsletters, but assistant principals were very involved with parents and community organizations through working with the strategic plan, serving as liaison with youth-serving agencies, and facilitating parent/student organizations devoted to school improvement. Assistant principals interacted with appropriate community agencies and with students and parents on a day-to-day basis, as indicated by one principal:

Good assistants have the power of making the parents believe that they're the principals. I've had kids who say, "Oh you're the big principal, aren't you?" And I say, "Yes, I am," and they say, "Well, my principal is. . . ." And they like that identity, and good assistant principals do that. They create in kids a confidence and in parents a confidence that they're going to make the right decisions or do the right things. (Principal, School A)

Two changes in the area of community relations were noteworthy. The principal, assistant principals, and teachers described one assistant who had a vital role working with the community. She was the only assistant who identified community relations as a primary duty, along with discipline and instruction. In addition to working with the school neighborhood's citizen advisory group, three years ago she had contacted the homes of more than 300 students who were academically deficient or who had discipline records. Under her leadership parents became involved with the school and formed "a partnership so that working with them we could figure out what we could do to help their children be better students, and we tried to figure out what we could do to help parents better connect or reconnect with their own children." The goals were "to bring in whatever it takes for their children to improve their grades [and] to do whatever it takes for their children to exhibit behavior where they will not get referrals any more." Eventually, the students were also invited to join this group, which met weekly. A goal for the students was to join at least two school

organizations and/or play a sport. This assistant was instrumental in establishing a network of positive relationships with community businesses and agencies that served as resources for school programs.

Perhaps the most surprising change in community relations was a significant shift in duties from assistant principals to a student activities coordinator. One school specifically created the coordinator's position during restructuring. In contrast to the assistant principals, whose time was devoted to pupil personnel and curriculum and instruction, the coordinator had been able to increase contacts with the community, involve volunteers in supporting the school, and coordinate community service projects for students.

#### Student Activities

Interview data from the principals at all four sites indicated that student activities (e.g., assemblies, school clubs, school dances, athletics) appeared to be the least important area in comparison with the other responsibilities. Much of the research on the role of the assistant principal likewise ranked the area of student activities as less important than duties in other areas (Austin & Brown, 1970; Bricker, 1991; Davidson, 1991/1992). In spite of the low rank, in some traditional settings assistants have been devoted almost entirely to athletics and student activities while others have squeezed in these duties as time permitted (Black, 1980; Potter, 1980; Reed & Himmler, 1985). In an urban high school with approximately 1900 students, Reed and Connors (1982) described a typical assistant who oversaw clubs, student government, and assemblies; maintained the school activity calendar in his office; and personally considered all requests for student activities.

Only one school remained traditional in assigning assistant principals to coordinate club activities, athletic events, school dances, and extracurricular programs. An explanation for administrators' and teachers' limited references to the role of the assistant principal

in student activities was directly related to a shift in traditional duties at three schools. A student activities coordinator, not an assistant principal, assumed duties such as maintaining the school activity calendar; preparing activities budgets; supervising the use of the public address system, bulletin boards, and showcases; and scheduling school assembly programs. Other than attending school functions in an administrative capacity, assistant principals had minimal involvement. Pellicer et al. (1988) suggested that an increased role in curriculum and instruction necessitated a "somewhat reduced role" (p. 44) in student activities. The data revealed that the changes in the role of the assistant principal in school activities were a direct result of restructuring in one school, which had created the coordinator's position to allow assistant principals to become more involved in instruction and to increase student involvement in school activities.

The review of the literature revealed that the duties of the assistant principal have been divided into six categories: pupil personnel (student services), school management, staff/personnel, curriculum and instruction, student activities, and community relations (Austin & Brown, 1970; Bricker, 1991; Davidson, 1991/1992; Norton & Kriekard, 1987; Patton, 1987; Pellicer & Stevenson, 1991; Pellicer et al., 1988). Traditionally the primary duties have been associated with pupil personnel, especially student discipline and attendance, and other noninstructional activities (Calabrese & Adams, 1987; Glanz, 1994; Pfeffer, 1955; Reed & Himmler, 1985). In a national survey Pellicer et al. (1988) categorized 30 duties in six areas and compared the role of the assistant principal in 1987 with the role in 1965. Assistant principals rated their administrative duties for degree of responsibility in 1965 and 1987. Most notable was the shift in "evaluation of teachers" from 23rd in 1965 to 3rd in 1987. "Teacher selection," "graduation activities," "instructional methods," "staff

inservice," and "teacher incentives/motivation" did not meet the criteria for inclusion in the 1965 survey but ranked in the top 25 in 1987. "School-related building use" ranked 8th in 1987, in contrast to 24th in 1965.

Data in the present study showed that principals, assistant principals, and teachers agreed that assistant principals had varying degrees of responsibility in the six categories. Consistent with Pellicer et al. (1988), the primary duties and responsibilities of assistant principals were in the categories of pupil personnel (student services), school management, and curriculum and instruction. Although assistants in 1988 ranked assemblies (student activities) in the top ten, assistant principals in the present study focused on curriculum and instruction (teacher evaluations, master schedule, instructional methods, and staff development), pupil personnel (primarily discipline), and school management (school policies, daily operations). At School D, assistant principals still attended athletic and other extracurricular events but had relinquished almost all of their responsibilities for student activities to a coordinator.

#### Degree of Importance

After describing the duties and responsibilities of the assistant principal, interviewees were asked to identify the area of greatest (most important) responsibility. Three principals gave similar responses. One divided the duties as scheduling and special education, discipline and safety, and instruction and professional development. Another specified discipline, instruction, and scheduling but stressed "that where one may be doing one thing this year, next year they may be doing something else, because that's the only way they grow, to me, is to be able to do different things." The third principal stated that for two of his four assistants, the greatest responsibility was instruction; for the other two, discipline and then instruction. Responding in a somewhat different way, the fourth principal said, "Running the school

on the day-to-day operation, the minutiae of the school--just grinding it out with kids, and questions, and parents. That's their greatest responsibility, making it work on a daily basis and running the systems."

In response to the same question, assistant principals prioritized instruction and discipline first and second, respectively, but some variations existed in the explanations. "Is it too simple to say, 'Instruction'?" asked an assistant from School A. He reaffirmed his answer when asked about the use of his time by saying, "Everything that entails. Still instruction." Although their primary emphasis was instruction, two assistants also expressed the importance and time requirements of specific duties with special education. Another respondent said his first concern was "being sure the kids are being taught what they need to learn," but he acknowledged that his time was often spent maintaining high visibility in areas such as hallways, cafeteria areas, and other non-classroom areas. This practice, known as *touring* (Mitchell, 1987/1988; Scott, 1989/1990) or *monitoring* (Reed & Himmeler, 1985), was reported by assistant principals at each site and in the literature.

Four assistants, two of whom had supervisory roles in discipline, spent most of their time with discipline. One remarked that she could have more of an impact on making a difference by dealing with students and their behaviors, noting that other things were sometimes beyond her control. Assistants viewed their disciplinary roles as vital to the functioning of the school, as indicated in the following words:

I think the climate of the school depends a great deal on how discipline is handled. Teachers come in and they expect that something is going to happen, and if it doesn't happen, of course they become very despondent and frustrated. And as a result, something along the way might suffer in terms of instruction. So I think discipline and safety and security play a tremendous part in

the livelihood of the school, and if you take away the discipline department, then you, for the most part, you might as well close that school. I mean that's how critical it is, and a lot of people don't understand that. . . . In my estimation, it is totally critical to have a discipline department that's involved in trying to ensure safety of the students as well as teachers and any member of the staff. (Assistant Principal, #11)

Two assistants from different schools found all duties to be equally important. One commented, "You can't classify it that way, because all of it's demanding and you can't let any of it slip." Another agreed that the greatest responsibility depended upon what was happening with respect to the school and upon her responsibilities at the moment, since duties were rotated. She concluded with a definite statement that "whatever seems to impact the most on the kids is my greatest responsibility."

Reed and Himmler (1985) reported that secondary assistant principals establish and maintain organizational stability. Whether they are touring the building, disciplining students, or monitoring classroom instruction, these individuals contribute to the smooth functioning of the school. Some assistants did indeed have significant responsibilities in running their schools:

Ultimately [the principal] is responsible for running the building but the bottom line is that I'm responsible for what goes on in the building. He is there to back me up. He's given me free rein to have those experiences. He's not walking away from responsibility; he's making an effort to give me the opportunities. So I would say management--to anticipate, to foresee, to remedy problems, and they all come to me, and when I can't resolve them, I get with him.

When I look at management it includes everything, and that includes instruction, but instruction is a big priority. I would

say my primary function here in the building is instruction but also management of this building to see that it runs day to day. I'm not talking about the maintenance of the building or anything else, but anticipating, knowing when things need to be addressed. I keep my finger on the pulse. (Assistant Principal, #4)

Assistant principals were asked to identify their most meaningful or worthwhile duties. They focused on tasks related to working with students and teachers, managing instruction, and broadening their own experiences (see Table 2). In 1980 Black found that more than 60% of the assistant principals enjoyed working with teachers and departments to improve and modify the instructional program, but none of the assistants whose greatest involvement was in pupil personnel found that area to be most meaningful. A contrast between Black's findings and the present study was that some assistant principals whose greatest involvement was in discipline reported that working with students was quite meaningful. Only two interviewees were reluctant to identify an area as most meaningful, stating that all duties were vital to the functioning of the school.

Table 2

Most Meaningful or Worthwhile Responsibilities As Reported by Assistant Principals

Category of Responsibilities	Illustrations
Working with students and teachers	"When you go through a day or a week and don't have any problems, you've done a good job. Getting out and interacting with students and teachers." (AP, School B)
	"Maybe, that's hard to say, but I think it would be interaction with kids--the kids that come in and have a problem. It could be anything from not getting along with somebody or whatever it might be, and to be able to get them over that, to solve it or whatnot, is pretty satisfying. Of course, it doesn't happen every time. . . . Because I like kids; I enjoy working with them." (AP, School D)
	"Working with the children . . . and I don't mean just doing discipline." (AP, School B)
	"Dealing with students, for the same reasons mentioned earlier. Opportunities to deal with them not just through discipline but during some supervisory duties before and after school and cafeteria duty." (AP, School A)
	"I think the discipline is. Maybe it's because I've been in it for so long but I think that we do a lot, especially here. We have a real good team, and I think we do a lot to help the kids." (AP, School C)
Broadening experiences	"Learning the responsibilities of the building principal and it's not one step at a time. [The principal] has stepped back and said, 'You can run my building.'" (AP, School B)

(table continues)

Category of Responsibilities	Illustrations
Managing instruction	<p data-bbox="639 406 1284 613">"I would rather work with stuff that we're beginning to implement, like the learning styles and work on some of the assessment areas. I would rather do that. I mean, if you're talking about what I like personally. The new initiatives. . . . I think that generally tends to be something that's gonna help the kids." (AP, School C)</p> <p data-bbox="639 642 1270 770">"Basically, my job then was class observations, curriculum development, and all of that. And that was quite meaningful. In the instructional area, you have time to prepare for those things." (AP, School D)</p> <p data-bbox="639 799 1284 1028">"Instruction is always to me where I'm at. I got in here wanting to be a teacher; I didn't get in the profession to be an administrator. I enjoy teaching kids. If I could afford it, I'd be right out there as a teacher, but unfortunately in the teaching profession they don't pay enough for a person to be able to afford that." (AP, School A)</p> <p data-bbox="639 1057 1284 1340">"Probably the master schedule. I think the master schedule is the culmination, a bringing together. I think there can be a certain amount of creativity in the master schedule, a certain amount of tedium too, but I guess I would say creating the master schedule with all of the parts and fragments and making it into something that's workable and functional and good. And the master schedule is a significant part of the plan in our school." (AP, School D)</p>
All duties	<p data-bbox="639 1389 1284 1568">"I think all of them are important. If they weren't, the principal wouldn't have put them down. There are many that I have, and I guess it depends on the outcome. Some things may be small and insignificant and they might have a lasting outcome." (AP, School D)</p> <p data-bbox="639 1596 1284 1769">"They all have to be done. You can't half do any of them. You can't half issue a key, or half evaluate a teacher or half discipline a student. You've got to do all of it and it all deals with the operation of the school. The school has got to operate." (AP, School A)</p>

Almost without exception, teachers identified instruction and discipline as the most important areas of responsibility. Specific responses were as follows: discipline ( $\bar{n} = 2$ ), instruction ( $\bar{n} = 6$ ), discipline followed closely by instruction ( $\bar{n} = 2$ ), instruction and discipline equally ( $\bar{n} = 3$ ), discipline at present but instruction as the desired goal ( $\bar{n} = 3$ ), and other ( $\bar{n} = 2$ ). Teachers more frequently mentioned discipline during the interviews than did the administrators. A teacher from School B echoed an assistant principal from School D on the importance of student discipline:

Yes, and I think that's important because if the discipline is bad, everything is bad. And we have kids who--many of our kids don't come from particularly disciplined homes, and they look for it here. And it makes a difference in the learning environment, in the safety factor, and every factor of the school is affected by discipline. (Teacher, #7)

Many teachers acknowledged the time devoted to discipline, but some recommended greater input in academic leadership and a more direct impact on teaching. This supported past literature on the assistant principalship (Austin & Brown, 1970; Brottman, 1981; Coppedge, 1968; Greenfield, 1985a; Hess, 1985; Jarrett, 1958; Kelly, 1987; Smith, 1987). In the words of a department chairperson, "I think it should be academic, educational leadership. I really think that's where the assistant principal should be. It should be a splitting of the principal in that sense."

The data indicated that assistant principals were involved in almost every aspect of the school. Tasks not handled by one assistant were sometimes handled by another assistant. In 1990 Hunter suggested that assistant principals needed to assume "their rightful place as instructional leaders" (p. 4; see also Lacey, 1992). In the present study principals and assistants viewed curriculum and instruction as the assistant principal's area of greatest importance; teachers viewed

curriculum and instruction and pupil personnel (discipline) as equally important. A somewhat surprising finding was that administrators and teachers in schools that were restructuring prioritized curriculum and instruction first, followed by pupil personnel, thus reversing the rankings reported by Pellicer et al. (1988). These findings were also contrary to Patton's (1987) study in which assistant principals in Virginia ranked pupil personnel (student services) as most important.

#### **Effects of Restructuring on the Assistant Principalship**

The review of the literature on school restructuring indicated that restructuring is altering the roles of educators at many levels, from superintendents to principals to classroom teachers (Cawelti, 1994; David, 1990; Lewis, 1989; Murphy, 1991; Murphy, Evertson, & Radnofsky, 1991; Murphy & Louis, 1994; Newmann, 1991b; O'Neil, 1990). Just as various themes and patterns were identified in previous studies on the superintendents, principals, and teachers, the present study identified emerging themes. Data analysis yielded six broad themes: effects on responsibilities, relationships within the school and community, processes for decision making, obligations for leadership, role of support, and distribution of power.

#### **Effects on Responsibilities**

I think there was a time when the assistant principals basically were kind of in a trap. If you were the disciplinarian, you were the disciplinarian. If you were the scheduler, you were the scheduler--year-in and year-out. And my philosophy is that they need to be rotated around to learn all the different facets of being a principal. (Principal, School C)

Well, without a doubt they're multifaceted now. They were more narrowly prescribed then, but I think even though (pause) . . . . I would just say that with school-based management there is more responsibility of a diverse nature whereas opposed to the

traditional management, there were more secluded areas of responsibility. That's basically it. (Principal, School B)

Our responsibilities are humongous, but because of how fast the school is moving, we have to be well-versed in all areas and beyond. (Principal, School D)

In the first book to focus on the position of assistant principal, Marshall (1992) examined the roles, problems, and opportunities associated with the assistant principalship. In searching for ways to improve the position, Marshall suggested rotating areas of responsibility among assistant principals. As suggested by Marshall and in contrast to traditional schools in which assistants were often kept in the same role, the data indicated a movement toward job rotation. There was a consensus among principals that the assistant principalship in schools that are restructuring should be characterized by diversity of responsibility.

A reason for this diversity was termed the "ripple effect" by an assistant principal: "The principal's role has changed. He can do more. I think that ripple effect will filter right on throughout. I think the assistant principal's role [has] changed because principals are more enlightened and can do more." Although two assistants noted their good fortune in having roles that were not narrowly defined when they served in previous schools, another commented that "when . . . the principal had his hands tied up, the assistant principal had his hands tied." He continued, "The principal's role has changed. . . . And I don't think in the past the principal was seen as the academic leader--the instructional leader--and now that role has changed tremendously. In order for him to fulfill his role then we have to do ours, and that puts a big burden on us." The expansion of the principals' workload has been documented (Murphy, 1991; Murphy & Louis, 1994), and Hallinger, Murphy, and Hausman (1992) have reported that principals project an increase in

the delegation of their responsibilities. Like the principals, superintendents in districts that were restructuring reported some of the burdens associated with their changing roles (Murphy, 1994). The data from the present study supported Clemons' (1989) assertion that as more responsibility is "placed in the hands of principals, more responsibility must necessarily be placed with assistant principals" (p. 33).

Several teachers also recognized the ripple effect from the principal's changing role. Areas of responsibility seemed to be specialized at School D, duties were rotated to different assistants at School C, and responsibilities were described as "more integrated" at School A. A teacher at School B said the principal was "smart" to depend very heavily on the assistant principals, bounce ideas off of them, and listen to them because they were "good people."

Along with diversity, restructuring brought about an increase in the number of responsibilities. Murphy (1991) cautioned that duties could not "simply be added to the already heavy load carried by school personnel" (p. 90). In a study on the impact of shared decision making on assistant principals, Sherman (1991/1992) reported that 45% experienced an increased workload, while 40% experienced no change in workload. On the contrary, although some duties had been shifted to others, the data for the present study indicated that assistant principals were still "working harder than they ever have before," "responsible for more things than they used to be responsible for," "overwhelmed," "doing more," "a whole lot more," "a great deal of work--period." Teachers at one school unanimously agreed the assistant principals' workload had increased, but some teachers suggested that site-based management had allowed teachers or teacher assistants to handle tasks (such as teacher substitutes and student attendance) that, in turn, might have alleviated some responsibilities for assistant principals. For instance, administrators and teachers at one school

reported that restructuring had enabled the creation of a position for a coordinator of student activities, thus removing that responsibility from the assistant principals.

At the same time that some traditional duties were reassigned to non-administrative personnel, other duties increased in depth and complexity for some assistants. At two schools, for example, approaches such as block scheduling and alternative forms of assessment placed greater demands on the assistants. In spite of the added obligations, these individuals seemed to thrive on such challenges:

The schedule. The schedule is very, very complex. We're doing clusters of students . . . , and we're doing the block schedule . . . , and we also co-teach, and so those are three things that make the schedule complex. Maybe that's why I like it; that's part of why I like it. It's complex--bringing everything together in making something that's worthwhile and makes sense.

(Assistant Principal, #12)

At least 75% of the assistant principals ( $n = 12$ ) emphasized the increased demand to be knowledgeable of current research and successful practices in education. These administrators were gathering quantitative and qualitative data to assess new programs, making decisions "based upon research and the thoughtfulness of, What is it we want to work better here? What kind of outcomes are we looking for?", working with teachers who were committed to using innovative instructional techniques (some of whom "have published in those areas"), and supporting teachers who were using alternative types of assessment. One teacher said she relied on assistants more than she used to for input into different things the department wanted to do. The principal of School D summarized this concept by stating that assistant principals had to be "a staff of readers just like the teachers have to be a faculty of readers," to be aware of trends and issues, to attend conferences, and "to be able to think about the school and their responsibilities and where they fit in

in a different way as an administrator. . . ." Teachers agreed that assistant principals, along with faculty, were responsible for promoting the restructuring process and were expected to be knowledgeable of current research and practices. If there were those who were not knowledgeable, they needed to remedy the situation.

Only 3 of the 12 assistant principals saw little or no change in their responsibilities. They explained that their present duties were similar to past duties, with one noting that the only difference was "that the teachers have more authority in terms of changing policies in the building itself." Two of these administrators were colleagues in the same school, a school where a number of administrative changes had recently occurred and whose principal had stated:

I don't think the role of the assistant principal has caught up with the point of where we are in restructuring. If we're only 10% there, I'm not sure the assistant principals are more than 5% there because everything is muddled right now, and assistant principals really work hard on systems for me and bring recommendations to me and collaboratively work with teachers.

A greater percentage (50%) of the teachers said that they had seen little or no change in the kinds of duties performed by the assistant principals. It is important to note that (1) four of these teachers were from the school least advanced in restructuring, and (2) four of the remaining teachers subsequently described an increase in overall responsibilities and/or a heightened focus on instructional duties.

In spite of their obvious support for restructuring initiatives, some assistants from schools more advanced in their restructuring efforts acknowledged the struggles in keeping up with the changes. Similar struggles were reported by superintendents in school divisions that were restructuring (Murphy, 1994). An assistant from School D commented, "In terms of the role change, [we're] trying to keep in touch with everything that's going on and that can be tough." Another

remarked, "One of the things that we're going through now is that one would assume as new structures come into place, they will assume the responsibility and authority of old ones. And we're just feeling them out." Teachers described restructuring as "a difficult process for everybody because it involves so much change" and said the teachers sometimes forgot that administrators were as overwhelmed as they were.

As indicated, assistant principals still had varying levels of responsibility in areas such as pupil personnel, curriculum and instruction, staff/personnel, student activities, community relations, and school management. During restructuring the duties of many assistants had increased in the area of instruction, and the duties of some had decreased in the area of student activities. Besides the shifts in categories of responsibility, the greatest effects of restructuring on specific responsibilities appeared to be in the diversity, scope, and complexity of the duties.

#### Relationships with School and Community

I think relationships have to change. . . . Restructuring is change, and it's really just a shot in the arm. This is all about change. The change process itself takes a lot of time. And what we've found is that it is the relationships, it's the human relationships in the schoolhouse that make the difference. It's not the programs; it's not the money. I mean you could give me \$100,000 and I could buy some wonderful computers and software, but we might make no gain from that \$100,000 investment. And again, if you take time and energy and work with the relationships, we believe that's where the quality changes take place. (Principal, School D)

Relationships appeared to be at the core of restructuring in all four schools. Some assistant principals mentioned improved relationships with students, but most of the attention focused on relationships with teachers. With the exception of one assistant who reported that

relationships were as cooperative as they had always been, most administrators described a more collegial atmosphere in which "we" and "they" no longer existed:

Sure, it's a big difference, and the difference is now that we're working as a team. Everybody has a piece of the pie. In the past the administrators had their piece--or all of the pie--and the teachers worked for the administrators. But now there's a team approach. So it's very hard to tell a teacher, "No." We try to do everything we can to find ways that we won't have to say, "No."  
(Assistant Principal, #6)

You see, I don't see any difference between [the principal's] relationship with us and our being his team and my relationship with teachers at all. I don't see him as my boss; I don't think they see me as their boss. . . . [At another school] oh, there was a line, there was a line. Faculty council, I see a much closer, tighter relationship with teachers. I'll tell you the difference. When something big comes up, I see us bonding together. That makes us stronger and makes whatever obstacle it is surmountable. That's what I see. (Assistant Principal, #5)

I think it [restructuring] puts them closer to the teachers. I don't think there's the delineation that there used to be that, "I'm the assistant principal." Now we're working *together*. Working together--even though I'm working at this job, we're trying to get the same things done, so it's more of a communal aspect there.  
(Principal, School B)

Sixty-one percent of the teachers also referred to closer relationships with assistant principals. Several assistant principals and teachers described collaborative efforts to develop and implement consistent discipline policies. As Hunter (1990) suggested, such efforts

regarding school discipline not only created a setting in which students and teachers understood what behavior was expected but also created "a more cohesive, collegial staff" (p. 4). Although 2 of the 18 teachers were unsure of whether the more positive relationships should be attributed to the personalities of some new administrators, to restructuring, or to both, the consensus of teachers from the four schools was that there was more give and take, more of a cooperative effort, and "more 'we' and less 'I.'" A teacher remarked, "When you go through tremendous change, the people that are there when you go through it, you have a tremendous bond with them in the end."

The findings on relationships between assistant principals and teachers strongly supported findings in previous studies. "All we're about is relationships," said a principal. In an examination of the evolving role of the principal in schools that were restructuring, Murphy and Louis (1994) described the principal as an key player in developing a network of relationships. The present study suggested that assistant principals also have a role in cultivating positive relationships within the school setting. In a study designed to determine "what makes for successful reform in urban high schools," Louis and Miles (1990) found that administrators and teachers at the successful sites had established open and collaborative relationships in contrast to "we-they" situations. Although Louis and Miles did not specifically examine the assistant principalship, their theme of removing the dividing lines between administrators and teachers emerged in the data from the present study. Just as principals were moving closer to the staff (Murphy, 1991), assistant principals and teachers were developing closer relationships.

One of the five components of high school restructuring identified in Cawelti's (1994) national study was community outreach (see also Conley, 1992). Besides the improved relationships with teachers, improved or expanded relationships with the school community existed at

two schools. Through an assistant principal, one school had consciously fostered positive interactions between parents and the school and developed new partnerships with community organizations/agencies. Administrators and teachers acknowledged the benefits of this effort. Rather than employing traditional practices of getting rid of "the troublemaker" who always complained about the school, the new policy was to "bring them in and get them involved." There was also a higher level of interaction between assistant principals and community members. In the past, one assistant recalled, "We didn't think about the pulling together process, and in the pulling together process, it's not the school that has to tell the community what to do. It's a collaborative effort and we decide as a group who has the best experience, the best facility, the best time [and] input, the money to make it happen. It has become a collaborative effort." In contrast to this school, which relied upon an assistant principal to strengthen community relations, the other school had increased community involvement, e.g., adult volunteer programs and community service projects for students, through a full-time coordinator.

Although references to relationships in the schools and their communities were frequent, less frequent were references to the central office. Perhaps this was true because each school was restructuring to meet the needs of its own students. When specifically asked about the role of the central office, one assistant reported limited support because of frequent personnel changes, one reported limited change since she had always called whenever she needed assistance, and three reported a much more facilitative role. Another stated, "Our input in central office is far more important now." After explaining that assistant principals had recently developed their own evaluation instrument, which had been adopted citywide, he continued, "Our roles are more important in defining through central office what we can do, . . . things you

never would have done before." No consistent patterns emerged in the data relative to the central office.

In the schools more advanced in restructuring, the collaborative nature of the relationships between assistant principals and teachers was much more apparent. Although participants did not entirely agree on the degree to which relationships had changed, they were quite consistent in the assertion that the processes for decision making had affected the assistant principalship.

#### Processes for Decision Making

The topic of decision making was central to discussions about the changing role of the assistant principal. Three sub-themes emerged in the data: (1) who was involved in decision making, (2) how much time was required for decision making, and (3) why others were involved in decision making.

The participants. The trend toward broad-based input in decision making is well documented in the literature on school restructuring (Conley, 1992; Murphy, 1994). Shared school governance, defined as "a mechanism such as a school council which . . . provides for involvement of teachers and parents in planning and decision making," was reported to be in general use by 45% of the respondents in a national study of high school restructuring (Cawelti, 1994). In contrast to most traditional models for school governance, the schools in this study had also adopted shared decision making. Each structure was designed to provide for greater involvement of teachers, parents, and the community in decision making, although implemented in different ways.

While input from parents and the community was said to be important, data from all schools indicated that the assistant principalship was more strongly affected by teacher participation in decision making. Murphy's (1994) study on "reshaping the principalship" noted that principals were becoming equal participants in decision making instead of sole decision makers. This change was also relevant to

assistant principals in the present study. In many cases, decisions were no longer made without faculty input:

I notice the request for more involvement in the decision-making process. . . . And the administrators now realize that there are some people out there who will have a part in this thing, not every decision that we make, but some of the decisions. (Assistant Principal, #12)

It used to be a time when you met with the administrators and maybe the department heads and you had the instructional people, the key people. But now you've got to get feedback from teachers who aren't necessarily department chairmen, and you've got to bring everybody together. . . . (Assistant Principal, #11)

I really don't have anything to do with it [Tech Prep] on a daily basis so the decision making is in the hands of the teachers. That's another important reason why I think it's going to work. As long as teachers have the power and you empower the teacher to do this--what does that mean? Giving them the power to decide what they're going to do in their classrooms with their students. (Assistant Principal, #2)

In decision making, as I've said, I realize that there are a lot of people whose input is important to those decisions. . . . I don't make decisions in isolation any more. I know there are people who can better help me make those decisions or who can make those decisions for me. (Assistant Principal, #4)

One teacher said that prior to the initial implementation of site-based management, the principal or assistant principals made 99% of the decisions. Decisions made by the assistant principals usually had to be approved by the principal. After the implementation of site-based

management, "the biggies got brought to faculty council." Similarly, another principal had relinquished more decision-making authority to teachers and assistant principals over time, according to a veteran teacher. Teachers from three schools confirmed that assistant principals sought both formal and informal input from faculty on various issues, the most important of which was instruction. With a chuckle, one assistant succinctly stated that decision making was no longer from the top: "Well, I don't think they [decisions] are that autocratic unless it's gonna be like, 'The fire is here.' I really don't."

Along with increasing involvement in decision making came increasing expectations. Teachers were more involved in decision making, and they expected to be more involved. As reported in the literature, they influenced decisions once within the realm of administrators (Murphy, 1991). A faculty council member said she never really knew how assistant principals made decisions before, but the process was clearer now:

Probably we expect them to be accountable when we never dared expect that before. We expect explanations and reasons and details, and we get them. So that's good. It's a much more open relationship. There aren't any big secrets. At least if there are, we're [faculty council] not aware of them or we agree this should probably be a secret. We don't need to know everything.

(Teacher, #7)

Evidence of this growing expectation likewise surfaced in other interviews:

I'll give you an example perhaps. Three years ago, we might have received some statistics and we might need to develop some strategies. And it would be very easy to turn it over to [an assistant principal] and say, "You need to develop some strategies so we can share these with the teachers." That could no more happen at [School D] in 1995, and that's because we've grown so

fast and teachers expect to be involved. *Absolutely*, they expect to be involved. (Principal, School D)

Instead of making a decision . . . and saying, "That's the way it's going to be," they [assistant principals] now stop and think of what's involved, who are the people involved. . . . Maybe they'll do a survey; maybe they'll call a meeting. They'll ask for input because they really want it to be a decision that is comfortable for the majority of the people here in the school. (Teacher, #11)

The literature indicated that principals often delegated "authority with responsibility" but with some constraint, so assistants were in a "sharing role" (Pellicer & Stevenson, 1991). The principal of School C debated whether to attribute his increase in sharing to restructuring or personal adjustments: "I don't know if it's a part of restructuring or if it's just a part of me being a little more educated, but I certainly do seek input from my assistant principals when making decisions." Either way, the greatest difference between the literature and current practice was that "sharing role" meant sharing with teachers, too.

Assistant principals described teacher involvement as "one of the best things that's ever happened--absolutely," and agreed that all administrators were now "mindful of the important voices" in decision making. Most assistant principals and teachers found positive outcomes in increased faculty involvement in decision making, but a couple of assistants appeared to have an "it's happening, so we have to adjust to it" attitude. One assistant believed that restructuring had brought about few changes:

And it doesn't make any difference what you call the system, there has been, and I don't know how to say this any other way, but there has been no change other than the teachers have more voice.

And the teachers always in the schools I've been in and the systems I've been in, the teachers have always had an opportunity to express their opinions. That's not anything new from any where I've ever been. . . . There is little that is new in education ever except names. (Assistant Principal, #3)

Interestingly, teacher perceptions at a given site were consistent with those of their administrators. In other words, teachers whose assistants displayed positive attitudes toward shared decision making likewise described both their own and the assistants' roles in a positive way. Teachers whose assistants had the "we have to adjust" attitude were much more likely to report little or no change in some assistant principals' decision making.

Those who believed their decision making had not been influenced by teacher participation were the exception to the rule. Under former structures decisions often were made by the principal alone or in consultation with other administrators. Under the shared decision making model, administrators were investing the time and energy necessary to ensure involvement of others. A teacher and an assistant principal from different schools noted that involvement was necessary and expected, even if it appeared to take more time. There were probably times, the teacher stated, when "they would rather go ahead and make a decision. It's faster. They know what they need to do but feel like they should ask council, and sometimes we decide just what they were gonna do anyway." The assistant principal illustrated the same idea by telling an anecdote. Upon appointment to his position, he discovered that the school had no tardy policy so he met with the other assistant principals to develop a policy. Instead of being thanked for his efforts, he "got in trouble" because he was unaware that the school-based management team needed to be involved. To address the teachers' displeasure at being left out, he convened the appropriate teachers to devise a policy. He concluded, "And it ended up being basically the same thing that we had

gone on and done to start with, but they were more pleased that we went through them than just making it and not consulting them."

The time. A principal expressed hope that the assistant principals would say they needed to include others in the decision making process in spite of the required time commitments. In contrast to superintendents who expressed frustrations with the time commitments essential to shared decision making (Murphy, 1994), few assistant principals emphasized frustrations relative to time required for this process. In fact, many believed the time invested in shared decision making was not wasted:

You are charged with finding a direction, but you're also charged with listening to what other people say. And they might have a better idea than you about something--completely different--and you're open enough to listen to it and explore it or let them explore it or get other people to help explore it, and not feel threatened by it. Yes, I think it takes longer, but in the long run it proves more effective. (Assistant Principal, #5)

But you know, I'm not sure that in the long run it does [take more time]. You think about it in teaching. You keep talking to teachers about--you know, they want to teach one way--maybe to do lecture, and I'll tell them [another way] to do it and they say, "Oh, I can do it so much faster." And my point to them is, "O.K., well, did all the kids get it? And how much did you have to go back for remediation? So how much did you put on the topic? You put a certain amount of time, this total amount of time on it. Suppose you'd done it differently. You might not have gone back and retaught it. . . . " Well, it's the same sort of thing with the decision making. And I just have to always remember, you don't have to go back and redo it. (Assistant Principal, #8)

For teachers, the "slower process" of shared decision making often led to better solutions because people were more supportive of decisions in which "they had some say." The faculty council at one school had frequently identified solutions the assistant principals had not thought of "because they are removed from the classroom and the kids to a certain degree, and frequently we come up with solutions that are better than the idea that they had. And they realize that, and I think they appreciate that." For many decisions, the "efficiency goal" had given way to the "quality goal" (Brottman, 1981, p. 12).

The rationale. Besides discussing who was involved and how much time was required for decision making, interviewees explained why involvement was important. The data provided a threefold rationale for supporting shared decision making: (1) doing things right the first time, (2) finding opportunities to experiment with new ideas or to do things differently, and (3) enjoying the benefits of ownership.

An atmosphere conducive to experimentation was vital. Teachers at two schools in particular lauded their administrators for fostering an environment that encouraged risk-taking. One teacher said that encouraging faculty to take risks "has been a real strong point of the restructuring process. I've no longer felt afraid in my classroom to do something that may not work, even if somebody's in my room observing me." Another said he had taken many risks in trying new and unique ways of teaching and assessing students, and he had felt encouraged to do so. Similarly, an assistant principal noted that as the "bottom up" policy broadened, it "created a sense of renewal in that we don't have to do things the way we did it last year. We don't have to function in the box. Let's try it. Let's be a risk taker." Consistent with previous findings that "readiness entails a commitment to take risks" (Murphy, 1991), the data indicated that schools which were more advanced in restructuring inspired staff experimentation. An important finding was that assistant principals have a critical role in teacher observations

and evaluations; therefore, their attitudes toward risk-taking and experimentation were equally as important as the principals' attitudes.

In addition to an environment conducive to risk-taking, over and over assistant principals and teachers reiterated the values of ownership--that if people buy into an idea or program, they are more likely to support its implementation:

As far as the value to them [teachers], I think it's necessary that they feel ownership in policies that we establish here and that they're a part of making policy instead of having it rammed down their throats. (Assistant Principal, #9)

Well, you know this business of change and climate, that teachers feel good about the fact that they have a certain amount of power, that they buy into a situation so therefore they may do a better job at what they're doing . . . When you think of changing curriculum, how would everybody buy into it? So . . . we feel that if people buy into a situation, they're going to do a better job. And I think that has happened. (Assistant Principal, #11)

But everybody wants to have some knowledge about what's going on and some say-so. I mean they don't want to be just buffeted about with somebody else's set of decisions, so I happen to believe in that. (Assistant Principal, #8)

You don't do this on every little thing, but there are certain things that you want to get their feelings and input on because as I said, if they don't buy into it, it's not going to work. (Principal, School C)

They [assistant principals] need to be sold on the program, just like the principal does, because it's really obvious if they're

not. And if they're not sold on the program but just doing their job, it's real easy for the teachers to pick up on that. (Teacher, #16)

From Louis and Miles' (1990) study on improvement in urban high schools to Meyers' (1995) analysis of the changing role of the principal in restructured schools, the need for ownership was emphasized. According to the data, having ownership and being valued were just as important for assistant principals as for teachers. One assistant described a past situation in which information flowed to "his teachers, custodians, and cafeteria workers, and then maybe his assistant principals would hear about it. We were devalued." Reflecting on a similar experience in a different setting, another assistant said, "I did what I was told. I was like a little automaton." When the school began restructuring under different leadership and the situation changed, so did his enthusiasm:

I'm more apt to be interested in the decisions I make. Where before I didn't see them effecting change in the building, I know now that just about everything I do can have a positive change, so it makes you think about what you're doing. (Assistant Principal, #4)

In 1981 Brottman reported that "too often" (p. 5) the assistant principal was given specific duties while the principal made the final decisions. In contrast to the decades when "high schools tended to be much more autocratically managed" (Cawelti, 1994, p. 66), the schools that were restructuring exemplified shared decision making and collaboration. Two frustrations identified by school superintendents in Murphy's (1994) study were (1) having to support inappropriate decisions made by "empowered" groups and (2) relinquishing decision making power while maintaining accountability for the results. Similar concerns have been identified by principals (Murphy & Louis, 1994). Such concerns either were minimal or were not expressed by the assistant principals in

this study. A teacher suggested that site-based management and shared decision making meant that either everyone succeeded together or everyone failed together.

### Obligations for Leadership

Because the staff is looking for us to lead. Even though we empower teachers, at any time we might have a staff member who has a particular interest or is working on a new strategy, and they come to the administrator and say, "What do you think about this?" And we need to support 125 teachers with all of these creative ideas, and so we have to be prepared. And it's a pretty challenging job, and the research says that administrators in a building are important, but when you're restructuring, the staff more than ever looks to the administrators because you're forging new ground and new territory. (Principal, School D)

In the landmark study of the assistant principalship, Austin and Brown's (1970) postscript stated that "the function of building-level school administration is to provide instructional leadership" (p. 83). While principals historically have been the school leaders, high school principals can no longer lead by themselves (Gorton, 1987). The literature suggested that the concept of leadership is indeed changing in schools that are restructuring (Clemons, 1989; Meyers, 1995; Murphy, 1991; Murphy & Louis, 1994; Schlechty, 1990). Two key concepts emerged during data analysis: (1) sharing leadership with others, and (2) fostering leadership in others.

In *Improving the Urban High School: What Works and Why*, Louis and Miles (1990) emphasized the leader's role in the dynamic process of "visioning" (p. 237). A key point was that "followers are not 'sold' on vision, but know they have helped to create it" (p. 237). The importance of vision and stability in leadership was particularly apparent at one school. According to administrators and teachers, the school had made less progress in its restructuring efforts because of recent changes in

the administration. The school's initial efforts were interrupted because the rudiments of change had been established under the direction of a different principal, and changes in several members of the administrative staff meant that everyone--administrators, teachers, parents, community--had to experience another orientation period before progress could be made. A teacher described the interruption: "They had a lot of things on the table that didn't get done because not only did the principal leave that year but the assistant principals left as well." She noted that the staff had begun some positive changes and continued, "That's probably where we'll end up again." This school's experience reinforced the concept that a shared vision must be in place before real restructuring can occur.

Administrators and teachers in schools that had progressed further in their restructuring efforts attributed much of their success to the principals' belief in shared leadership. This was consistent with Richardson and Flanigan's (1991) contention that "the principal is not the only person who must exercise a leadership role in the school" (p. 6; see also Wilson & Corcoran, 1988). In contrast to Lacey's (1992) finding that the term *leadership* is rarely applied to the assistant principalship and "thus understood as a quality not to be found in the position," assistant principals talked about being asked for their input; being given the opportunity to initiate, implement, and manage changes in programs; informing the principal as needed rather than getting permission; and having their ideas valued. Teachers also expressed these ideas, confirming that assistant principals were able to make decisions "on their own." In many ways the assistants felt equal to the principals:

And it might just be working for [this principal]--that as an assistant principal you don't feel as an assistant. You feel as though you are a principal because of the way he operates and he makes you operate. Your decision is the final decision unless it's

appealed, and it's not a personal thing. . . . And more than likely, he's going to support you. So I think that has changed tremendously, because a lot of times assistant principals just couldn't make a decision without a principal's okay. (Assistant Principal, #6)

The data left little doubt that principals had a vital role in school restructuring. Rather than adhering to traditional authoritarian leadership, these principals not only said they believed in sharing leadership with their assistant principals but also demonstrated that belief. An obligation of leadership from top administrators was to form a "leadership partnership" (NASSP's Council, 1991, p. 6) through which they could model collaborative leadership. The principals in this study were not guilty of "the one-person concept of leadership" (Gorton, 1987); rather, they shared leadership with assistant principals, who had the skills to contribute significantly to school programs.

The obligations for leadership went beyond sharing leadership with others. Another concept that emerged was the "leader of leaders." Since the literature presented the view of the assistant principalship as a training ground for principals (Black, 1980; Fulton, 1987; Howley, 1985; Smith, 1987), it was not surprising for principals to say they had to be willing to say good things about assistant principals, realizing that they might lose them to the principalship. The principal of School C said that principals should be mentors, and continued: "I think one of the worst things that can happen is if someone is satisfied with being an assistant principal. Now if you're satisfied, I'm not saying that you won't work as hard, but I'm not sure how strong you are. I think it's good if people are striving." One of his assistants believed it was critical for the principal to ensure diversity in experiences: "I mean, how else could you ever be able to be a principal if you'd never done more than this piece or this piece or this piece? And how would you ever know how to slide it together?" Several assistant principals from

School B expressed gratitude for the same mentorship from their principal, as illustrated in the following:

Yea, it's definitely a team in this case. . . . He is my mentor and is unafraid to relinquish his responsibility. I think that most people in his position would be afraid . . . . but he's doing it so that I can learn the things I need to learn. He is my advocate. . . . And I think it's harder to do what he's doing, to sit back and let someone learn to row than to do it yourself.

(Assistant Principal, #4)

The principal as a *leader of leaders* is documented in the literature (e.g., Hallinger & Hausman, 1993), but a more provocative concept in the data was the assistant principal as a leader of leaders. One assistant believed her role was to encourage faculty members not only to take an active part in change but also to become leaders, because "I think everybody has the potential to be a leader, even for five minutes." Another assistant principal said he had always held teachers in high esteem and had never forgotten what it was like to be in the classroom. His working relationship with teachers had changed because he had learned "to tap their potential and use it." He had assumed the role of encouraging those with leadership potential to get their certification to become administrators because he wanted them "to develop that and continue to grow." He concluded, "I think that we need to provide opportunities for teachers to experience leadership, we need to mentor them when we can, and I don't think much of that was done before--unless you coached." He gave an example of how restructuring had enabled him to fulfill this role:

We've done some creative things here. We have a teacher who's not an assistant principal, but he is. We got him here when I hired a [teacher for a] science position, and I realized with these special programs that we have, we could use an administrator just to work with these kids. And I presented the idea that we get

somebody in here whom I would schedule for only three classes. . . . He has no duties and he does discipline and counseling for this group one bell. This is an opportunity to mentor him through the role of assistant principal so he can make a decision. He's halfway through a program, so that he can make the decisions and learn from the experiences. It gives him the leading edge on any other candidate going in. He'll be able to say, "I worked as an administrator under this team here."

(Assistant Principal, #4)

Several teachers also supported the concept of the assistant principal as a leader of leaders. Leaders, they asserted, had to do more than pay lip-service to seeking faculty input. They had to be committed to helping teachers become leaders. One teacher stated very simply, "And that is happening."

Expanded leadership roles were an important element of successful urban schools in Louis and Miles (1990) study. Leadership similarly emerged as crucial to the success of individuals and schools in the present study. Another important role was that of support.

#### Role of Support

But teachers expect a lot of assistant principals, and if they deliver, then of course they're wonderful. . . . As teachers we work hard and we work long hours, and we want to see other people doing the same thing. And we want to see them working with us, and not against us, and trying to make our jobs easier and more relaxed, and not tougher. . . . (Teacher, #8)

The word support may suggest that one encourages or helps others; at the same time it may suggest that one assumes a role that is subordinate to another. The data indicated that restructuring flourishes in an atmosphere of support. Like communication, support is a two-way process. Principals and assistant principals supported each other;

similarly, most assistant principals viewed themselves as supporters of their teachers.

There was no doubt in the mind of one assistant that she could not fulfill her role without a principal like the principal of School B. As suggested by Marshall (1993), her principal's "positive reinforcement [had] an impact on performance and morale" (p. 38). The assistant's remarks substantiated the principal's self-described willingness to encourage risk-taking, a condition that normally had no part in the culture of schools (Murphy, 1991): "I'd like to see people who take chances, who get things done. I have no problem with mistakes; I have a problem with continuous error. If you don't try, you won't make mistakes and you won't improve. I think our people know that I encourage them to take on that . . . approach to being an administrator." Another said,

And I think what I feel fortunate in and what ought to be true of principals and assistant principals' relationships, I ought to be trying to make them look good and they ought to be trying to make me look good. I don't mean that in an ugly way, but together we make the school look good. Because we're all here for the kids, and the things we're doing are for the kids. (Principal, School C)

The principal of School A said that the role of the assistant principals was to make him look good, "because if they make me look good, my name is synonymous with the school, and they make the school look good. They'll probably tell you that that's their job description because we've laughed about it."

As in the literature, principals had a key role in improving the assistant principalship (Gorton, 1987). As recommended by McIntyre (1988), collegial relationships were necessary. Assistant principals viewed their role in supporting teachers in a similar way. They believed they should "look out for the interests of the students and the teachers," "[work] with people so we can have the best scenario possible," "support teachers," and "do everything possible in their area

of expertise . . . to make their [the teachers'] plan run smoothly." One actually defined administration in terms of support:

You step back and let them [teachers] do the job that they are very capable of doing. That's all you do. That's what administration is--you minister to people and you remove any obstacle that keeps them from doing their job. That is what my purpose is. It is not a power play. . . . I mean, we're all part of a team, but our job specifically is to remove any obstacles. Yes, we serve them. The most important person in this building is the teacher. They're very important. It's also the hardest job. You've taught; I've taught. It's day in and day out. . . . It is exhausting, physically exhausting. . . . This is tiring too, but not like teaching. (Assistant Principal, #5)

These findings contrasted with Marshall's (1993) finding that restructuring and site-based management had "thrown the career AP's role into turmoil" (p. 45). Whereas respondents in Marshall's study reported the frustrations of "being left out of the loop" while teachers were empowered "to order us around" (p. 45), data from the present study presented a more positive view of the changes in the role. A few assistants said that little had changed except giving the teachers a voice, but none of the interviewees responded negatively to the movement toward teacher empowerment and shared decision making. There was no evidence that career assistant principals had found themselves in more turmoil than less experienced assistants. In fact, several of the assistant principals who were enthusiastic about restructuring were career assistant principals.

In an emerging vision of school restructuring, Conley (1992) said the role of the administrator was to facilitate. In many cases faculty members substantiated the assistant principals' comments that one of their roles was to support teachers. One teacher said she thought she relied on assistant principals more than she used to, and she also

thought assistant principals gave teachers more input than assistants did in the past. Another remarked, "I think one of the roles of the assistant principal is to act as a counselor or facilitator between students and teachers." Another said they should provide guidance and instructional support, support teachers in keeping discipline in the classroom, and offer a shoulder to cry on when necessary. In the words of one administrator, "I really believe that the important people in the building are the teachers, but I think the second most people are the administrators who are there to support. And I don't think teachers can do their jobs without the number two people."

Even in an environment of support, conflicts may occur. The principal of School A noted that the teacher evaluation process had the potential of straining the relationship between assistant principals and teachers. At School B, however, an assistant viewed her "role as an evaluator as more of a facilitator. I have tried, and I think it has happened, to have the kind of relationship with department chairs and teachers in that department to know that I am not here to just to evaluate what you do, but more importantly, I am here as a support system for you, a facilitator for you." In working with the school planning council, she said, assistant principals attended meetings "as facilitators, when we are called up, because you want the persons who are most involved, the teachers, to do the most of the talking and to lead the decision-making process. We're there as a support system."

The theme of the assistant principal as facilitator also emerged during the teacher interviews. Whether working with school committees, planning councils, faculty councils, management teams, or action teams, assistants were frequently described in a helping mode:

Because a teacher will be the chairperson, it's a teacher who runs the meeting and sets the agenda and that sort of thing. Then usually the assistant principal is just there to see what's going on, to answer questions if we have them, give the go ahead if we

need it, troubleshoot if they see a reason why we can't go ahead with the plan, that sort of thing. It's a helpful role. And I don't want to say it's a minor role, because it isn't. We need that, but they're not doing the planning, they're not telling us what we're going to do, they're not dictating any strategy or any agenda. They're just there to see what we need. (Teacher, #7)

Faculty council--they come to those meetings and contribute when asked, and of course we didn't have that in the past.  
(Teacher, #8)

They're just primarily there, instead of control, it's to aid. I believe [that] is their whole purpose. (Teacher, #9)

We don't feel that they need to be doing any more than they're already doing, and they are there for us. (Teacher, #13)

I really feel that the staff here see the assistant principals as helping supervisors, really. And that is accepted. We don't fear assistant principals like I think they used to when they came in for evaluations. I think some considered that as a way of being picked on. Now I think we have great rapport. (Teacher, #14)

An example of the role of the assistant principal was illustrated by a member of the staff development team at School B. She indicated that the assistant principal made every effort to assist the team in getting information or making arrangements but left it up to the action teams to get the work done. In general, assistants certainly had a role, but the teacher felt it neither should have been nor was a dominant role. Two teachers (School B and School C) shared the belief that part of the reason for assistant principals assuming a facilitative role was restructuring, or specifically site-based management; concomitant

reasons were that "each year we expect more" and "I think it's going on everywhere, not just at our school."

The models of restructuring adopted in the schools for this study for the most part encouraged administrators to become facilitators. As the next section reveals, the concept of power also emerged in the data.

### **Distribution of Power**

Historically the final authority and responsibility for all decision making by assistant principals has rested with the principal (Michaels, 1965; Pellicer & Stevenson, 1991). The position has been associated with feelings of powerlessness (Calabrese & Adams, 1987; Greenfield, 1985b; Marshall, 1993), and assistant principals have often been reminded that "the principal runs his school" (Glanz, 1994). Between 1965 and 1987 assistant principals' overall discretion in performing delegated duties actually decreased, but they reportedly carried out their responsibilities with "considerable discretion" (Pellicer et al., 1988), leading Pellicer and Stevenson to suggest that the assistant principalship was becoming a "sharing role" (p. 62). While principals held the power in traditional settings, an assistant principal's statement that "You're really much more a facilitator than a dictator" indicated that total power in the study schools no longer resided in the office of the administrator. The data indicated that principals still had considerable authority, but the "'this is my castle' style of leadership" (Marshall, 1993, p. 37) no longer worked.

Whereas the early literature found that there was a need to establish clear lines of responsibility and authority for assistant principals (Jarrett, 1958), the data indicated that the lines became even more blurred when principals began sharing their power with assistant principals and teachers under new decision making structures. At School D, teachers for the most part had more power than they had the previous year, and one assistant explained how influential teachers had been in altering the organization of the school day with regard to a

homeroom period. The change created some problems with student tardiness, but assistant principals would not realign the schedule without teacher approval. In the past administrators would have said, "Hey, we're going to move this," he said with a laugh. A teacher at School C described the school as somewhat less "authority-based," and assistant principals were "more like facilitators" than when he had first joined the staff. Prior to restructuring, one school had been led by a "dictator" who "managed through intimidation" and who "had to have his hand in all of the pies." Under the "old regime" in another school, teachers had been unwilling to try new instructional methods or alternative ways of assessing students. In contrast, principals and assistant principals in these schools supported shared decision making and valued teacher input.

The hierarchy associated with large schools and school systems also appeared to have flattened. The principal of School B captured the concept when he said, "Quicker, much quicker. Things get done much quicker. There's not a bureaucratic structure in place. There's no pecking order now." That pecking order had flattened at the central office and local school levels.

This is an environment of genuine shared decision making here, and if you were in a traditional model and you're not accustomed to it, some people might call it the "power" you may have in a position is relinquished. So you can't really think of yourself as having any more authority than anyone else. I think that's just one of the real things--that nobody's really a subordinate anymore. Everybody's got an equally important job to do and an equally important contribution. . . . It's pretty much dissolved here. On a superficial level there's a hierarchy, but on the working level we're pretty actively involved with everybody, and I certainly don't see anybody as having a more subordinate position.

(Principal, School B)

One assistant described a more level playing ground where barriers were removed so people could generate ideas with openness. She insisted that the assistant principals had to buy into this idea, too. In contrast to some schools that gave "lip service" to site-based management, the school planning council in her school dealt with instructional issues. She concluded, "But the assistant principal has to buy into it also and has to be willing to accept the responsibilities that go with it and be willing to let go. It's so different."

Prior to restructuring and the change in administrators, the hierarchy apparently had been perpetuated in one school. Using phrases such as "commanders-in-chiefs" and "they were on pedestals," a teacher contrasted the past with the present. The last two groups of administrators, she said, were "human"; they made teachers feel that their ideas were equally valuable. The teacher summed it up as follows: "I mean, we're all working with the kids and that's supposed to be the goal. Some just decided they want to be administrators and some of us want to stay in the classroom."

There was no disagreement among the assistant principals that teachers had more voice in the decisions that affected them and their students. Specific references to teacher empowerment appeared in 58% of the interviews with assistant principals, and one assistant fondly referred to an influential group of teachers in the school as "the power group." These individuals were defined as the teachers "who know how to teach, who care about kids, [who] care about their school, [and] do anything and everything for a child."

Teachers likewise emphasized the redistribution of power. In contrast to findings in a qualitative study of fourteen teachers' perspectives of school restructuring, teachers in the present study did not express a belief that the role of administrators needed to be deemphasized and their power significantly reduced (Murphy et al., 1991). Under the new management style, teachers said assistants could do

more, had more responsibility, and knew that nobody would "pull the plug on them." The teachers also had more input, felt that they actually belonged to the organization, and were no longer told what to do. At School C, a teacher said, "There's not so much of a division any more." She also believed that assistant principals treated teachers with more respect, as if they were "equivalent." At School B, the same idea was echoed: "I think we expect them to listen to us, and to treat us as equals in terms of professionals, and I've seen that happen." At School D, one teacher said the hierarchy previously in place had disappeared under new leadership:

[In the past] you did not circumvent; you even felt funny going to an assistant principal without going to a chairman. Now it's more on a level ground. They have raised their impression of us as teachers to the point so it's not such a pyramid-type scheme with principal, assistant principal, department chair, teacher. In terms of relationships and working with each other, they've come down and we've come up. (Teacher, #18)

An exception was at School A, where one teacher suggested that "some of the faculty believe that they have some decisions and powers that they don't really have. . . . I'm not sure everybody wants to relinquish their powers." Another said, "Shared decision making seems to be a way to say, 'Oh, we don't do that any more. You do that.' I thought the whole deal was, 'Come on in. Now we'll work on this together.'"

Attitudes toward loss of power emerged as a pattern in the data. The degree to which power was redistributed, stated the principal of School B, "all depends on the administration's philosophy, how much power the principal wants to control." His teachers were unanimous in their suggestion that he was indeed willing to share the power and "not on a power drive": "He is not the kind of person who has to have all the power; he is not afraid to share in that. But with restructuring, I

think the principal just makes an effort to make people feel involved and part of the decision." Another principal was likewise complimented by the teachers for not being "control-oriented" as a predecessor had been. In a study on improving urban high schools, Louis and Miles (1990) found that leadership in the more successful urban schools was characterized by "power sharing." Their finding was also supported during data analysis for the present study.

A few concerns and frustrations accompanied the commitment to share the power with teachers. Teachers noted that the assistant principals were "just there to lend ideas and discuss like anybody else," had "no particular power to dominate," did not "really lay down a rule," had an equal voice "just like everyone else," and were advised to "be quiet unless they [faculty council members] ask you a question." During the early stages of school restructuring, a principal said some assistant principals were concerned that teachers were going to "come in and tell us what to do and we're not gonna have any input." At first it was especially difficult and frustrating, a teacher said, for assistants to attend faculty council meetings but to refrain from telling the faculty why a particular idea was not going to work. Gradually, however, they realized that teachers generated some good solutions to the school's problems. The principal of School C believed many of the original concerns had been replaced with "a trust factor now between teachers and assistant principals and the assistant principals and the teachers." This emphasis on the importance of developing trust between administrators and teachers as a "bedrock condition for change" (p. 87) was also reported in the literature (Murphy, 1991; see also Conley, 1992; Marshall, 1992, 1993).

Sherman (1991/1992) reported that assistant principals in schools where shared decision making was implemented were frustrated with "the second-rate position to which many feel they have been relegated" (p. 60). For some assistants in the present study, new structures led to

a state of uncertainty regarding the distribution of power between assistant principals and teachers. One assistant alluded to the evolving nature of restructuring: "The main thing we're thinking differently is, we're wondering which decisions that we're making may at some subsequent time be taken over by somebody else." Without a doubt, teachers were leading committees and expected to continue leading committees. The bottom line, according to a principal, was that the administrators had to have "confidence in where they're going, not that they have all the answers, and so that role is very difficult-- [but who have] the courage to give up power so teachers can become empowered." For a few individuals, finding such courage was more challenging than for others. In contrast to Sherman's findings, however, most assistant principals indicated that sharing the power with others had positive benefits for administrators, teachers, and students and was essential in developing collegial, non-hierarchical relationships.

#### **Identification of Concerns, Issues, and Recommended Modifications**

The assistant principalship was influenced in several areas as schools implemented restructuring initiatives. These areas included duties and responsibilities, relationships with the school and community, processes for decision making, obligations for leadership, expectations for support, and distribution of power. While one purpose of this study was to examine the current role of the assistant principal in high schools that were restructuring, another purpose was to address the following research questions:

1. What concerns and issues need to be considered for redefining the role of the assistant principal in high schools that are restructuring?
2. What modifications might be offered to enhance the role of the assistant principal in high schools that are restructuring?

Much of the literature on restructuring has centered on principals, but Hallinger and Hausman (1993) assert that "less obvious, but at least as important, is the need to examine the concerns of school leaders other than the principal" (p. 140). This section presents the findings pertaining to the identification of concerns, issues, and recommended modifications associated with the assistant principalship. Because problems and solutions were often intertwined during the interview process, the data were analyzed jointly. A thematic presentation of the data is presented in seven sections: role definition, diversity, training, support, power, job satisfaction, and career goals.

#### **Role Definition**

Austin and Brown's (1970) landmark study on the assistant principalship found that specific job descriptions for assistant principals were almost nonexistent, and a decade later Black (1980) reported that job descriptions were ambiguous. On the other hand, there is some evidence that the roles of assistant principals may have been more clearly defined in recent years. During discussions of the concerns and issues to be considered by high schools in the restructuring process, the theme of role definitions emerged.

For the participants in this study, *job description* was synonymous with the specific list of duties developed for each assistant principal at the school level. Most administrators and teachers were unsure of whether a citywide job description existed and were unable to produce one. Approximately half of the administrators said job descriptions for assistant principals were developed by principals, and approximately half said they were developed in consultation with assistant principals. The consensus was that the lists accurately reflected the assistants' actual duties but in a simplistic way.

One assistant specifically voiced a concern shared by others when restructuring initiatives were first implemented; that is, what was the

assistant principal's role? For one assistant, the ambiguity continued. In a 1991 statement on restructuring the role of the assistant principal, NASSP's Council on the Assistant Principalship recommended that principals foster positive relationships with assistants by involving them in the school's total educational program. For example, a major role on the school-based management team was suggested. Surprisingly, the data indicated that this had not occurred. Only one principal appeared to have ensured that assistants had key roles on school councils or management teams. In two other schools, however, assistants clearly worked with restructuring initiatives and felt they were adequately involved in the process. In the fourth school, restructuring initiatives had been interrupted by changes in several administrative positions and involvement did not appear to be extensive.

In general administrators and teachers described or recommended some changes in the role of the assistant principal. Only one assistant felt that his role had not changed at all and saw no need for that role to change. He suggested that the assistant remained "the person that operates the building on a daily basis." At School C, an assistant who supervised the discipline functions saw no need for additional restructuring of the role, but he emphasized the importance of ensuring that assigned roles and responsibilities in restructured schools were clear to faculty members. An assistant from School D recommended ongoing examination of the role of the assistant principal.

In contrast to the few who said their roles either had not changed or did not need to change, most said that some changes had already occurred or suggested other modifications to the role. Administrators and teachers suggested redefining the role to enable assistant principals to get out of their offices and into the classrooms. Role conflict was still an issue for assistant principals who believed instruction was important but who were busy with discipline.

Still the same as it has always been for assistant principals. The roles need to be defined more and they need more help. They're tied up with too many details and petty discipline problems that they shouldn't have to deal with. . . . (Assistant Principal, #2)

The biggest frustration I've heard assistant principals say to me throughout the years is that we really want to do this, this, and this, but I can't get out of my office long enough to do it. And they've had some great ideas through the time, and one assistant principal just dropped what he was doing and did it. But you can't do but so much in the confines of the day, so you really need to change what their job is. (Teacher, #2)

This theme of increased involvement in the classroom was suggested by assistant principals in Marshall's (1993) study of career assistant principals. Greater classroom involvement was viewed as a means of promoting the positive side of the school and, at the same time, reducing discipline problems (see also Hunter, 1990).

A common theme in the definition of role was the increasing similarity between the assistant principalship and the principalship in terms of leadership. A decade ago Hess (1985) warned against making the assistant "a sort of supercustodian of the building" who was used as a "staff wastebasket for humdrum assignments" (pp. 99-100). Two principals asserted that the traditional role of the assistant was no longer viable. In fact, one specifically stated, "And the traditional assistant principals--that day in my opinion is done; it's gone." Another said, "I don't think that my responsibilities should be any different from the assistants. They should have vision, they should have professional drive, they should be capable and they should have the ability to lead." This view was supported by assistant principals who felt that they had to be "involved in all of it," and who viewed their roles "more or less as decision makers and persons who execute more policy and projects,

which we are allowed to do . . . ." One stated that the focus was on leadership, "not the assistant principal as such as a job, a defined task as such. That's not what leadership is."

Teachers echoed the thoughts of a principal who stated, "That's how I would really want assistant principals to work--to be instructional leaders for their departments and for individuals and to hear these ideas. That's how their roles should be defined." When specifically asked to identify concerns, issues, or possible modifications pertaining to the role of the assistant principal, 39% of the teachers discussed the instructional role. Many assistant principals were already devoting more time to instruction, visiting classrooms more frequently, and assisting teachers in the development of new instructional strategies. Teachers appreciated the increased involvement in instruction and recommended even more. Assistant principals, they said, needed to "devote more of their time to the academic side," to visit classrooms more frequently "to help teachers improve instruction," "to assist with the restructuring process," and to be instructional leaders. The assistant principal should have more than surface involvement in instruction. The assistant should be visible in the departments and classrooms--"someone who comes in and out of classes and someone that the children recognize who is as much a part of the instructional program as the teacher."

Data from principals, assistant principals, and teachers reinforced the notion of increasing the effectiveness of the assistant principal's position by ensuring that assistants were instructional leaders, not "fire fighters" (McIntyre, 1988, p. 5; see also Hunter, 1990; Richardson & Flanigan, 1991; Rodrick, 1986). Assistants would retain some essential managerial tasks for the smooth operation of the school, but through instructional leadership they could help teachers improve their classroom performance. A specific aspect of instruction that emerged during teacher interviews was the assistant principal's

role in teacher training. Teachers in three schools had a lead role in identifying their own staff development needs, but their assistant principals also helped identify needs and coordinate in-service activities to meet those needs. Although teachers from all four sites recommended teacher involvement, some proposed more active participation by assistant principals. Instead of having consultants present to teachers, assistant principals "should model for you . . . [and] help you put it together." For example, one teacher stated that it was the assistant principal's job to say, "We've got these five different ways that we could do it. Let me find someone who can show [you] this; let me provide some information on this; let me put [you] in small groups of learners. Let me practice the cooperative learning situation with the teachers, and let [you] see that it works." Just as students were expected to become actively involved in the learning process, assistant principals were expected to become actively involved in teacher training. An important role of the assistants, therefore, was to become models for teachers.

Although different schools had altered the role of the assistant principal in different ways, the administrators and teachers emphasized the importance of leadership. To fulfill the demands of such a leadership position, however, assistant principals needed diversity in their roles.

### Diversity

In reflecting upon the assistant principalship, administrators and teachers mentioned generalization versus specialization. The literature also included these alternatives, with some recommending a specialized role (Hunter, 1990) and others recommending job rotation (Kelly, 1987; Howley, 1985; Michaels, 1965). All four principals specifically discussed the need for diversity in the duties and responsibilities of the assistant principals. In contrast to past practices which assigned the same duties to the same individuals for several years, three

principals had already made conscious efforts to rotate various duties among the assistants, while the remaining principal had several assistants who were either new to their position or to the school. The goals of rotation were to ensure (1) that no one was burdened with the less desirable duties, such as overseeing buses or supervising discipline, and (2) that everyone had an opportunity to learn different aspects of administration. One principal emphasized the necessity of developing or sharpening skills in several areas:

The first thing is . . . the assistant principals are required to deal with a diverse span of activities. The thing they should be attentive to is doing exactly that. Often, too many times an assistant principal will only do what they do well and they will not pay attention to their shortcomings, and they should pay attention. In this day and time your shortcomings will kill you if you don't pay attention to them. (Principal, School B)

A few assistant principals mentioned the benefits of specialization in their roles; they also saw the benefits of rotating duties. One noted, "We are already trying to be reasonably broad-based about what our people [assistants] do. . . . Obviously I think that's important because restructuring is an overall happening. It's not a single thing you do." Another assistant, who had experienced diversity in his duties, believed that isolating an assistant principal "really hurt your school." Even those who had specialized areas of responsibility such as instruction, discipline, or scheduling believed in being knowledgeable and up-to-date in all areas of the school's operation. Providing a blend of specialization and generalization was a recommended option:

If you're trying to use the assistant principal position to train principals, then there should be some apparatus within that specialization to allow that to happen. And I don't think they're

totally incompatible. I can see how you can do both. (Assistant Principal, #10)

From the teachers' perspective, limiting assistant principals to isolated areas was inadvisable. Although they might have had primary responsibilities in selected areas, assistant principals were the educators who kept up with their journals, knew that certain things were possible, and really did "have to be everywhere, know everything, and do everything." They needed enough knowledge and skill to fulfill any other assistant principal's role if needed. Above all, they needed a desire "to be involved in the total school package." One teacher reflected on the dilemma of specialization, which sometimes caused administrators to become possessive of certain duties, and rotation, which sometimes led to disruptions and lack of continuity. Both practices had advantages and disadvantages, so she recommended a blend of specialization and rotation to benefit assistant principals and teachers.

Finding the balance between specialization and generalization was one challenge of restructuring. An assistant in a school more advanced in its restructuring initiatives underscored the critical need for communication. His belief was substantiated by Murphy and Hallinger (1993) who said restructured schools placed "a premium" (p. 264) on communication. A teacher in the same school described the assistant principals' roles prior to restructuring as "very separate, very segregated." In contrast, she continued,

They should be defined as to what piece of the pie they are going to take the heat for. The thing that people don't understand when they start [restructuring] is how many of these pieces are going to overlap. . . . So much of the stuff intermeshes that there needs to be communication among the assistant principals; they need to have common time to sit down and discuss what goes on. (Teacher, #18)

Her assistants, she continued, knew which "piece of the pie" was theirs. They also communicated regularly with each other and were knowledgeable of the whole process. The ideal situation, of course, would have been to be involved in every piece, but "that's like a jack of all trades and master of none."

Analysis of the data revealed that principals, assistant principals, and teachers viewed the role of the assistant principal as more diverse than it had been in the past. The data further revealed that preparing for diversity had implications for the professional training of assistant principals.

### Training

The review of the literature found staff training to be a key factor explaining why some restructuring initiatives were successful and why others were less successful than they might have been (Louis & Miles, 1990; Murphy & Hallinger, 1993). Training for assistant principals emerged as either a concern or a recommendation in interviews with principals, assistant principals, and teachers. Many assistant principals had taken advantage of opportunities to attend a variety of in-service meetings on topics such as consensus building, alternative assessment, cooperative learning, peer mediation, conflict resolution, and technology. These individuals viewed their training as essential to the performance of their duties.

The principals' focus on training for assistant principals was consistent with data on role definition. Assistant principals had to be confident in their own ability and in the ability of others so they not only could be leaders themselves but also could foster leadership in others. Two of the four specifically recommended that assistants be trained first and foremost to be instructional leaders. In conveying this idea, the principal of School D captured the essence of school administration:

I think that there are so many capable people who can manage this building, I mean many, many, many who can do this job, as with assistants, since these are management positions, but what makes us different . . . is that we have educational experience. That means instruction. And yet administrators get so far away from instruction that now administrators say, "Now I don't have time to get in the classroom," which is true *except* that's how they prioritize their day. But also a lot of people, it's been years since they stayed abreast of instructional strategies or read instructional articles or talked to teachers about instruction, about kids. And we're not going to make a difference if we don't focus on instruction.

The assistants echoed similar concerns for schools that were just beginning restructuring. Preparing assistant principals in the same way they were prepared years ago was no longer viable. As in the literature (Marshall, 1992; Murphy, 1991; NASSP's Council, 1991; Peterson, Marshall, & Grier, 1987; Rodrick, 1986; Sherman, 1991/1992), ongoing training was recommended. Assistants needed to work closely with teachers in staff development and to be exposed to "different aspects of business management." Schools needed to ensure that assistant principals had time for professional development because, if not, "you're not growing, you're just staying stagnant, or you're falling back." One assistant principal recommended training that included training in how to allocate resources, how to design programs, and how to delegate responsibilities. He concluded:

I don't think you train assistant principals anymore. You train teacher leaders, and all of what an assistant principal does in shared decision making prepares them to be the leader for tomorrow. . . . Now it's leadership, and leadership is so all-encompassing. Initiating and planning change, you're agents of

change--leaders--and that's where it's different. (Assistant Principal, #4)

Like the administrators, the teachers viewed training as essential for assistant principals. Attending in-service activities conducted by consultants was but one method of being trained. Several teachers specifically recommended that assistant principals receive more of their training by visiting other schools that were restructuring. Time invested in these visits would benefit the entire staff since assistant principals could increase their own knowledge of successful strategies in schools that were restructuring and then share innovative techniques with their own staff. Assistant principals also needed "to have a real firm grip on the realities of the classroom, especially in restructuring because you're asking teachers . . . to take some risks, and they need to be well aware of what it's like to take risks."

Training was provided when restructuring first began at the four research sites, but teachers reiterated that everyone, such as principals, assistant principals, teachers, and custodians, needed training to understand the direction of the school and to remove the threat that restructuring was going to hurt them or cost them in some way. One concern that emerged in teacher interviews was that assistant principals had not been given enough specific training before restructuring began. According to one teacher, the lack of training resulted in a fear of losing power and control early in the process. The assistants had different management styles, and they needed to develop an understanding of how and why restructuring was occurring in corporate America and how the management skills could transfer to the school setting. A few assistant principals were said to be "slow buying into" restructuring because they had not received enough initial training. A shared attitude that restructuring would benefit all was essential. This need to learn how to lead through collaboration was identified in the literature (Murphy et al., 1991). In focusing on the assistant

principalship, another teacher concluded, "I think that assistant principals need to be kept totally involved in whatever [is associated with] restructuring, which I think happens here."

Whereas the limited opportunities for professional development have often made assistant principals feel "like second-class citizens" (Gorton, 1987), the consensus of the administrators was that various staff development opportunities were available to assistant principals. They stressed that ongoing training was important. While some assistants found the time to take advantage of the opportunities offered, others suggested that adequate support for completion of their duties would enable them to increase their participation in staff development.

### Support

Traditionally the assistant principalship has been associated with custodial duties (Calabrese & Adams, 1987; Glanz, 1994; Panyako & Rorie, 1987; Pfeffer, 1955; Reed & Himmler, 1985) and clerical duties (Black, 1980; Van Eman, 1926). Duties such as student discipline have often consumed the workday of the assistant principal (Reed & Himmler, 1985), leaving little time for other areas of responsibility. The data from the present study revealed that restructuring had allowed many assistant principals time to increase their involvement in areas other than pupil personnel; however, the data also indicated that administrators and teachers continued to see a need for assistants to have additional support to perform their duties.

More than two decades ago Austin (1972) reported that assistant principals were "somewhat pitied" for their work overload and that "something ought to be done about it" (p. 74). Several teachers in the present study likewise pitied assistants, saying they had "the toughest job in the building because they're on line in terms of instruction," dealt with "hassles that would ruin my day," and had a "terribly hard, thankless job." An assistant said that an examination of the assistant

principalship was very good because his role was much more meaningful than it used to be:

I think it's been sort of the black sheep of the family for a long time. It can be an extremely worthwhile position, and I realize that. I had never thought about it before I happened to be at a principal's conference. . . . A gentleman who had been an assistant principal his entire career did a presentation on the role of the AP, ways that they affect the climate in general and sort of looking at it in a totally different light. And I realized that it was not what I had perceived it to be--as some punishment for grievous sins, or they make you do these things like they did the first place that I worked, and I thought, Who would want to be there doing that? (Assistant Principal, #10)

An interesting finding in a school that apparently had been successful in restructuring was that teachers viewed the assistants' jobs as more difficult than their own, while the assistants viewed the teachers' jobs as more difficult. This mutual respect for each other's roles appeared to foster a supportive environment. This finding did not emerge in the school less advanced in restructuring.

Administrators and teachers were almost unanimous in their assessment of restructuring as "a lot of work." Signs of role overload appeared in comments such as "You just don't have the time." This theme was not surprising since time--the need for additional time, the effective use of time, and the need for adequate support personnel--was a dominant theme in much of the research on school restructuring (Cawelti, 1994; Murphy et al., 1991). In the school that had made the least progress toward its goals, administrators said paperwork and "housekeeping chores" consumed much of the assistant principals' time. Teachers likewise referred to "the busywork duties," "the paperwork kind of shuffle," and the amount of time spent in offices. These duties were reminiscent of what Hess (1985) termed "a treadmill of endless

operational tasks, a series of disconnected responsibilities that lack any unifying thread" (p. 95).

Because the "paperwork jungle" and certain other activities were viewed as jobs that did not require the expertise of an administrator, a frequently recommended modification was to restructure staff assignments to allow teachers, teacher assistants, secretaries or other paraprofessionals to complete those tasks. Similar recommendations appeared in previous literature (Coppedge, 1968; Marshall, 1993; Panyako & Rorie, 1987; Potter, 1980). Some assistants needed "to turn more of the little stuff over," especially filling out work orders, assigning detention to students who cut class, and keeping track of keys. These duties needed to be done, but they were described as a waste of an assistant principal's talent. The assistants themselves might have been guilty at times of putting aside areas with which they felt uncomfortable and dealing with less challenging duties. It was much easier, said one principal, "to schedule a building with the door closed pushing numbers . . . rather than doing team observations with a coordinator to learn more about geography or social studies" in order to help the teacher who needs to be helped.

At some schools, reassignments had already occurred. For example, a teacher assistant was responsible for contacting and assigning substitutes, teachers had duty bells to work with attendance, and full-time security monitors regularly toured buildings to monitor student behavior. As early as 1987, Calabrese and Adams (1987) recommended hiring trained security officers to assume the custodial duties assigned to assistant principals. Contrasting his current situation with a previous experience in another school division, an assistant principal described how he and his former colleagues had been unable to use their expertise because of unending duties, especially discipline, that placed demands on their time. He stated, "They just didn't have anything like the amount of time we have here" to focus on instruction. Schools that

do not find ways to realign duties to alleviate the relentless demands on staff time run the risk of "diminishing enthusiasm for the changes underway" (Cawelti, 1994). Efforts were underway to address this concern in several schools, but there still appeared to be room for improvement.

Progress in terms of support had been made in some schools. The consensus of administrators and teachers was that some duties traditionally assigned to assistant principals already were or should have been relinquished to other individuals. Student activities, for example, was described by a teacher as "the albatross" for assistant principals, not because they did not value it, but because their time was divided among more pressing duties. At School D, however, this issue had been resolved with the employment of a full-time coordinator for student activities who assumed responsibilities once assigned to an assistant principal. Both administrators and teachers lauded this change. The coordinator was able to involve students who normally would not have been involved in school programs, to coordinate a conflict mediation program, and ultimately to have an intricate role in increasing school pride. These activities were consistent with the school's goals for restructuring. The teacher interviewees from this school unanimously recommended that other schools involved in restructuring consider this reassignment of assistant principals' duties.

Most assistant principals believed they had been successful in some of their efforts to improve teaching and learning or to facilitate restructuring efforts. With adequate support, administrators and teachers believed assistants could be more productive. They believed their time would be better spent observing teachers, facilitating staff development, planning and evaluating new initiatives, and working with teachers to improve teaching and learning.

### Power

In a study of principals' perceptions of restructuring, Hallinger, Hausman, and Murphy (1992) found that "principals viewed the effects of restructuring on themselves almost exclusively in terms of power," especially losing control and power (p. 335). The theme of power emerged in the data on changes that had already occurred in the assistant principalship during restructuring, and it also emerged in discussions of concerns and proposed modifications. In general administrators said principals in schools beginning to restructure should share the power with assistant principals and teachers. The principal of School C used community relations as an example:

They need to be put in a situation where they interact with the community out of authority too. Not just, "I'm here to represent the principal tonight; he can't be here," but "I'm a viable part of this and I'm working with you."

Panyako and Rorie (1987) suggested that, for assistant principals, advancing professionally was dependent upon the principal's willingness to share responsibility. One assistant principal cautioned that principals had to have a real commitment to restructuring and empowerment; paying lip service to such structures would only lead to mistrust and failure. After praising her own principal's willingness to share leadership, another assistant commented, "They [principals] have to let it go. And that's true with any good leader. They hire the best they can hire and they empower that person and step back." Teachers who commended their principal for sharing their authority also envisioned that assistant principals would have less control if they had to work for a very dominating principal. Rather than being authoritarian, all administrators needed personality traits that promoted collegiality, collaboration, and shared leadership. A teacher concluded, "You can adjust to site-based or whatever is in place, but if your personality

and philosophy towards the job doesn't mesh with your surroundings, you're in trouble--or someone else is."

Prior to restructuring, the traditional distribution of power was hierarchical. As the schools began restructuring, the hierarchy flattened but did not totally disappear. In a positive tone, many teachers said they still knew who their "bosses" were, but their comments indicated that assistant principals either were or would eventually become "less boss and more facilitator":

That person needs to be subtle and yet at the same time needs to be confident so that people . . . view the assistant principal as someone who's really there to help facilitate, not to dictate. If you are a facilitator, you are just are. . . . It's just a state of existence. (Teacher, #4)

If we had some problems, I'd be the first to tell you, but . . . they don't exhibit that hierarchy. Our assistant principals never have that push on faculty. They're . . . there for us. Even though there's a hierarchy, our group are team players.... (Teacher, #13)

Most of the administrators embraced the concepts of shared decision making and teacher empowerment, but ideas and anxieties about losing power and control periodically surfaced. One assistant matter-of-factly stated, "It's not like it used to be here" when the administrative staff established policy. Even more interesting, however, were the thoughts of three administrators from two different schools who speculated on a similar scenario for the role of the assistant principal. A principal highlighted the trend toward shifting responsibilities formerly assigned to assistants to teachers and suggested that a principal and several assistants in a high school might someday become "a thing of the past." In this scenario the power of the assistant principal would become increasingly diminished as the power of teachers increased. More and more teachers would assume administrative

roles, thus making the assistant principalship no longer viable. In imagining this scenario, one administrator also speculated on its pitfalls. He questioned whether teachers would be willing to sacrifice their time for increased authority. Since this individual was satisfied with his opportunities for planning and working with instruction, he noted that these ideas were "just speculation." These ideas might have been speculation, but in reality, David (1990) reported that one junior high school involved in restructuring had replaced an assistant principal with two teachers, who were subsequently assigned to handle counseling and discipline.

Surprisingly, in an era of teacher empowerment none of the teachers speculated on a diminished role for the assistant principal, but one suggested a diminishing role for the principal. Most teachers valued assistants who had immersed themselves in restructuring initiatives, who were knowledgeable of current educational trends, and who not only demonstrated leadership themselves but who fostered leadership in others. A teacher contrasted traditional training with current needs:

What your training teaches you is, you've got to be the administrator, you've got to be the boss, you've got to be mandating and dictating and passing out the stuff, but what current research in education teaches you is, that's not what you need to be. You need to be an instructional leader, and you need to delegate. (Teacher, #2)

Faculty were resolute in believing that assistant principals had to have confidence in themselves so they could "be open and honest," "work with a team of people," "listen to input and [be] flexible enough to deal with that," and "[be] involved in the decisions and then [lead] the way in the implementation of those decisions." Assistant principals had the power to make things happen primarily because of their supportive role for teachers. Describing a challenging situation in which an assistant

principal had provided the support, a teacher said, "Hey, we did it. . . . I loved handling it, but I loved handling it with a net under me."

The data indicated that the concept of power was evolving from one's official capacity to exert control over others to one's ability to perform effectively by working with others. Even though administrators and teachers overwhelmingly described restructuring as hard work, one teacher succinctly stated that no one wanted to reverse the process:

We're in that stage--that growth, painful stage . . . where it's stressful. We've been doing this for three years now and we know what we're supposed to be doing, we know what the responsibilities are, and we've all felt the burden of changing our management style. And it would be very easy just to say, "Forget it. We'll go back to the way it was. . . ." But in actuality, if they tried to make us go back to the way it was, we would be very unruly.

(Teacher, #11)

### **Job Satisfaction**

The literature has noted the dissatisfactions associated with the assistant principalship (Austin, 1972; Austin & Brown, 1970; Black, 1980; Garawski, 1978; Marshall, 1985). Dissatisfactions have included trivial and unfulfilling tasks; inability to finish tasks, low salary levels, inadequate secretarial assistance, functioning in traditional organizational structures without innovation, and having superiors receive credit for assistants' work. Some evidence also exists that assistant principals have found some satisfactions in their roles (Bricker, 1991; Croft & Morton, 1977; Forcella, 1991; Patton, 1987). Associated with the satisfactions have been decision making responsibilities and duties such as teacher evaluation and preparation of the master schedule.

All administrators in the present study were asked about the effects of restructuring on the job satisfaction of assistant

principals. Of the four principals, one said job satisfaction would be greater if assistants were freed from disciplinary duties to be instructional leaders, one said it was the same or slightly better, and two said it was greater because assistants were working in a different climate, were given freedom and responsibility, and could "see the fruits of their work immediately." Of the twelve assistant principals, two perceived no relationship between restructuring and satisfaction, two said the level of satisfaction was about the same, one was unsure, one said it would be greater with an increased instructional focus. Fifty percent of the assistant principals said the level of satisfaction had increased. The six who were more satisfied attributed their satisfaction to being able to effect change; feeling valued and knowing their ideas were important; seeing more "good things" about teachers and parents and capitalizing on their strengths; being a part of decisions; utilizing teacher empowerment to obtain more input in their own decision making; and being involved in "various kinds of things and you can't be involved unless you are learned."

When analyzed on a case-by-case basis, the data revealed considerable consistency in the responses of the principals and their assistants. Administrators in schools where restructuring initiatives were more advanced were more likely to find satisfactions in the role. This suggests that administrators may have to experience some "growing pains" before enjoying the fruits of their labor.

### **Career Goals**

The literature on the career mobility of assistant principals reflects two views: the assistant principalship as a training ground for the principalship (Austin, 1972; Black, 1980; Bricker, 1991; Croft & Morton, 1977; Fulton, 1987; Howley, 1985; Smith, 1987), and the assistant principalship as a career choice (Gillespie, 1961; Iannacone & Podorf, 1984; Marshall, 1993; Pellicer & Stevenson, 1991). Although the 12 assistant principals were not asked to identify themselves as career

mobile or career stable, all administrators were asked whether restructuring would affect career goals of assistant principals in general.

The principals' responses were evenly divided (2 "yes" and 2 "no"). While one principal believed there would always two tracks for assistant principals, the others viewed the assistant principalship as a training ground for the principalship. Rotating their responsibilities was an important part of inspiring them to become principals.

Of the assistant principals, two were unsure, three said "no," and seven said "yes." Assistants who had negative responses said the position had always been viewed as a stepping stone to other positions or that one's career goals were only determined after one assumed the position. In contrast, assistants who had positive responses suggested that assistant principals would have the opportunity to develop leadership skills by facing different situations and developing their confidence levels. They also suggested that the role in a school that was restructuring was "closer to or would be more akin to the principalship," thus making it a good training ground. Regardless of whether the responses were positive or negative, the data suggested that school restructuring could enable assistant principals to develop skills essential for the career mobility.

Teachers were not asked about their perceptions of assistant principals' career goals, but some of them spontaneously expressed their thoughts on the topic during the interviews. An unexpected finding, therefore, was that teachers from three different schools had definite perceptions on the relationship between career mobility and job performance. Two teachers believed assistant principals who knew they were not going to be promoted were sometimes content to maintain the status quo, risked suffering burnout, and eventually viewed their jobs as a "dead-end deal." On the contrary, those who had higher aspirations were likely to generate ideas for new programs and find ways to address

problems. The implication was that upwardly mobile assistant principals were perhaps more effective than career stable assistant principals. However, another teacher noted that for many, the goal of becoming principal was "almost a dream because there are too many people vying for the positions, which is good because I think the cream will rise to the top."

In direct contrast to the other three teachers, the fourth teacher supported Marshall's (1993) assertion that not everyone has to become "enmeshed in the struggle to the top" (p. 3). Although many of her thoughts were questions, the implication was clear:

I wonder, people who are assistant principals, how do they see themselves? Is it just waiting to become a principal; is it a station somewhere between being a teacher and being a principal. . . ? I think it shouldn't be an interim goal. I mean, does every assistant principal have to become a principal? Have you not fulfilled your goal if you stay an assistant principal? Is that a bad thing? It seems to me that it is looked upon that way, that if you never become a principal, then something's wrong with you. And they need to change that. What's wrong with being an assistant principal for life? I think if you look at it like that, then you're not doing as good a job as you could, if it's only an interim job, just a step. . . . Just a thought. Have I failed if I don't become a principal? (Teacher, #16)

#### **Role of the Assistant Principal in Attaining Goals**

After interviewees specifically discussed changes in the role of the assistant principal, issues and concerns relative to the role, and recommended modifications, they were asked two questions pertaining to the goals of restructuring and the assistant principal's role in attaining those goals:

1. What do you see as the goals of restructuring in your school?

2. What is the role of the assistant principal in attaining those goals?

The second question was posed only after responses to the first had been recorded.

The definition of restructuring formulated by the NASSP Commission on Restructuring (1992) and selected for this study was used for data analysis. The definition states that restructuring is "the reforming of school organizational interrelationships and processes to increase student learning and performance" with a focus on eight dimensions:

- a. The quality of learning experiences and outcomes
- b. The professional role and performance of teachers
- c. Collaborative leadership and management
- d. Redefined and integrated curriculum
- e. Systematic planning and measurement of results
- f. Multiple learning sites and school schedules
- g. Coordination of community resources, human and fiscal
- h. Equity, fairness, and inclusion for all students (p. 3)

Responses to the question, What do you see as the goals of restructuring in your school, were analyzed and categorized in accordance with the eight dimensions of restructuring (see Appendix H). For all three groups, the greatest percentage of responses was located in the first dimension, the quality of learning experiences and outcomes. In some instances, participant responses pertained to several dimensions. Table 3 presents a frequency distribution of the stated goals of restructuring categorized by dimension and by groups (principals, assistant principals, and teachers).

For the total group the greatest percentage of responses to this question placed the goals of restructuring in three dimensions: quality of learning experiences and outcomes, collaborative leadership/management, and professional role and performance of teachers, respectively. All principals (100%), 11 of the 12 assistant

principals (92%), and 14 of the 18 teachers (78%) identified goals corresponding to these three dimensions. For the total group, 29 of the 34 interviewees (85%) focused on these dimensions.

Table 3

Frequency Distribution of Stated Goals of Restructuring Categorized by Dimension

Dimension	Number of Responses			Total
	Principal <sup>a</sup>	Assistant Principal <sup>b</sup>	Teachers <sup>c</sup>	
Quality of learning experiences and outcomes	4	8	12	71%
Professional role and performance of teachers	1	4	3	24%
Collaborative leadership/management	1	5	7	38%
Redefined and Integrated Curricula	1	2	1	12%
Systematic Planning and Measurement of Results	1	0	1	6%
Multiple Learning Sites and Schedules	0	0	0	0%
Coordination of Community Resources	0	1	1	6%
Equity, Fairness, and Inclusion for All Students	1	0	2	9%

Note. N = 34. The number of responses exceeds the number of participants because individual responses frequently pertained to several dimensions. <sup>a</sup>n = 4. <sup>b</sup>n = 12. <sup>c</sup>n = 18.

Responses to the second question, What is the role of the assistant principal in attaining those goals?, were also analyzed using the eight dimensions of restructuring defined by the NASSP Commission (1992). Using these dimensions, Appendix I presents illustrations of participant responses on the role of the assistant principal in attaining the goals of restructuring. Once again, the majority of the responses for the three groups pertained to the first three dimensions: quality of learning experiences and outcomes, collaborative leadership/management, and professional role and performance of teachers. A common thread in the principal's responses was that of helping teachers work with students, building trusting relationships with teachers, and being leaders. Assistant principals focused on supervising and monitoring instruction, having high expectations, being team players, creating an environment conducive to teaching and learning, and building trust. Teachers emphasized the assistant principal's role in collaborative leadership/management, especially in shared decision making and instructional leadership.

## Chapter 5

### Conclusions and Recommendations

This study has been conducted to fill a gap in the literature on the assistant principalship in schools that are restructuring. This chapter provides a summary of the study, conclusions from the study, methodological concerns, recommendations for further research, and implications for practice.

#### Summary of the Study

The study examined the role of the assistant principal in urban public high schools in southeastern Virginia that were restructuring. Four research questions provided the framework for investigation of the problem:

1. What is the current role of the assistant principal in high schools that are restructuring?
2. How has the role of the assistant principal changed as a result of restructuring?
3. What concerns and issues need to be considered for redefining the role of the assistant principal in high schools that are restructuring?
4. What modifications might be offered to enhance the role of the assistant principal in high schools that are restructuring?

The review of the literature on the assistant principalship and on restructuring revealed that the role of the assistant principal in general and in schools that are restructuring has been ignored. Themes identified for exploration included role definition, changing relationships, decision making, role conflict, role ambiguity, shared leadership, job satisfaction, and career goals.

A qualitative research design was employed, and four high schools participated in the study. Interviews were conducted with 34 participants, including 4 principals, 12 assistant principals, and 18 teachers. Data were analyzed using Miles and Huberman's (1994) methods for qualitative data analysis.

The findings showed that the primary duties and responsibilities of assistant principals at all sites were curriculum and instruction, pupil personnel, and school management. Assistant principals also had varying levels of involvement in staff/personnel, community relations, and student activities. Some shifts in levels of involvement resulted from school restructuring. Some shifts were specific to restructuring initiatives at individual sites. Transferring the responsibility for teacher substitutes to a site-based management team and reassigning the responsibility for student activities to a full-time coordinator were two examples. As in studies by Bricker (1991), Pellicer et al. (1988), and Patton (1987), developing the master schedule remained an important duty.

In contrast to Lacey's (1992) finding that assistants devoted little attention to curriculum and instruction because of task overload, principals and assistant principals identified instruction as the primary duty. Of the 12 assistant principals, only 4 focused on discipline and dealing with students as their primary responsibilities. This contrasted with the disciplinary focus in the literature. Teachers' views of the primary duties of the assistant principal were not entirely congruent with those of principals and assistant principals. Of the 18 teachers, 7 focused on discipline before discussing instructional duties. Teachers viewed instruction and discipline as equally important duties.

Previous research indicated that principals and assistant principals assumed responsibility for staff inservice more than 50% of the time (Pellicer et al., 1988). The data showed that assistant

principals assisted with staff development initiatives in all four schools, but the primary responsibility for staff development decisions had been transferred from the administrators to teachers in two schools.

Data in the school that had made the least progress in its restructuring efforts supported findings by Patton (1987) and Pellicer et al. (1988) that student discipline was first in degree of importance. Four assistant principals had discipline duties as assigned by grade level. Assistant principals in schools that had non-administrative disciplinary personnel, such as deans of students and full-time security monitors, were less likely to report that all assistant principals were involved with discipline. Some assistants whose primary duty was discipline also found pupil personnel to be quite meaningful, thus contradicting Black's (1980) findings.

Some changes in the role were site-specific. For example, three principals shared the responsibility for interviewing with their assistants, while assistant principals conducted all interviews for teacher personnel at the fourth school. At one school an assistant had a vital role in working with the community, while at another school both community relations and student activities had been assigned to a coordinator. Only one school remained traditional in assigning assistant principals to coordinate club activities, athletic events, school dances, and extracurricular programs. As in the literature, the assistant principal was still viewed by teachers as the person who kept the school going and who maintained organizational stability.

A somewhat surprising finding was that administrators and teachers in schools that were restructuring prioritized curriculum and instruction first in importance, followed by pupil personnel, thus reversing the rankings reported by Pellicer et al. (1988). These findings were also contrary to Patton's (1987) study in which assistant principals in Virginia ranked pupil personnel (student services) as most important.

As suggested by Marshall (1992) and in contrast to past practices where assistants retained the same duties for several years, job rotation was emphasized. Three principals had already made conscious efforts to rotate duties among the assistants. The consensus among principals was that the assistant principalship in schools that are restructuring should be characterized by diversity of responsibility. One reason for the existing diversity in the study schools was the ripple effect from the principal's expanding workload. In contrast to Sherman's findings that 40% of the assistant principals experienced no change in workload with a shared decision making model, data from all groups indicated that assistant principals, along with principals and teachers, were experiencing an increased workload. Although a few assistant principals mentioned the benefits of specialization in their roles, they also saw the benefits of rotating duties. At least 75% of the assistant principals emphasized the increased demand to be knowledgeable of current research and successful practices in education. From the teachers' perspective, limiting assistant principals only to specialized areas was inadvisable. Regardless of the degree of restructuring accomplished in their schools, teachers expected assistant principals to keep up with journals and have the knowledge and skills to fulfill any other assistant principal's role if needed.

Only 3 of the 12 assistants saw little or no change in their responsibilities. Half of the teachers said they had seen little or no change in the kinds of duties performed by the assistant principals. Four of these teachers were from the school least advanced in restructuring, and four of the remaining teachers did describe an increase in overall responsibilities and/or a heightened focus on instructional duties.

Along with modifications in some duties, changing relationships were more apparent in the schools that had progressed further in their restructuring initiatives. Most administrators and teachers described a

more collegial atmosphere in which "we" and "they" no longer existed, supporting Louis and Miles (1990) findings on what makes for successful reform in urban high schools.

Data from all schools indicated that the assistant principalship was more strongly affected by teacher participation in decision making than by parent or community input. Teacher perceptions at a given site were consistent with those of their administrators. In other words, teachers whose assistants displayed positive attitudes toward shared decision making likewise described both their own and the assistants' roles in a positive way. Teachers where some assistants had the "we have to adjust" attitude were much more likely to report little or no change in some assistant principals' decision making. Assistant principals who believed their decision making had not been influenced by teacher participation were the exception to the rule. Surprisingly few assistant principals emphasized frustrations relative to time required for shared decision making, although all groups acknowledged the time demands for shared decision making. Many believed the trade-off between time investment and the quality of the decisions was worthwhile.

Consistent with previous findings that "readiness entails a commitment to take risks" (Murphy, 1991), schools which were more advanced in restructuring inspired staff experimentation. Assistant principals had a critical role in teacher observations and evaluations, which historically have been threatening to teachers. A significant finding was that assistant principals' attitudes toward risk-taking and experimentation were equally as important as the principals' attitudes. The willingness to take risks was more evident in schools more advanced in restructuring.

From Louis and Miles' (1990) study on improvement in urban high schools to Meyers' (1995) analysis of the changing role of the principal in restructured schools, the need for ownership was emphasized.

According to the data, having ownership and being valued were just as important to assistant principals as to teachers.

Two frustrations associated with restructuring, according to the literature, were having to support inappropriate decisions made by empowered groups and relinquishing decision making power while maintaining accountability for the results. Such concerns either were minimal or were not expressed by the assistant principals in this study. Findings suggested that as restructuring evolved and assistant principals became more confident in the quality of shared decisions, concerns about accountability were supplanted by an orientation toward a collegial climate and shared accountability.

The literature suggested that the concept of leadership is changing in schools that are restructuring. Two key concepts emerged in the data: sharing leadership with others and fostering leadership in others. Louis and Miles (1990) emphasized the leader's role in the dynamic process of "visioning" (p. 237). The importance of vision and stability in leadership was particularly apparent at one school where initial efforts were interrupted because the rudiments of change had been established under the direction of a different principal. Changes in several members of the administrative staff meant that everyone had to experience another orientation period before progress could continue. This school's experience also reinforced the concept that a shared vision must be in place before real restructuring can occur.

Administrators and teachers in schools that had progressed further in their restructuring efforts attributed much of their success to the principals' belief in shared leadership. This was consistent with Richardson and Flanigan's (1991) contention that the principal is not the only person with a leadership role. Findings contradicted Lacey's (1992) finding that the term *leadership* is rarely applied to the assistant principalship and "thus understood as a quality not to be found in the position." Assistant principals discussed being asked for

their input; being given the opportunity to initiate, implement, and manage changes in programs; informing the principal as needed rather than getting permission; and having their ideas valued.

Whereas Marshall (1993) found that restructuring and site-based management had thrown the career assistant principal's role into turmoil, several career assistant principals conveyed positive attitudes toward teacher empowerment and shared decision making. The hierarchical structures in place prior to restructuring appeared to have flattened. In the new structures assistant principals and teachers had gained power, but the lines were blurred. Contrary to findings of Murphy et al. (1991), teachers did not express a belief that the administrators' role needed to be deemphasized and their power significantly reduced. Sherman (1991/1992) reported that assistant principals in schools where shared decision making was implemented were frustrated with being relegated to a second-rate position. In contrast to Sherman's findings, the data revealed that most assistant principals believed sharing power with others had positive benefits for administrators, teachers, and students and was essential in developing collegial, non-hierarchical relationships. Both assistant principals and teachers tended to define the assistant principal's role in terms of supporting and facilitating.

Of particular interest were three administrators who described a scenario in which the power of the assistant principal would become increasingly diminished as the power of teachers increased. Surprisingly, in this era of teacher empowerment none of the teachers speculated on a diminished role for the assistant principal, although one suggested a diminishing role for the principal.

For the participants in this study, *job description* was synonymous with the specific list of duties developed for each assistant principal at the school level. Most administrators and teachers were unsure of whether a citywide job description existed and were unable to produce one. Role ambiguity did not appear to be a major concern, although one

participant said assistant principals had wondered what their role would be when the school first started restructuring. Despite the increase in workload and the lack of formal job descriptions, assistant principals did not appear to need more specific job descriptions, nor did they appear to be experiencing dissatisfactions due to role ambiguity. Repeated complaints about the lack of job descriptions were conspicuous by their absence. Findings suggested that many concerns relative to role ambiguity and role conflict had been replaced by an orientation toward collaboration, shared decision making, a shared mission or vision, and a focus on student learning. Assistant principals saw the system working and, in most cases, working better. The unifying thread provided by restructuring, that is, mutual progress toward a goal and an emphasis on student learning, had apparently redefined their roles for them.

In a 1991 statement on restructuring the role of the assistant principal, NASSP's Council on the Assistant Principalship recommended that principals involve assistants in the school's total educational program. For example, a major role on the school-based management team was suggested. Surprisingly, the data indicated that this had occurred in only one school. Assistants did have opportunities to work with other facets of restructuring.

Administrators and teachers, especially at the school that had made the least progress in restructuring, still suggested redefining the role to enable assistant principals to get out of their offices and into the classrooms. Two of the four principals specifically recommended that assistants be trained first and foremost to be instructional leaders. The assistant principals made a similar recommendation for any school in the initial stages of restructuring. Teachers viewed training as essential for assistant principals who could share innovative techniques with the staff. One concern that emerged in teacher interviews was that assistant principals had not been given enough specific training before restructuring began. A specific aspect of instruction that emerged

during teacher interviews at all sites was the assistant principal's role in teacher training. Teachers suggested that assistant principals not only should facilitate in-service activities but also should model instructional techniques.

An interesting finding in a school that apparently had been successful in its restructuring initiatives was that teachers viewed the assistants' jobs as more difficult than their own, while the assistants viewed the teachers' jobs as more difficult. This mutual respect for each other's roles appeared to foster a supportive environment.

Administrators and teachers continued to see a need for assistants to have additional support to perform their duties. Because the "paperwork jungle" and certain other activities were viewed as jobs that did not require the expertise of an administrator, a frequently recommended modification was to restructure staff assignments to allow teachers, teacher assistants, secretaries or other paraprofessionals to complete those tasks. This restructuring had been accomplished to some extent in all schools, but support for non-administrative duties remained a concern as it had in the literature.

When analyzed on a case-by-case basis, the data revealed considerable consistency in the responses of principals and their assistants regarding job satisfaction. Administrators in schools where restructuring initiatives were more advanced were more likely to find satisfactions in the role. This suggests that administrators may have to experience some growing pains before enjoying the fruits of their labor. More than half of the assistant principals projected that restructuring would make the role more satisfying because the role was more akin to the principalship and allowed opportunities to develop leadership skills.

Five administrators either believed restructuring would have no effect on the career aspirations of assistants principals or were unsure of the potential effect. Nine administrators indicated that job

satisfaction would increase because assistant principals would have the opportunity to develop leadership skills by facing different situations and developing their confidence levels. They suggested that the role in schools that were restructuring was more akin to the principalship, thus making it a good training ground for the principalship. Teachers were not asked about their perceptions of assistant principals' career goals. An unexpected finding was that some teachers had definite perceptions on the relationship between career mobility and job performance. Two believed assistant principals who knew they were not going to be promoted were sometimes content to maintain the status quo and had little motivation to perform well. Another noted that for many, the goal of becoming principal was a dream because of the number of administrators vying for the positions. In direct contrast to the other three teachers, the fourth teacher supported Marshall's (1993) assertion that becoming a career assistant principal should be acceptable.

Assistant principals believed that their role in attaining the goals of restructuring was related to supervising and monitoring instruction, having high expectations, being team players, creating an environment conducive to teaching and learning, and building trust. Teachers emphasized the assistant principal's role in collaborative leadership/management, with a focus on shared decision making and instructional leadership.

#### Conclusions from the Study

Findings from this examination of the assistant principalship in high schools that are restructuring reveal that the role of the assistant principal has been redefined to some extent. Findings also suggest that further modifications may be advisable. Detailed below are the conclusions that have been drawn from this study.

1. The primary duties and responsibilities of the assistant principal are in the six areas identified in the literature: pupil personnel, curriculum and instruction, school management, staff/

personnel, community relations, and student activities. A common pattern in the data from principals, assistant principals, and teachers is the increased emphasis on instruction. Levels of involvement in other areas vary from site to site. Some responsibilities have been shifted to other personnel. It appears that schools share the increased emphasis on instruction. At the same time, just as individual schools are restructuring in ways that best meet the needs of their students, schools need some flexibility in defining the role of the assistant principal in accordance with the needs of the teachers, students, and the school community.

2. In schools that are restructuring, the most important responsibility of the assistant principal is instruction. As reported in the literature, assistant principals still maintain organizational stability by monitoring the school environment and supervising student behavior when students are not in class. The relationship between discipline and instruction is intertwined, especially from the perspective of the classroom teacher. Changing teachers' perceptions is more difficult than changing administrators' perceptions. It appears that the view of the assistant principal as only a disciplinarian can be altered if schools provide non-administrative personnel to handle many basic responsibilities relative to discipline.
3. Restricting an assistant principal to a specialized role for an extended period of time appears to be inadvisable. Restructuring requires all members of the leadership team to share an understanding of and commitment to the process. Developing such an understanding is possible only if assistant principals are not placed in "pigeon holes."
4. As suggested by NASSP's Council on the Assistant Principalship (1991), the assistant principal should actively participate in

shared decision making and instructional leadership. The assistant principal's contributions to school restructuring initiatives will be greater if appropriate training is provided prior to implementation and during implementation. Ownership is as important for assistant principals as it is for teachers, and their feelings of ownership can positively affect teacher attitudes toward restructuring.

5. The role of the assistant principal is enhanced under the leadership of principals who believe in shared leadership. This means that they are willing to share the power with assistant principals and teachers and to tap their potential. Assistant principals who are mentored by such principals see themselves as *leaders of leaders*.
6. Assistant principals still do not have a great deal of involvement in determining their role. Written lists of duties for individual assistant principals at the school site may serve as job descriptions. Role ambiguity does not appear to be a concern in terms of specific duties, but the role of the assistant principal can be associated with ambiguity when duties and responsibilities are shifted and when assistant principals are not involved in the planning stages for restructuring. Many concerns relative to role ambiguity and role conflict have been replaced by an orientation toward collaboration, shared decision making, a shared mission or vision, and a focus on student learning. Assistant principals see the system working and, in most cases, working better. The unifying thread provided by restructuring, that is, mutual progress toward a goal and an emphasis on student learning, has apparently redefined their roles for them.
7. A common concern in the literature and in this study is that restructuring is a time-hungry activity. The expanding workload of the principal is creating a ripple effect on the workload of the

assistant principal. If workloads continue to increase without adequate time and support to fulfill responsibilities, negative stresses associated with increasing expectations may lead to greater role conflict for assistant principals.

8. Shared decision making and site-based management can lead to collegial relationships between administrators and teachers, thus removing "we-they" divisions and flattening the traditional hierarchy. Shared decision making can also lead to higher quality decisions for assistant principals.
9. Assistant principals have a vital role in encouraging risk taking and experimentation. Teachers' attitudes are influenced by administrators' attitudes, and teachers have suggested that assistant principals need to understand what it is like to take risks.
10. A shared vision and a degree of stability in leadership are vital to the success of restructuring. In schools where restructuring initiatives are in their initial stages, simultaneous changes in the principal's position and several assistant principals' positions hampers progress.
11. The role of the career assistant principal is not necessarily thrown into turmoil by restructuring as was suggested by Marshall (1993). Some assistants have conveyed positive attitudes toward shared decision making and teacher empowerment.
12. In contrast to Sherman's (1991/1992) findings, the data revealed that most assistant principals believed sharing power with others had positive benefits for administrators, teachers, and students.
13. Support for restructuring is crucial to its success. Support for assistant principals is also crucial. Duties that do not require the knowledge and skills of an administrator have been transferred to other individuals at some schools. This practice enables the

assistant to focus on the purpose of educational leadership-- instruction.

14. A few anxieties relative to relinquishing the power to others lie just beneath the surface. Scenarios described by assistant principals about the diminishing role of the assistant principal indicate that the future of the role may be uncertain from their viewpoint. Interestingly, none of the teachers speculated on the diminishing role. This may confirm a view reported in the literature review; that is, teachers view assistant principals as more important in the overall functioning of the school than do the assistant principals themselves. On the other hand, this may suggest that teachers have more difficulty picturing the administrative structure of the school differently from the current organization than do administrators.
15. Administrators in schools where restructuring initiatives were more advanced were more likely to find satisfactions in the role. This suggests that administrators may have to experience some growing pains before enjoying the fruits of their labor.
16. The literature reveals that the assistant principalship may be a stepping stone to the principalship for some administrators or a career alternative for others. Overwhelmingly, the administrators in schools that are restructuring believe the assistant principalship enables assistants to have experiences akin to the principalship and to train for that role. Teachers view the role from different angles, suggesting that career mobile assistant principals will either be inspired to perform well or will view the position simply as a stepping stone. Only one teacher supported Marshall's (1993) finding that career assistant principals can make significant contributions to schools.
17. The role of the assistant principal in attaining the goals of restructuring focuses on the following: demonstrating

instructional leadership, having high expectations, being team players, creating an environment conducive to teaching and learning, building trust, and demonstrating collaborative leadership/management.

### Methodological Concerns

In the tradition of qualitative research, this study has provided rich descriptions of the assistant principalship in schools that were restructuring. The voices of the participants--4 principals, 12 assistant principals, and 18 teachers--provided the foundation for data analysis. The findings of the study, however, should be interpreted with an awareness of several methodological concerns.

After study sites were identified for participation, participants in this study were essentially self-selected. All four principals agreed to participate in the study, but 2 of the 14 assistant principals did not participate. One declined to participate because he had been an assistant principal for only three months when the study began. The other agreed to participate but later cancelled the interview appointment due to a scheduling conflict. Efforts to reschedule the appointment were unsuccessful. The 21 teachers selected for participation were identified by their principals. Three teachers chose not to participate. No attempt was made to interview teachers other than those selected by the principals. During data collection, patterns and themes emerged. Although some feedback on emerging themes was obtained from subsequent participants during data collection, no formal "member checks" were used for verification.

Participants were informed that their anonymity would be preserved although interviews were audio taped. One participant declined to be taped, and another was visibly uncomfortable during the taping. This participant's remarks came much more fluidly when the recorder was off. Although most participants appeared to be comfortable during the interviews, perhaps some consideration should be given to participants'

motives for participating and the extent to which they accurately reported their perceptions. An attempt to address this concern was made through the use of triangulation to confirm findings.

#### Recommendations for Further Research

This study has examined the current role of the assistant principal in high schools that are restructuring. It adds to the field's knowledge by examining changes in the assistant principalship that have occurred during high school restructuring. Areas examined include duties and responsibilities, relationships with school and community, decision making, leadership, and distribution of power.

Because this study was restricted to four urban high schools in southeastern Virginia, it has "only dimly illuminated" (Murphy, 1994) the area of research on restructuring dealing with the assistant principalship. Further research in this area is needed to delve into the unexplored facets of the assistant principalship, such as accountability in site-based management structures, evaluation policies and practices, changing relationships with parents, students, and the community, and the *leader of leaders* concept.

This study also provides insights on concerns and issues associated with the assistant principalship that may need to be considered by high schools that are restructuring. Future research in schools that have been involved in restructuring from five to seven years is recommended to identify and assess methods for addressing issues such as role ambiguity, role conflict, lack of training, and loss of power.

Current research addresses the career mobility and job satisfaction of assistant principals in traditional schools. Additional research is needed to answer questions such as, Is the assistant principalship a legitimate career alternative in schools that are restructuring? What will be the effect of restructuring on the job satisfaction of career mobile versus career stable assistant principals?

To what extent does the career mobility of assistant principals affect progress toward restructuring?

### Implications for Practice

Based on the findings and conclusions of this study, the following implications for practice are presented.

1. For years the knowledge and skills of the assistant principal have been underutilized. This study suggests that assistant principals are becoming increasingly involved in instruction. Principals should consult assistant principals in identifying work experiences that not only will tap the potential of the individuals in this position but also will clearly establish the assistant principalship as vital to school restructuring. A commitment to shared leadership is essential to this process. Consideration should be given to reassigning duties that do not require the expertise of an administrator.
2. Principals should give careful consideration to job rotation and issues related to specialization versus generalization. A balance between the two may be the best solution.
3. Among the teachers' expectations for the assistant principal is that assistant principals will be knowledgeable of a variety of instructional techniques for improving teaching and learning. School districts committed to restructuring must realize that funding for staff development is essential. Districts should ensure that professional development for the assistant principal is a top priority. Assistant principals should be trained to model the instructional strategies being adopted by their schools.
4. Decision makers responsible for approving changes in administrative positions should consider the characteristics that appear to contribute to successful relationships between teachers and assistant principals in schools that are restructuring. For

example, assistant principals need to willing to take risks themselves and to encourage others to experiment.

### References

- Austin, D. B. (1972). The assistant principal--What does he do? Theory Into Practice, 11(1), 68-72.
- Austin, D. B., & Brown, H. L., Jr. (1970). Report of the assistant principalship. The Study of the Secondary School Principalship: Vol. 3. Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.
- Biddle, B. J. (1979). Role theory: Expectations, identities, and behaviors. New York: Academic Press.
- Black, A. B. (1980). Clarifying the role of the assistant principal. NASSP Bulletin, 64(436), 33-39.
- Bogdan, R. C., & Biklen, S. K. (1992). Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Borg, W. R., & Gall, M. D. (1989). Educational research: An introduction (5th ed.). New York: Longman.
- Boyer, E. L. (1983). High school: A report on secondary education in America. New York: Harper & Row.
- Brandt, R. (1990). Overview. Educational Leadership, 47(7), 3.
- Bricker, J. B. (1991). A descriptive study of the demographic characteristics of secondary school assistant principals in South Carolina (Doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina, 1991). Dissertation Abstracts International, 52, 1955.
- Brottman, M. A. (1981, March). The assistant principal as decision maker. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Eastern Educational Research Association, Philadelphia.
- Calabrese, R. L., & Adams, C. F. (1987). A comparative analysis of alienation among secondary school administrators. Planning and Changing, 18(2), 90-97.

- Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. (1986). A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century. Washington, D.C.: Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy.
- Cawelti, G. (1994). High school restructuring: A national study (ERS Report). Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service.
- Clemons, M. J. (1989). The assistant principal's responsibility in school-based management systems. NASSP Bulletin, 73(518), 33-36.
- Cohen, M. (1990). Key issues confronting state policymakers. In R. F. Elmore & Associates (Eds.), Restructuring schools: The next generation of educational reform (pp. 251-288). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Conley, D. T. (1991). What is restructuring? Educators adapt to a changing world. Equity and Choice, 7, 46-51.
- Conley, D. T. (1992). Some emerging trends in school restructuring (Contract No. OERI R188062004). Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED). (ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management No. EDO-EA-92-3)
- Coppedge, F. L. (1968). The "new" image of the assistant principal. The Clearing House, 42, 283-287.
- Croft, J. C., & Morton, J. R. (1977, April). The assistant principal: In quandry or comfort? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (1993). Reframing the school reform agenda: Developing capacity for school transformation. Phi Delta Kappan, 74, 753-761.
- David, J. L. (1990). Restructuring in progress: Lessons from pioneering districts. In R. F. Elmore & Associates (Eds.), Restructuring schools: The next generation of educational reform (pp. 209-250). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Davidson, L. O. (1992). The role of the assistant principal in selected secondary school districts in the state of Mississippi: A

- comparison of principals and assistant principals (Doctoral dissertation, University of Mississippi, 1991). Dissertation Abstracts International, 52, 3135.
- Dean, D. G. (1961). Alienation: Its meaning and measurement. American Sociological Review, 26, 753-758.
- Edison, E. L. (1993). Career assistant principals: Job satisfaction, self-efficacy, and perceptions of task structure (Doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University, 1992). Dissertation Abstracts International, 53, 4146.
- Elmore, R. F. (1990). Introduction: On changing the structure of public schools. In R. F. Elmore & Associates (Eds.), Restructuring schools: The next generation of educational reform (pp. 1-28). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Forcella, T. A. (1991). An examination of job satisfaction, role ambiguity, and role conflict with respect to career mobile and career stable assistant principals in Massachusetts public high schools (Doctoral dissertation, University of Bridgeport, 1991). Dissertation Abstracts International, 52, 1146.
- Fulton, O. K. (1987). Basic competencies of the assistant principal. NASSP Bulletin, 71(501), 52, 54.
- Garawski, R. A. (1978). The assistant principal: His job satisfaction, and organizational potency. Clearing House, 52, 8-10.
- Getzels, J. W., & Guba, E. G. (1954). Role, role conflict, and effectiveness: An empirical study. American Sociological Review, 19, 164-175.
- Getzels, J. W., Lipham, J. M., & Campbell, R. F. (1968). Educational administration as a social process. New York: Harper & Row.
- Gideonse, H. D. (1990). Organizing schools to encourage teacher inquiry. In R. F. Elmore & Associates (Eds.), Restructuring schools: The next generation of educational reform (pp. 97-124). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Gillespie, T. M. (1961). The assistant principal: Status, duties, and responsibilities. NASSP Bulletin, 45(269), 59-68.
- Glanz, J. (1994). Where did the assistant principalship begin? Where is it headed? NASSP Bulletin, 78, 35-40.
- Goodlad, J. I. (1984). A place called school: Prospects for the future. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Gorton, R. (1987). Improving the assistant principalship: The principal's contribution. NASSP Bulletin, 71(501), 1-4.
- Greenfield, W. D. (1985a). Developing an instructional role for the assistant principal. Education and Urban Society, 18, 85-92.
- Greenfield, W. D. (1985b). Studies of the assistant principalship: Toward new avenues of inquiry. Education and Urban Society, 18, 7-27.
- Hallinger, P., & Hausman, C. (1993). The changing role of the principal in a school of choice. In J. Murphy & P. Hallinger (Eds.), Restructuring schooling: Learning from ongoing efforts (pp. 114-142). Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.
- Hallinger, P., Murphy, J., & Hausman, C. (1992). Restructuring schools: Principals' perceptions of fundamental educational reform. Educational Administration Quarterly, 28, 330-349.
- Heck, R. H. (1992). Public school restructuring in Chicago: Indicator of another revolution in the politics of education? Equity & Excellence, 25, 216-221.
- Hess, F. (1985). The socialization of the assistant principal: From the perspective of the local school district. Education and Urban Society, 18(1), 93-106.
- Holmes Group. (1986). Tomorrow's teachers. East Lansing, MI: Author.
- Howley, P. (1985). The assistant principalship--Changes, speculations offered. NASSP Bulletin, 69, 88-89.

- Hunter, D. R. (1990, December). How to increase assistant principals' involvement in class management. Tips for Principals from NASSP, 4-5.
- Hurley, L. (1965). The vice principal: Educational leader or hatchet man? NASSP Bulletin, 49(297), 12-14.
- Iannacone, G., & Podorf, F. (1984). Assistant principals: Who are they and what changes can they expect in the position? NASSP Bulletin, 68(472), 116-118.
- Jarrett, R. W. (1958). The activities of the assistant principal in secondary schools. NASSP Bulletin, 42, 27-30.
- Jick, T. D. (1983). Mixing qualitative and quantitative methods: Triangulation in action. In J. Van Mannen (Ed.), Qualitative methodology (pp. 135-148). Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Johnson, S. M. (1990). Redesigning teachers' work. In R. F. Elmore & Associates (Eds.), Restructuring schools: The next generation of educational reform (pp. 125-151). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kahn, R. L., Wolfe, D. M., Quinn, R. P., & Snoek, J. D. (1964). Organizational stress: Studies in role conflict and ambiguity. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Kelly, G. (1987). The assistant principalship as a training ground for the principalship. NASSP Bulletin, 71(501), 13-20.
- Knezevich, S. J. (1984). Administration of public education. New York: Harper & Row.
- Lacey, F. M. (1992). The roles, responsibilities, and status of assistant principals in the Chicago public high schools (Doctoral dissertation, University of Illinois at Chicago, 1992). Dissertation Abstracts International, 53, 1007.
- Leithwood, K. (1992). Images of future school administration: Moving on from "instructional leadership" to "transformational leadership." Educational Leadership, 49(5), 8-12.

- Lewis, A. (1989). Restructuring America's schools. Arlington, VA: American Association of School Administrators.
- Lightfoot, S. L. (1983). The good high school: Portraits of character and culture. New York: Basic Books.
- Locke, L. F., Spirduso, W. W., & Silverman, S. J. (1987). Proposals that work: A guide for planning dissertations and grant proposals. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Louis, K. S., & Miles, M. B. (1990). Improving the urban high school: What works and why. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Maeroff, G. I. (1988). Withered hopes, stillborn dreams: The dismal panorama of urban schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 69, 633-638.
- Marshall, C. (1985). Professional shock: The enculturation of the assistant principal. Education and Urban Society, 18(1), 28-58.
- Marshall, C. (1992). The assistant principal: Leadership choices and challenges. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.
- Marshall, C. (1993). The unsung role of the career assistant principal. Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.
- Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. (1989). Designing qualitative research. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- McCarthy, J., & Still, S. (1993). Hollibrook accelerated elementary school. In J. Murphy & P. Hallinger (Eds.), Restructuring schooling: Learning from ongoing efforts (pp. 63-83). Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.
- McElveen, K. P. (1990). A comparison of job perceptions, job roles, job satisfaction, and career plans of more and less experienced secondary school assistant principals (Doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina, 1989). Dissertation Abstracts International, 50, 119.
- McIntyre, K. E. (1988, November). How to increase the assistant principal's effectiveness. Tips for Principals from NASSP, 4-5.

- Meyers, E. (1995, May). Changing schools, changing roles--Redefining the role of the principal in a restructured school. A report from IMPACT II--The Teachers Network. New York: William T. Grant Foundation.
- Michaels, M. L. (1965). The role of the assistant principal. NASSP Bulletin, 49(297), 5-11.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). Qualitative data analysis (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Mitchell, B. A. (1988). Modes for managing the assistant principalship: Sex differences in socialization, role orientation and mobility of public secondary school assistant principals (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1987). Dissertation Abstracts International, 49, 396.
- Murphy, J. (1991). Restructuring schools: Capturing and assessing the phenomena. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Murphy, J. (1993). Restructuring: In search of a movement. In J. Murphy & P. Hallinger (Eds.), Restructuring schooling: Learning from ongoing efforts (pp. 1-31). Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.
- Murphy, J. (1994, April). The changing role of the superintendency in restructuring districts in Kentucky. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.
- Murphy, J., Evertson, C. M., & Radnofsky, M. L. (1991). Restructuring schools: Fourteen elementary and secondary teachers' perspectives on reform. The Elementary School Journal, 92, 135-148.
- Murphy, J., & Hallinger, P. (Eds.). (1993). Restructuring schooling: Learning from ongoing efforts. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin.
- Murphy, J., & Louis, K. S. (Eds.). (1994). Reshaping the principalship: Insights from transformational change efforts. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin/Sage.

- NASSP Commission on Restructuring. (1992). A leader's guide to school restructuring. Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.
- NASSP's Council on the Assistant Principalship. (1991). Restructuring the role of the assistant principal. Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.
- National Governors' Association. (1986). Time for results. Washington, DC: Author.
- Newmann, F. M. (1991a). Linking restructuring to authentic student achievement. Phi Delta Kappan, 72, 458-463.
- Newmann, F. M. (1991b). What is a "restructured" school? A framework to clarify means and ends. A framework for school restructuring (Issue Report No. 1). National Center on Organization and Restructuring of Schools. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin-Madison.
- Norton, M. S., & Kriekard, J. A. (1987). Real and ideal competencies for the assistant principal. NASSP Bulletin, 71(501), 23-30.
- O'Neil, J. (1990). Piecing together the restructuring puzzle. Educational Leadership, 47(7), 4-10.
- Ornstein, A. C. (1991). Reforming American schools: The role of the states. NASSP Bulletin, 75(537), 46-55.
- Ortiz, F. I. (1982). Career patterns in education: Women, men, and minorities in public school administration. South Hadley, MA: J. F. Bergen.
- Palanki, A. (1991). Chicago school reform: An overview. Equity and Choice, 8(1), 4-6.
- Panyako, D., & Rorie, L. (1987). The changing role of the assistant principal. NASSP Bulletin, 71(501), 6-8.
- Patton, J. (1987). The role and function of assistant principals in Virginia senior high schools. (Doctoral dissertation, Virginia

- Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1987). Dissertation Abstracts International, 48, 1371.
- Pellicer, L. O., Anderson, L. W., Keefe, J. W., Kelley, E. A., & McCleary, L. E. (1988). High school leaders and their schools: Vol. 1. A national profile. Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.
- Pellicer, L. O., & Stevenson, K. R. (1991). The assistant principalship as a legitimate terminal career alternative. NASSP Bulletin, 75, 59-65.
- Peterson, K. D., Marshall, C., & Grier, T. (1987). The assistant principals' academy: Technical training and socialization of future leaders. NASSP Bulletin, 71(501), 32-38.
- Pfeffer, E. I. (1955). Duties of vice principals in New Jersey. NASSP Bulletin, 39, 57-67.
- Potter, J. M., Jr. (1980). Enhancing the role of the assistant principal. NASSP Bulletin, 64(436), 9-13.
- Prestine, N. A. (1993). Feeling the ripples, riding the waves: Making an essential school. In J. Murphy & P. Hallinger (Eds.), Restructuring schooling: Learning from ongoing efforts (pp. 32-62). Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.
- Raywid, M. A. (1990). Rethinking school governance. In R. F. Elmore & Associates (Eds.), Restructuring schools: The next generation of educational reform (pp. 152-205). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Reed, D. B., & Conners, D. A. (1982). The vice principalship in urban high schools: A field study. Urban Education, 16, 465-481.
- Reed, D. B., & Himmler, A. H. (1985). The work of the secondary assistant principalship: A field study. Education and Urban Society, 18, 59-84.
- Reitzug, U., & Cross, B. (1994, April). A multi-site case study of site-based management in urban schools. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.

- Richardson, J. (1993, April 21). Assistant principal's role--often ignored or misunderstood--is changing with the times. Education Week, pp. 6-7.
- Richardson, M. D., & Flanigan, J. L. (1991). Removing the barriers to effectiveness: A practical approach to assistant principal staff development. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Association of School Administrators Conference-within-a-Convention, New Orleans, LA.
- Rodrick, L. (1986). Working with assistant principals to achieve maximum value. NASSP Bulletin, 70(487), 91-93.
- Schlechty, P. (1990). Schools for the twenty-first century: Leadership imperatives for educational reform. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Scott, D. (1990). Examining the role of the assistant principal: Role orientation, task assignment and upward mobility of the public secondary school assistant principal (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1989). Dissertation Abstracts International, 51, 374.
- Sherman, E. H. (1992). Perceptions of senior high school assistant principals on the impact of shared decision-making in the Los Angeles Unified School District (Doctoral dissertation, Pepperdine University, 1991). Dissertation Abstracts International, 52, 2360.
- Shockley, R. E., & Smith, Denis D. (1981). The co-principal: Looking at realities. The Clearing House, 55(2), 90-93.
- Short, P. M., & Greer, J. T. (1993). Restructuring schools through empowerment. In J. Murphy & P. Hallinger (Eds.), Restructuring schooling: Learning from ongoing efforts (pp. 165-187). Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.
- Sizer, T. R. (1984). Horace's compromise: The dilemma of the American high school. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Slavin, R. E., Madden, N. A., Shaw, A. H., Mainzer, K. L., & Donnelly, M. C. (1993). Success for all: Three case studies of comprehensive

- restructuring of urban elementary schools. In J. Murphy & P. Hallinger (Eds.), Restructuring schooling: Learning from ongoing efforts (pp. 84-113). Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.
- Smith, J. A. (1987). Assistant principals: New demands, new realities, and new perspectives. NASSP Bulletin, 71(501), 9-12.
- Van Eman, C. R. (1926). The functions of the assistant high school principal and other assistant executives. Educational Research Bulletin, 5, 148-150.
- Webb, J., Corbett, H. D., & Wilson, B. L. (1993). Restructuring systemically for students: Can it be more than just talk? In J. Murphy & P. Hallinger (Eds.), Restructuring schooling: Learning from ongoing efforts (pp. 188-215). Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.
- Wehlage, G., Smith, G., & Lipman, P. (1992). Restructuring urban schools: The New Futures Experience. American Educational Research Journal, 29(1), 51-93.
- Weinholtz, D. (1991). Restructuring an urban high school (Fastback 323). Bloomington: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation.
- Wells, P. C., Nelson, R. H., & Johnsen, E. M. (1965). The assistant secondary school principal: The professional literature says. NASSP Bulletin, 49(297), 15-22.
- Wilson, B. L., & Corcoran, T. B. (1988). Successful secondary schools: Visions of excellence in American public education. Philadelphia: Falmer Press.

## **Appendixes**

## Appendix A

### SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING SURVEY

**Directions:** Please indicate the extent to which each statement describes the existing conditions in your school by **CIRCLING THE APPROPRIATE RESPONSE.**

1. Teachers, parents, and other community leaders work together to develop
  - a. a mission statement for my school.  

*Extensively   Considerably   Moderately   Slightly   Not at all*
  - b. goals and objectives for my school.  

*Extensively   Considerably   Moderately   Slightly   Not at all*
2. My school has building-level control of
  - a. the instructional program (school or faculty council, site-/school-based management, etc.).  

*Extensively   Considerably   Moderately   Slightly   Not at all*
  - b. budget.  

*Extensively   Considerably   Moderately   Slightly   Not at all*
  - c. staffing.  

*Extensively   Considerably   Moderately   Slightly   Not at all*
3. My school involves staff in shared decision making.  

*Extensively   Considerably   Moderately   Slightly   Not at all*
4. Teachers have ownership of school improvement (consensus decision making, collaborative projects, etc.).  

*Extensively   Considerably   Moderately   Slightly   Not at all*
5. My school promotes the creation of new roles (e.g., teachers as leaders, evaluators, mentors, curriculum developers, and facilitators of student learning; administrators as facilitators of teachers and as instructional leaders).  

*Extensively   Considerably   Moderately   Slightly   Not at all*

6. My school regularly monitors
- current or past student perceptions of our school climate.  
*Extensively   Considerably   Moderately   Slightly   Not at all*
  - teacher perceptions of our school climate.  
*Extensively   Considerably   Moderately   Slightly   Not at all*
  - parent perceptions of our school climate.  
*Extensively   Considerably   Moderately   Slightly   Not at all*
7. My school encourages experimentation, risk taking, and innovative problem solving.  
*Extensively   Considerably   Moderately   Slightly   Not at all*
8. My school incorporates current research on school and classroom effectiveness in its programs.  
*Extensively   Considerably   Moderately   Slightly   Not at all*
9. My school uses a flexible approach in scheduling student time (block, continuous progress, etc.).  
*Extensively   Considerably   Moderately   Slightly   Not at all*
10. Instruction is learner-centered rather than subject-centered. (To what extent?)  
*Extensively   Considerably   Moderately   Slightly   Not at all*
11. My school promotes the inclusion of students with different learning needs through
- magnet programs.  
*Extensively   Considerably   Moderately   Slightly   Not at all*
  - alternative education.  
*Extensively   Considerably   Moderately   Slightly   Not at all*
  - school-within-a-school concept.  
*Extensively   Considerably   Moderately   Slightly   Not at all*
  - special education.  
*Extensively   Considerably   Moderately   Slightly   Not at all*

12. My school uses a personalized/diagnostic-prescriptive approach to student learning and instruction.
- Extensively      Considerably      Moderately      Slightly      Not at all*
13. Teachers use a variety of instructional strategies based on student needs (flexible teaching styles and a range of instructional methods).
- Extensively      Considerably      Moderately      Slightly      Not at all*
14. The curriculum includes
- a. global perspectives.
- Extensively      Considerably      Moderately      Slightly      Not at all*
- b. multicultural perspectives.
- Extensively      Considerably      Moderately      Slightly      Not at all*
- c. cross-cultural perspectives.
- Extensively      Considerably      Moderately      Slightly      Not at all*
- d. interdisciplinary perspectives.
- Extensively      Considerably      Moderately      Slightly      Not at all*
15. Technology plays an integral role in curriculum, teaching and learning, or assessment (use of CD-ROM, multimedia, networking, simulations, word processing applications, etc.).
- Extensively      Considerably      Moderately      Slightly      Not at all*
16. Various samples of student work are used to evaluate performance (portfolios, exhibitions, demonstrations, performances, etc.).
- Extensively      Considerably      Moderately      Slightly      Not at all*
17. My school systematically collects data to examine
- a. school budgeting.
- Extensively      Considerably      Moderately      Slightly      Not at all*
- b. program improvement.
- Extensively      Considerably      Moderately      Slightly      Not at all*

18. Data collected on school programs is used to modify and improve programs.  
*Extensively   Considerably   Moderately   Slightly   Not at all*
19. My school participates actively in building and maintaining alliances with  
 a. community foundations, advocacy groups, or businesses.  
*Extensively   Considerably   Moderately   Slightly   Not at all*  
 b. other public schools, community colleges, or universities.  
*Extensively   Considerably   Moderately   Slightly   Not at all*
20. My school provides time for staff to assume new roles and responsibilities (time for planning, working with colleagues, school decision making, and released time for professional development activities, etc.).  
*Extensively   Considerably   Moderately   Slightly   Not at all*
21. Staff development decisions are made at the building level.  
*Extensively   Considerably   Moderately   Slightly   Not at all*
22. Major structural changes have already been implemented in my school.  
*Extensively   Considerably   Moderately   Slightly   Not at all*
23. Please indicate any other ways in which your school is restructuring.
- a. \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_
- b. \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_
- c. \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

Selected items adapted from the National Association of Secondary School Principals, "NASSP Quick Survey on School Restructuring," *A Leader's Guide to School Restructuring: A Special Report of the NASSP Commission on Restructuring*, 1992, pp. 8-9, and from Richard F. Elmore and Associates, "What Restructuring School Districts Do," *Restructuring Schools: The Next Generation of Educational Reform*, pp. 244-245 (Table 7.2). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 1990.

## Appendix B

### CONSENT FOR RESEARCH STUDY

Subject Group: Administrators and teachers in selected high schools in Virginia  
 Method: Interview  
 Title of Project: Redefining the Role of the Assistant Principal in High Schools in Virginia That Are Restructuring  
 Investigator: Teresa K. Mizelle  
 Name of Volunteer: \_\_\_\_\_

TO PERSONS WHO AGREE TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS STUDY: The following information is provided to inform you of the nature of the research project and your participation in it. Please read this information carefully and feel free to ask any questions concerning it.

PURPOSE OF STUDY: The purpose of this study is to examine the assistant principalship in high schools in Virginia that are restructuring.

PROCEDURES THAT INVOLVE INTERVIEWEE: I will meet with you at times and in school locations convenient to you. During the interview, I will use an interview guide to ask questions pertaining to the assistant principalship and restructuring. Questions will focus on what has been the role of the high school assistant principal, the role of the assistant principal in the restructured environment in light of the goals of restructuring, concerns and issues that need to be considered for redefining the role of the assistant principal in high schools in the restructuring process, and modifications that might be offered to enhance the role of the assistant principal in high schools in the restructuring process. With your permission, interviews will be taped for accuracy of data collection.

LENGTH OF TIME INVOLVING INTERVIEWEES: Each interview will last approximately 1-1½ hours. If necessary, follow-up interviews of approximately 20 minutes to 1 hour will be conducted to clarify interview data and to ensure accuracy of interpretations. Follow-up contacts will be made by phone or in person at times convenient to participants.

CONFIDENTIALITY: I will preserve the anonymity of the participants in this study. In reporting this study, I will not reveal the identity of the school or the school division unless authorized by your research department. Each participant will have the opportunity to strike from my notes any comments with which the participant is uncomfortable or to amend my notes for clarification or accuracy. Taped interviews will be destroyed following completion of the dissertation.

PARTICIPATION IS TOTALLY VOLUNTARY AND YOU ARE FREE TO WITHDRAW THIS CONSENT AND TO DISCONTINUE PARTICIPATION IN THIS STUDY AT ANY TIME.

*I have read the consent form, and I understand the procedures to be used in this study. I freely and voluntarily choose to participate. I understand that I may withdraw at any time.*

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Signature of participant*

\_\_\_\_\_  
*Date*

If you would like further information or would like to obtain information about the results of this study, please contact me by phone (547-0153, extension 256) or by mail (Teresa Mizelle, Chesapeake Public Schools, School Administration Building, P.O. Box 15204, Chesapeake, Virginia 23328).

## Appendix C

### Interview Guide for Principals

#### A. Background

1. How long have you been principal of \_\_\_\_ High School?
2. What were your previous positions in education? (complete #11, Biographical Sketch)
3. How many assistant principals are currently assigned to your school? specific titles?

#### B. Present roles and responsibilities of assistant principals

1. What do you see as the primary duties and responsibilities of your assistant principals?
  - \_\_\_\_ a. Pupil Personnel (discipline, attendance, special education/Child Study Team)
  - \_\_\_\_ b. School Management (budget, facilities use, buses, school policies, graduation)
  - \_\_\_\_ c. Staff/Personnel (recruitment/selection, teacher duty rosters, substitutes, teacher incentives/motivation)
  - \_\_\_\_ d. Instruction (teacher evaluation, professional development, curriculum development/evaluation, teaching classes, master schedule, innovations/experiments/research)
  - \_\_\_\_ e. Student Activities (student organizations, athletic program)
  - \_\_\_\_ f. Community Relations (communications, reports/newsletters, human resources/materials, liaison with community youth-serving agencies)
2. In which area(s) do your assistant principals have their greatest responsibility? (Clarify: in terms of importance or in terms of time)
3. In which areas do your assistant principals have the least responsibility--little or no involvement? (budget, staffing, curriculum, data collection and analysis)

**C. Changes in roles, responsibilities, and relationships as a result of restructuring**

1. How have the assistant principals' responsibilities changed as a result of restructuring?  
(Probes: level of involvement in developing the mission statement, strategic planning, school improvement team or council, specific duty areas, etc.)
2. Has restructuring affected the way assistant principals think about their work? If so, in what way?
3. Is restructuring affecting your assistant principals' relationships with others? If so, in what way? (Probe: more about relationship with principal, other assistant principals in the school and district, teachers, central office, and community)
4. How has the making of decisions changed for assistant principals as a result of restructuring or how are decisions made? (self-initiated, involvement of others, relationship between principal and assistant principal - specific examples?)

**D. The future**

1. Based on your experiences, what concerns and issues for redefining the role of the assistant principal need to be considered by high schools in the restructuring process or that are beginning the restructuring process?
2. What changes would you suggest to enhance the role of the assistant principal in high schools that are restructuring? (at school or district level - changes already made and other suggested changes)

**E. Goals of restructuring**

1. What do you see as the goals of restructuring in your school?
  - a. Which are the most difficult to attain?
  - b. Which are the easiest to attain?
2. What is the assistant principal's role in attaining these goals?
3. What do you see as the goals of restructuring in general?

**F. A final note**

1. Do your assistant principals have written job descriptions? How are the job descriptions developed? Do you believe the written job descriptions reflect the actual duties and responsibilities?

How are assistant principals evaluated?

2. In general, do you believe that assistant principals' levels of job satisfaction as a result of restructuring are more, less, or the same? Why?
3. In general, do you believe that restructuring has affected or will affect assistant principals' career goals? If so, in what way?
4. What additional information do I need to know about the assistant principalship?

## Appendix D

## Principal's Biographical Sketch

1. Interviewee Number: \_\_\_\_\_ Date of Interview: \_\_\_\_\_
2. Name: \_\_\_\_\_
3. Title: \_\_\_\_\_
4. School: \_\_\_\_\_
5. Sex:            ☐ Male            ☐ Female
6. Age:            ☐ 20-29            ☐ 30-39            ☐ 40-49            ☐ 50-59            ☐ 60 or over
7. Ethnicity:    ☐ African-American    ☐ Hispanic    ☐ Asian  
☐ Native American    ☐ Caucasian    ☐ Other \_\_\_\_\_
8. Highest degree received:  
☐ B.A. or B.S.                      ☐ Ed.D. or Ph.D.  
☐ M.A. or M.S.                      ☐ Other \_\_\_\_\_
9. How long have you been a principal? \_\_\_\_\_ years
10. How long have you been in your present position? \_\_\_\_\_ years
11. Please indicate your previous positions in education in chronological order by completing the table below. (Please begin with your first position in education.)

DATES	POSITION	LEVEL	NO. YEARS
TOTAL YEARS IN EDUCATION			

# Appendix E

## Question Codes (Based on Interview Guides)

TOPIC AREA	QUESTION	AP.INT	PRIN.INT	TCH.INT
Background	How did you become an assistant principal? Why?	HOW.AP		
Present roles and responsibilities	What do you see as your primary duties and responsibilities as an assistant principal?	DUTP.AP	DUTP.P	DUTP.T
	In which areas do you have the greatest responsibility?	RESG.AP	RESG.P	RESG.T
	In which areas do you have the least responsibility--little or no involvement?	RESL.AP	RESL.P	RESL.T
	Which of your current responsibilities do you find most meaningful or worthwhile? Why?	MEANG.AP		
	Which of your current responsibilities do you find least meaningful or worthwhile? Why?	MEANL.AP		
Changes in roles, responsibilities, and relationships as a result of restructuring	How have your (or the APs) responsibilities changed as a result of restructuring?	CHG.AP	CHG.P	CHG.T
	Has restructuring affected the way you think about your work? If so, in what way?	THK.AP	THK.P	
	Is restructuring affecting your relationships with others? If so, in what way?	REL.AP	REL.P	REL.T
	How has the making of decisions changed or how are decisions made?	DEC.AP	DEC.P	DEC.T
The future	Based on your experiences, what concerns and issues for redefining the role of the assistant principal need to be considered by high schools in the restructuring process or that are beginning the restructuring process?	CON.AP	CON.P	CON.T
	What changes would you suggest to enhance the role of the assistant principal in high schools that are restructuring?	ENH.AP	ENH.P	ENH.T

TOPIC AREA	QUESTION	AP.INT	PRIN.INT	TCH.INT
Goals of Restructuring	What do you think are the goals of restructuring in your school? Which are most difficult to attain? Which are easiest to attain?	GOLS.AP	GOLS.P	GOLS.T
	What is the your role in attaining these goals?	ATT.AP	ATT.P	ATT.T
	What do you see as the goals of restructuring in general?	GOLG.AP	GOLG.P	
A final note	Do you have a written job description? How was it developed? Does your job description reflect your actual duties and responsibilities? How are APs evaluated?	JOB.AP  EVAL.AP	JOB.P  EVAL.P	JOB.T  EVAL.T
	Is your (ap's) level of job satisfaction as a result of restructuring more, less, or the same? In what way or why?	SAT.AP	SAT.P	
	Do you believe that restructuring has affected or will affect assistant principals' career goals or plans? If so, in what way?	CAR.AP	CAR.P	
	What additional information do I need to know about the assistant principalship?	ADD.AP	ADD.P	ADD.T

## Appendix F

### Duties Codes

MAJOR AREAS	MAJOR AREA CODE	SPECIFIC DUTIES	SUBCODES	KEY WORDS FOR SEARCH
SCHOOL MANAGEMENT	MGT	Facilities use/maintenance Transportation/parking Budget preparation School safety/security Inventory (e.g., textbooks, keys) Local, state, federal reports In charge when principal is absent	MGT.FAC MGT.TRAN MGT.BUD MGT.SAF MGT.INV  MGT.REP MGT.ABS	facilities, maintenance transportation, parking, budget safe, security, safety inventory, textbook, key reports absence
STAFF/ PERSONNEL	PER	Evaluation/observation Interviews/ recruitment/selection Counseling/conflict resolution Staff development/training	PER.EVAL PER.INT  PER.COUN PER.DEV	evaluations, observations interview, recruitment counsel, liaison development, in-service
INSTRUCTION	INS	Initiates improvement activities Prepares master schedule Monitors extent to which curriculum goals are met/ assists with curriculum development Supervises testing programs Maintains awareness of up-to-date techniques/innovations Equalizes opportunities for all students Provides instructional leadership	INS.IMP  INS.SCHED INS.CUR  INS.TEST INS.INNOV  INS.ALL  INS.LDR	instruction, improvement schedule, master curriculum   test initiative, innovative  CST, special education, inclusion, at risk leader, leadership, mentor
STUDENT ACTIVITIES	ACT	Supervises student organizations Supervises athletic program & encourages/secures community involvement	ACT.ORG  ACT.ATH	activities, organizations  athletic, sports, participation, involvement

MAJOR AREAS	MAJOR AREA CODE	SPECIFIC DUTIES	SUBCODES	KEY WORDS FOR SEARCH
PUPIL PERSONNEL	PP	Discipline procedures/ management Attendance procedures/ programs Guidance program supervision	PP.DIS PP.ATT PP.GUI	discipline, referrals attendance guidance, counselors
COMMUNITY RELATIONS	COM	Communicates with parents re programs Provides for dialog/ cooperation between school & community groups & coordinates human/material resources to enrich educational program Writes/presents reports to community or prepares public newsletters	COM.PAR COM.COOR COM.NEWS	parents community, business, police, social services, liaison, the public newsletters

**Appendix G**  
**Codes for Emerging Themes**

TOPIC	EMERGING THEME	CODE
Changing role	Leadership (instruction)	T-LED
	Decision making	T-DEC
	Diversity	T-DIV
	Relationships Teachers Parents Community Central Office	T-RELT T-RELP T-RELC T-RELCO
	Facilitator (support of teachers)	T-FAC
	Power	T-PWR
Concerns/ issues	Leadership training/ professional development	T-TRN
	Use of time	T-TIM
	Diminishing role	T-DIM
	Need for additional support	T-SUP
	Ambiguity	T-AMB
	Role conflict	T-RC
Causes/ explanations	Support of principal	T-SUPP

## Appendix H

## Perceptions of the Goals of Restructuring

Goal	Illustrations
Quality of learning experiences and outcomes (vision statement and mission, high expectations, relevant learning, teacher adviser program, cooperative learning, enrichment opportunities for all, alternative assessments)	<p>"Every student to perform to his highest level, every teacher to help every student to succeed, to learn what is necessary for success." (Principal, School G)</p> <p>"The ultimate outcome is the specific objectives: first, that attendance increase; two, that test scores rise; third, that dropout rates decrease, fourth, that failure rates decrease." (Principal, School B)</p> <p>"We're looking for ways of assessing better, grading differently, looking at the different ways the learners can learn. That's what's got to take place because of the diversification of our learners." (Principal, School C)</p> <p>"To improve teaching and learning." (Principal, School D)</p> <p>"And our goal is student improvement. That is the bottom line. We always have to ask ourselves with every decision we make, Is it best for the students? Will students improve as a result? If you went through our strategic plan you'll see that everyone could answer that question. Yes, it improves. Somehow it improves student performance." (Assistant Principal, #4)</p> <p>"To make a better school for all involved--I mean that's all we ever work for--to make it better for the students, to make it better for the teachers, to make it better for the parents, for anybody who's involved in this building and who has an interest in this building--to make a better school and better education for students." (Assistant Principal, #5)</p> <p>"To improve student understanding." (Assistant Principal, #10)</p> <p>"There are multiple goals but the way I see them they're all centered around students--having an effective instructional program for your students. Providing the best teaching situations and the best learning environments, providing the best opportunities for students to have positive activities for them. (Assistant Principal, #12)</p>

Goal	Illustrations
Quality of learning experiences and outcomes (continued)	<p data-bbox="550 340 1271 599">"I just felt as though we were looking at things backwards. I always believed in outcome accountability. Whereas in the past I always thought of the performance objective but didn't consider what it ended up being, now they have a performance objective but also outcome accountability. What can the kid do? How well can he perform? And I feel as though that's one of the major goals of restructuring." (Assistant Principal, #6)</p> <p data-bbox="550 627 1271 961">"Our mission statement is to produce productive citizens in society--globally. We're looking for enhanced student performance in standardized testing, in any kind of outcomes. We're looking at student performance and we're looking at creating a culture and a climate that is more conducive to learning, more conducive to teaching, and an environment where we all feel safe, comfortable, and secure. We want to feel safe. We don't want weapons or drugs here. That's a zero tolerance. Comfortable and secure goes into how teachers deliver the instruction, how we interrelate...." (Assistant Principal, #7)</p> <p data-bbox="550 989 1271 1248">"I think it's school improvement, for the students to do well and to learn and to be productive members of society, and they [the public] feel like we [schools] have gone astray in the sense that there are some people coming out with a diploma.... And so I guess I get back to the platitude that you want to try to stretch everybody as much as you can but also, somewhere in here, I want to do the best that I can for the kid...." (Assistant Principal, #8)</p> <p data-bbox="550 1276 1271 1481">"The goals, of course, when you look at goals, you always think back to the student because we're here to assist them in learning. So the goal is, What can we do to help students achieve in a modern age. And so, we have said, We have to have authentic learning, we have to make learning meaningful to the students." (Assistant Principal, #11)</p> <p data-bbox="550 1509 1255 1584">"Just to improve how things are done, to improve things for the students and the teachers." (Teacher, #2)</p> <p data-bbox="550 1612 1208 1688">"They're gonna see a focused goal towards learning and achieving and being successful." (Teacher, #3)</p> <p data-bbox="550 1716 1224 1752">"To improve teaching and learning is the major goal." (Teacher, #17)</p>

Goal	Illustrations
Quality of learning experiences and outcomes (continued)	<p data-bbox="550 329 1271 562">"To provide for the needs of the students of that community and the parents of that community. I mean, for instance, in this community we have relatively low test scores, we have lower numbers of students that go to college, higher numbers of students on welfare programs, and things like that. And we need to provide a lot of success here ... so their kids can do better and get away from that particular life style." (Teacher, #5)</p> <p data-bbox="550 588 1271 847">"I also think that another goal is to be able to introduce programs that are better suited for our students, to come up with policies that are suited to our students. We have a very different student body than say [school X or school XX] that have much more affluent students.... One of the goals would be to assess the student body, to assess their needs, and to come up with the programs that are best going to meet their needs." (Teacher, #6)</p> <p data-bbox="550 873 1271 1256">"In my school the whole thrust of restructuring seems to be the best way to educate the most kids, because you're going to educate some kids with whatever program you have because some kids are just inherently motivated, but it seems to me the diversity of programs is to address the diversity of students. And when we say diversity, it comes out to more than a racial diversity; there's an economic level diversity, there's a family diversity. There are all kinds of diversity just like there are all kinds of learners, and I think the more programs that you offer, the more likely that you're going to make sure that you reach more students." (Teacher, #16)</p> <p data-bbox="550 1282 1271 1494">"The ultimate goals--to have students walk out of these doors who are good citizens, who have good reading, writing, and communication skills, and are ready to take their place and be productive members of society. When we force kids to memorize...we're not doing anything. You have to be a good problem solver, to communicate.... (Teacher, #18)</p> <p data-bbox="550 1519 1224 1569">"To make a better student, to put out a better product for the community." (Teacher, #9)</p>

Goal	Illustrations
Quality of learning experiences and outcomes (continued)	<p data-bbox="550 329 1255 534">"I would say our biggest goal has been to identify our strengths and weaknesses and then develop programs to help those weak areas become stronger. And that's really what I feel like we've spent most of our last three years doing, and there have been some improvements, but of course there's just so much to do yet." (Teacher, #8)</p> <p data-bbox="550 562 1271 1026">"Definitely our goal, I think the faculty overall when we brought them together to ask about our mission, the SBM team came up with our vision and it's definitely to improve instruction, to create a warm, secure, caring environment for our children when they come into the building. And when they leave us, we definitely want them to be productive citizens in society, so our vision is sort of three parts. While they're in the building we want to improve instruction, and we also want a warm and nurturing environment. Safety is a major concern for our faculty. We don't have a safety problem because we are concerned and we want our kids to feel safe when they come into our building. And I think you can ask any of our kids and teachers and they'll tell you they feel very safe, even though we're an inner city school." (Teacher, #13)</p> <p data-bbox="550 1054 1047 1101">"To improve instruction as much as possible...." (Teacher, #14)</p> <p data-bbox="550 1129 1271 1433">"I see this particular building and the city trying to eliminate a discipline problem that's widespread across the nation, and not limited here, have a safe building within itself where kids can go and come without fear of being approached, stopped or placed in a situation where they have to speak about something that they'll regret later (so security is one goal), having a focus and mission is the other goal. And we do a pretty good job with that. Kids, teachers, and the staff all know that what we're here for is to educate." (Teacher, #15)</p>

Goal	Illustrations
Professional role and performance of teachers (ownership, peer feedback, professional growth, staff development)	<p data-bbox="550 323 1208 396">"As teachers become more knowledgeable I feel that they are being brought into different processes." (Principal, School B)</p> <p data-bbox="550 426 1135 476">"The involvement of faculty." (Assistant Principal, #1)</p> <p data-bbox="550 506 1271 735">"Oh, it's so slow but people buy into it because they're part of it, you are charged with finding a direction but you're also charged with listening to what other people say and they might have a better idea than you about something completely different and you're open enough to listen to it and explore it or let them explore it or get other people to help explore it and not feel threatened by it." (Assistant Principal, #5)</p> <p data-bbox="550 765 1224 864">"To make it a more efficient school. As far as the school-based management goes, to give teachers ownership of what's going on here." (Assistant Principal, #9)</p> <p data-bbox="550 894 1271 993">"You need people on board for restructuring to be successful, and if they don't feel a part of ownership there, they won't feel involved..." (Assistant Principal, #12)</p> <p data-bbox="550 1024 1271 1274">"One is so that people feel that they're part of the process. As a teacher, it's to appease the crying teachers have been doing for years about being involved in making decisions about what we do everyday. We've been left out. We were the only ones nobody ever asked about school. And we outnumber anybody else, except the students. And we are professional and smart and frequently have good ideas, and this is the first time anybody ever asked." (Teacher, #7)</p> <p data-bbox="550 1304 1255 1425">"I also think that one of the goals of restructuring should be to make the faculty feel that they're a part of all the decisions and policies and procedures that the school adopts." (Teacher, #8)</p> <p data-bbox="550 1455 1240 1504">"The faculty has a vote on everything... has to give consensus." (Teacher, #14)</p>

Goal	Illustrations
Collaborative leadership/management (team building, shared decision making, instructional leadership, communication, staff diversity)	<p>"Well, the shared leadership has worked out extremely well. I have no problem with it. The biggest thing is that we [who are] restructuring know the concept of shared decision making." (Principal, School B)</p> <p>"Ownership in decision making, involving more people, hoping to have more responsibility for implementing." (Assistant Principal, #1)</p> <p>"Site-based management, leadership training, instructional improvement--generally speaking the wonderful things we've always had as our goal." (Assistant Principal, #2)</p> <p>"What I'm trying to do now is move these people who are on the school planning council and have literally seen these things all the way through to become more facilitators, stepping back and tapping in more to those who have the potential to do it for the staff." (Assistant Principal, #4)</p> <p>"For example, part of restructuring is about empowering more people. That's part of the factor here too." (Assistant Principal, #10)</p> <p>"I think communication is so important. People knowing what's going on. You have lot of things taking place in the school when you're restructuring and you can't always come to grips with everything. And communication is one of them, and trying to get the teachers involved, getting your staff involved and participating at some level." (Assistant Principal, #12)</p> <p>"I'm not sure. Again, they [assistant principals] don't sit in on any of the faculty councils or school planning council meetings. I would think that they should be involved in everything because if they're the leaders of the school, and they don't know what's going on, they're not going to lead very well. And they get minutes of the meetings, but that still doesn't make them take an active part in it." (Teacher, #3)</p>

Goal	Illustrations
Collaborative leadership/management (continued)	<p>"I would hope that the goal is to form some sense of partnership in which teachers, administrators, parents, custodians, all of us came together to understand that these are our children. And so now, What are we going to do? The parent may have given birth, but you know, I'm the parent here. And in some ways, I have the opportunity to be a more effective parent because someone else's child is more likely to talk to me than to the parent." (Teacher, #4)</p> <p>"I think it takes a group of people working together for a period of time, maybe not necessarily an extended period of time, but to get to know each other and be focused on what the needs of a particular group or community are." (Teacher, #5)</p> <p>"I would think the elimination of the paperwork and the time frame in order to start acting on a decision, that once a decision is made, it's implemented. And I think with site-based management, you can get that." (Teacher, #6)</p> <p>"And I think we will [succeed] as long as everybody wants to be involved." (Teacher, #9)</p> <p>"Oh, yes, since they're [assistant principals] the ones that everything has been delegated to, and they're actually our leaders, next in command." (Teacher, #9)</p>
Systematic Planning and Measurement of Results (evaluation/assessment, long-range plan, data-based planning and decision making, strategic planning)	<p>"Also there is time for reflection--and that's something that educators rarely have time to do." (Principal, School D)</p> <p>"Because now if we have something here, it's our fault. We had a strategic plan and if we addressed these particular problems, there's no one else to blame but ourselves." (Teacher, #7)</p>

Goal	Illustrations
<p>Redefined and Integrated Curricula (essential learnings, reflects cultural diversity, curriculum articulation with school's goals)</p>	<p>"So I think some of it is very easy because if you have talented staff, it's always, How am I going to improve, and how am I going to help the school? Then I'm always going to have teachers who are developing courses, always looking at new instructional strategies in classrooms, always looking at how can I do this better." (Principal, School D)</p> <p>"It just takes longer.... It is far easier under the old system to come out and say, This is the way it is. This is your curriculum. Teach it or get another job. I mean that's the most efficient way of doing anything. That's not what we're doing. [The principal] stands up and says, We really need to work on vocabulary. The test improvement committee has said that if you want to improve your scores, this is what you need to do...." (Assistant Principal, #5)</p> <p>"I think most schools that are looking at the new change are looking at the interdisciplinary approach to learning. Before this year, our teachers normally planned and they weren't necessarily concerned that this teacher in math had 5th bell, but now with block scheduling all of these teachers are planning together and they have to go and look at the entire picture. So that's a different concept. Then active learning, we've talked about that and authentic learning." (Assistant Principal, #11)</p> <p>"More of a team effort. I don't see English working on a solution for math, or science working on a solution for math, or home economics in isolation. I see everybody trying to work in a cohesive program. And you can't do that when your office is down there, and the other office is here, and you never see each other because all your classrooms are down there and these are up here. I see restructuring bringing people together on some common ground and with some common goals, and trying to find some ways to integrate--a lot of interdisciplinary stuff. If students see that things relate, they're not gonna yell at me for correcting their grammar in math class." (Teacher, #2)</p>
<p>Multiple Learning Sites and Schedules</p>	<p>--</p>

Goal	Illustrations
Coordination of Community Resources	<p>"And the other thing we have to do, when you look at the demographics, we are getting more and more people out there who do not have direct contact with the school. And if you look at the polls, it's the ones that have kids in the schools who usually rate the schools higher. Yet we're getting more and more of those who don't. And yet they must pay taxes. They must see that they [schools] are a valuable thing for them. . . . We have to . . . keep them with us supporting us, because they can go just like they've done in some other places, which is back down the support totally." (Assistant Principal, #8)</p> <p>"To make the [school] a hub of the community, a safe place for the community, a learning place for the community, a gathering place for the community, and to make school part of the lives of the families in this area." (Teacher, #17)</p>
Equity, Fairness, and Inclusion for All Students (flexible scheduling and grouping practices, learning-style diagnosis, vision statement, flexible budgets)	<p>"To me it is very important as we see the diversification. That's why it's important to listen. I had a student in here about a month ago who had a terrible record when he came to us, and we talked, and he said, 'At least you listened to me. My principal before would never listen to me.' Just being willing to listen and that's one of the things I've had to overcome. I used to be like, you'd start the sentence and I'd finish it for you, but I'm getting better with that. That's good with teachers, parents, and kids, and I think it's less stressful if you do it that way. I do think that it's not tough to be able to achieve the goals if you listen and care about the kids. You know, talk is cheap, but if you say, I'll check into this and get back with you, and you do it and build a level of trust." (Principal, School C)</p> <p>"I think what our main goal is, to provide an educational opportunity for every student. And that involves having teachers that are willing to work with a variety of learners, and that involves working with obstacles that other schools don't have to deal with." (Teacher, #11)</p> <p>"Also to eliminate the dropout rate, to reach those that are on the verge of dropping out and try to keep them here." (Teacher, #15)</p>

## Appendix I

## Role of the Assistant Principal in Attaining the Goals of Restructuring

Dimension	Illustration
Quality of learning experiences and outcomes (vision statement and mission, high expectations, relevant learning, teacher adviser program, cooperative learning, enrichment opportunities for all, alternative assessments)	<p>"I think the more we support good instruction, the more we demand good instruction--when I say good instruction, the test results speak for themselves, attendance speaks for itself, students come because they want to come, they feel obligated to come, and after they get here they feel obligated to do well. I think the whole thing starts with instruction. And also, we have to create a multicultural climate here, or anywhere, where people are going to feel good about themselves. If you feel good about yourself, learning will be more meaningful and it's all meshed in together. It really is. It's a very challenging process. I think we have turned the corner and we're getting there." (Assistant Principal, #7)</p> <p>"As we are doing observations, that's the foremost thing we're looking at. We're looking to see that there is critical thinking going on, we are doing higher level questioning, we are looking at the kinds of assessment. As we're talking with kids, we are making sure that they know that we want to know what the kids are learning in the class, that they're in the class. We don't pull them out and have them waiting for us like class doesn't matter. We don't make announcements. In other words, it's everything you do. You show what you think is important. Now I think, and what you think is important, is what we all think is important. I think that's our major role and I think that's what it should be." (Assistant Principal, #8)</p> <p>"But I think that's what our job is--to help in any way we can to set high expectations and help everybody meet them. Set them for ourselves, set them for our teachers, set them for the students--and all of us try to get together and find ways to make it possible." (Assistant Principal, #10)</p>

Dimension	Illustration
Quality of learning experiences and outcomes (continued)	<p data-bbox="545 329 1282 534">"I think assistant principals should be a part of the team. Each of us has our own responsibilities, whether it's scheduling or graduation or whatever, but it's looking out for the interests of the students and the teachers. Providing the best schedule for kids to get what they need, and for teachers to be teaching in situations that they're happy with." (Assistant Principal, #12)</p> <p data-bbox="545 562 1146 612">"To help teachers succeed with students." (Principal, School B)</p> <p data-bbox="545 640 1224 741">"In the jobs that they're doing, they're all involved in this [restructuring] and trying to achieve the goals with the same philosophy--to care for the kids." (Principal, School C)</p> <p data-bbox="545 769 1282 972">"When they also see the kids, they see the trouble that the kids are having, they have good ideas on how to help the ones that are having the trouble. . . . A couple of the assistant principals are looking for newer innovations, like a program for tutoring. They've mentioned it to the departments and they have asked for our input." (Teacher, #1)</p> <p data-bbox="545 1000 1282 1203">"I think the assistant principal should be an incredibly busy, visible individual. . . . That person represents the principal and the whole mind set of the school in a much more hands-on way than a single principal can do. That person is in a sense the ambassador of the principal, but that person is also much more directly keyed into the classroom." (Teacher, #4)</p> <p data-bbox="545 1231 1282 1353">"It's with the discipline and the instruction. . . . And it's to achieve, and that's the number one goal--to put out a good product, and they [assistant principals] do it." (Teacher, #9)</p>

Dimension	Illustration
Professional role and performance of teachers (ownership, peer feedback, professional growth, staff development)	<p data-bbox="545 325 1271 534">"Support, guidance for the teachers, carrying out things, and running things, executing things, coming up with ideas. When I say value teachers, it's value people, use their expertise, tap into it and use it, not just say 'Oh, what a great idea,' but really listen to what they have to say because they know their children better than anybody." (Assistant Principal, #5)</p> <p data-bbox="545 556 1282 814">"We're taking a team approach . . . where everybody has got input and I'll just say, everybody's got an idea and can contribute. In the past, basically teachers just taught and that was it. Now they're running the schools; they have input. Sitting here I don't know what's going on in the cafeteria or the classroom, but teachers in the classroom know everyday and that should be accepted by the administrators, and that's what we do." (Assistant Principal, #6)</p> <p data-bbox="545 842 1282 1181">"To monitor the instructional program, to try to help teachers. First of all, give them an environment which they can do these things in the hope that kids will understand and encourage them to take these steps, and to ask them to rigorously evaluate the results. That's one of the things everybody's been having trouble with. We do a lot of exhibitions, a lot of alternative assessments, and it's a time-hungry activity. And you always have to ask yourself first, How am I going to evaluate this to make sure that Johnny can do whatever it is. That's the first part." (Assistant Principal, #10)</p> <p data-bbox="545 1203 1266 1440">"So I see our main function as trying to building this trust with teachers, talking with them, talking about instruction, talking about how kids can understand, giving them feedback, and just trying to help them find more ways--to support them, and sometimes it's just cheering them on, 'Hey, great job.' And there are a lot of teachers around here where that's all you have to say, 'Great job!'" (Assistant Principal, #10)</p> <p data-bbox="545 1461 1282 1640">"Helping teachers understand how they can grow professionally. . . . We have developed and are working together to develop a new level of professionalism. We've developed our own evaluation instrument and we're running a pilot on it. It focuses on different areas." (Principal, School D)</p>

Dimension	Illustration
Collaborative leadership/management (team building, shared decision making, instructional leadership, communications and staff diversity)	<p>"I don't know of anything in particular but to be supportive of the principal, realizing that he/she is involved in more committees so maybe we have other things to do as a result, more of a team." (Assistant Principal, #1)</p> <p>"Just like anybody else on the staff, we're all in this together and we're either going to succeed or going to fail together so we're all hopefully going to succeed and achieve all the goals that the faculty and school planning council have established. . . ." (Assistant Principal, #3)</p> <p>"I facilitate the entire restructuring process. I'm responsible for that. I brought the first faculty council together, the first school planning council together. I provided them with the training they needed, either myself or through hiring consultants, and I see it through. I guess they [other assistant principals] are in a sense facilitators in that they don't facilitate the overall process but they work with the teams." (Assistant Principal, #4)</p> <p>"I think my role pertaining to the overall picture is working together with the administrative team to achieve the goals of improving teaching and learning. And teaching and learning are the most important elements that we think exist. And I have a role in that and I've already indicated that I think I play a mighty powerful role in terms of keeping the classroom at a level where instruction and learning can take place. And I have a role in the observation of the teachers, seeing that they are doing the kinds of jobs that we think they should be doing. . . . So I think the role of the assistant principal is part of the process." (Assistant Principal, #11)</p> <p>"To continue to build in a sense of trust, to continue to let teachers believe that they're in a helping situation, and to help teachers be the best they can be." (Principal, School A)</p>

Dimension	Illustration
Collaborative leadership/management (continued)	<p data-bbox="545 329 1279 814">"And so it's improving relationships. It's developing a better trust factor between administrators and teachers. And I think that really a big piece of the reason of bringing education up to where it should be falls to administrators, administrators who are very knowledgeable in instruction, who are very savvy and understand instructional strategies, who are working to develop better relationship with teachers, who can understand where they need to be and how they need to grow in order to connect with kids, rather than cover the material. And there's administrators who need to monitor and need to inspire and need to develop leaders, not to be able just to chair a committee but to be leaders in the classroom and to be leaders in the city and to write curricula and to present. And so that's restructuring. It's a very basic formula and it's where we need to be." (Principal, School D)</p> <p data-bbox="545 847 1279 1021">"I think providing us the opportunity, answering our questions when we come to a stumbling point, helping us know where we need to go next. . . . So they provide the total picture and they need to be bringing us input. So they're informants, they're facilitators, they're friends. . . ." (Teacher, #2)</p> <p data-bbox="545 1054 1279 1435">"They have an equal role with the principal and the teachers that they need to be at the forefront of restructuring. They need to go to the universities and hear from the experts in the profession and not just be told that this is how it's going to be. Not just knowledgeable but very knowledgeable because if I talk to an assistant principal about a program, I would expect them to know and not say, 'Well, I have some information on that somewhere in a book. . . .' And as an assistant principal, you are an administrator. You should be knowledgeable. You should not just have a notebook with some information in it. You should be able to explain the program, the goals." (Teacher, #16)</p> <p data-bbox="545 1468 1188 1511">"Overseeing the improvement of instruction." (Teacher, #17)</p>

Dimension	Illustration
Collaborative leadership/ management (continued)	<p>"Instructional leadership." (Teacher, #18)</p> <p>"I think the assistant principals serve as leaders by example. And that if you have an assistant principal that is not giving a positive example, that is very harmful to the whole atmosphere of the school. So it's an image thing, the image is very, very important." (Teacher, #11)</p> <p>"A principal can't do everything. He needs those assistants. He needs good ones. The teachers need those assistants because they can't always reach the principal and those assistants who have decision making capabilities and are allowed to make those kinds of decisions are crucial for us, especially with a big staff, to be able to get to somebody who can make a decision. [In the past] we had assistant principals making a decision that the principal or another assistant principal negated. Or it was, What's the rule today? Now we see consistency--that teamwork. They're all thinking along the same lines, so pretty much what we find is we can ask them all the same question and they will tell us the same answer." (Teacher, #8)</p> <p>"The way all that was done was through the school planning council, where they are a vocal part. One is the facilitator but again as I mentioned before, each of us that are on the school planning council--parents, administrators and teachers--each is a liaison to an action team. And so the role of the assistant principal has basically been the same as the role of every other planning council member, which is to act as a liaison, to sort of facilitate within their individual action team. . . . So I guess technically their role would be to act as facilitator or leaders." (Teacher, #8)</p> <p>"To support the teachers, to support the new strategies that we want to come up with. . . definitely basically for instruction. We definitely need support from the assistant principals. . . . I think the role of the assistant principal is to be there to answer questions and to help us out and support us." (Teacher, #13)</p>
Redefined and Integrated Curricula	--

Dimension	Illustration
Systematic Planning and Measurement of Results (evaluation and assessment, long-range plan, data-based planning and decision making, strategic planning)	<p>"I'm responsible for monitoring the blueprint that brings about restructuring here. That's my sole responsibility." (Assistant Principal, #4)</p> <p>"I think the role of the assistant principal in that situation would be to do everything possible in their area of expertise or their responsibility to make their plan run smoothly. That it would be our responsibility to work with them [teachers] and to try to make their plan work." (Assistant Principal, #9)</p> <p>"Then the second part [of evaluation] is, Did the amount of time that I consumed to get to this point, is that justified or would it have been spent better in other ways?" (Assistant Principal, #10)</p> <p>"The assistant principal is responsible to make sure that they follow the different action committee strategies that we have implemented." (Principal, School B)</p> <p>"I think the assistant principals need to help with the surveying, the assessing to find out what the needs are. . . ." (Teacher, #7)</p>
Multiple Learning Sites and Schedules (community-based learning, flexible scheduling, programmatic options)	<p>"I think the assistant principals are involved because we have this Saturday school program. One of the assistant principals has grabbed that by the horns and has done something with it whereas kids come in for a half a day and they don't just occupy space. They have some work to do. So that is something that is turned into a day school on Saturday." (Teacher, #15)</p>
Coordination of Community Resources (school-community councils, local school councils, partnerships, variety of funding sources)	<p>"Sure, well look at the school planning council, you have to be able to pull people in. You have to be able to work with them. PTAs in the past, it was a matter of how many cookies can you bake? I attended the Board meeting. . . . I saw them talking about things and making decisions that in the past would never have been possible for a PTA." (Assistant Principal, #5)</p> <p>"In some cases they've had to take a real active role . . . in working with the community." (Teacher, #8)</p>
Equity, Fairness, and Inclusion for All Students	--