DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 451 596 EA 030 939

AUTHOR Ricciardi, Diane; Petrosko, Joseph M.

TITLE Perceptions of First-Year Administrators: Impact of Responsibilities and Preparation on Professional Growth Needs.

PUB DATE 2000-04-00

NOTE 37p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 24-28, 2000).

PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; *Administrator Role; *Assistant Principals; Discipline; *Educational Responsibility; Elementary Secondary Education; *Internship Programs; Labor Turnover; Performance Factors; *Principals; Public Schools

ABSTRACT

A study extended research on the Kentucky Principal Intern Program (KPIP), an induction program for new administrators. Study participants (N=97) were public school principals and assistant principals appointed during 1998-99. All were participating as KPIP administrator interns. Survey research was used to collect data about demographic characteristics, job responsibilities, professional growth needs, and school-change efforts. Although KPIP interns are required to demonstrate competence on all state administrator standards, results show that they spent much time dealing with student discipline and supervision. Less time was spent in areas of curriculum and instructional development. Assistant principals have primary responsibilities for disciplining students, and administrators at lower school levels spend more time supervising faculty and staff. Although professional growth needs varied, analyses revealed that demographic variables of position, gender, school level, and school size are not useful predictors of growth needs. (Contains 28 references and tables.) (DFR)

Running Head: RESPONSIBLITIES AND GROWTH NEEDS OF INTERNS

Perceptions of First-Year Administrators:

Impact of Responsibilities and Preparation on Professional Growth Needs

Diane Ricciardi and Joseph M. Petrosko

University of Louisville

A paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the

American Educational Research Association,

April 24-28, 2000, New Orleans

Abstract

This study extends research on the Kentucky Principal Intern Program (KPIP), an induction program for new administrators. Study participants ($n = 97$) were public school principals and assistant principals appointed during 1998-99. All were participating as KPIP administrator interns. Survey research was used to collected data about demographic characteristics, job responsibilities, professional growth needs and school change efforts. Although KPIP interns are required to demonstrate competence on all state administrator standards, results show that administrators spent much time dealing with student discipline and supervision. Less time was spent in areas of curriculum and instructional development. Regression analyses revealed that (a) assistant principals, more so than principals, have primary responsibility for disciplining students, and that (b) administrators at lower school levels spend more time supervising faculty and staff. Although professional growth needs varied, regression analyses revealed that demographic variables of position, gender, school level and school size are not useful predictors of growth needs. A factor analysis was used to understand correlations among professional growth areas. Study results may provide direction for KPIP program planners and committee members working to strengthen the development and support offered to KPIP interns.

Perceptions of First-Year Administrators:
Impact of Job Responsibilities and Preparation on Professional Growth Needs

The 1990 Kentucky Education Reform Act (KERA) introduced innovations related to student grouping, standards-based assessment, and site governance that have served to reshape the work of public school educators. As a result of innovations, administrators are expected to adjust their leadership focus from a traditional management-orientation to a performance-orientation that guarantees high achievement for all students. Due to changing leadership roles in Kentucky and throughout the country, the challenges facing the next generation of school administrators are still being discovered (Murphy & Forsyth,1999).

Accompanying role changes, administrators are changing demographically, being hired at a younger age with more diverse gender and ethnic representation (Doud & Keller, 1998). Characterized by youth and inexperience, many new administrators undergo anxiety, frustration, and self-doubt when they move into leadership positions (Anderson, 1989). These administrators can be disadvantaged when they confront high-pressured job demands, while struggling to understand their new roles (Murphy & Forsyth, 1999). Even when administrators consider themselves well prepared, most lack formal leadership experience because they are hired directly from teaching positions. Although experience as a teacher may be helpful, major differences exist between the roles of classroom teachers and administrators (Daresh & Playko, 1992).

Administrators who vacate positions after a few years, claim that obstacles created by job transition and role conflicts are common during the entry year (Duke, 1986). Daresh (1986) reported that new leaders commonly identify job concerns in areas of (a) role clarification, (b) technical expertise, and (c) professional socialization. Novices may discover they lack both knowledge and practical experience held by more experienced peers. Daresh and Playko (1992)

reported differences in perceptions of inexperienced and experienced administrators related to essential job skills. Aspiring principals gave priority to skills tied to technical and managerial duties, whereas experienced principals placed priority on higher level skills including self-awareness and job socialization, suggesting that perceptions of novices change with work experience. Regarding job familiarity, Lyons (1993) reported that new principals consider themselves most familiar with duties of (a) curriculum and instruction and (b) student issues, such as discipline and attendance. Conversely, these administrators reported themselves least familiar with duties of (a) school-community relations, (b) school business management, and (c) staff personnel administration.

Due to the complex nature of school leadership, the success of entry-level administrators may lie in their ability to engage in relevant development activities early in their careers. New administrators likely discover that their professional development takes "back burner" to their job responsibilities. Although much focus is placed on preservice preparation, less attention is given to developing administrators after they are appointed to positions. Erlandson (1994) contends that ongoing professional development for principals is the most neglected component of administrative preparation. Although the value of professional development seldom is disputed, activities rarely address individual needs of administrators. Considering job challenges, at no time may administrator support and development be more important than during the entry year.

Ideally, schools as work environments should help administrators develop professional knowledge and skills. However, adult learning theorists (Knowles, 1988; Levine, 1982) contend that schools seldom accommodate the developmental needs of adult workers. Although common in preservice preparation, rarely do formalized experiences exist to provide job-embedded

development for administrators. Hart (1993) found that when programs and activities exist, they often are ill defined, poorly structured, and plagued by logistical issues of personnel costs and time constraints. Also, she reported that job succession and induction research suggests that more formalized entry experiences would be a welcomed addition in helping administrators succeed in the early years.

Likewise, those who provide support can influence whether beginners succeed or fail in leadership roles (Knight & Weiss, 1980). Wiggins (1975) reported that support serves to accelerate job transition, and that districts play an important function in induction since most principals are socialized as teachers, assistant principals, and line staff in school districts.

One formal induction model that incorporates both internship and mentoring is the Kentucky Principal Intern Program (KPIP). The state-mandated program is designed to provide job-embedded support for first-year administrators (Prickett, 1990). Created by the Kentucky General Assembly in 1985, two program goals exist: (a) provide administrator interns with opportunities to learn from practicing professionals, and (b) provide licensure based upon administrator interns demonstrating the ability to meet state administrator standards (Kentucky Department of Education, 1999). Being the first of its kind in the nation, the one-year program mandates activities that target professional growth of new principals and assistant principals. Formative growth activities include 50 hours of contact with a principal mentor, along with observation and feedback cycles directed by a diverse three-member committee. In addition to the mentor principal, each committee is composed of a university professor and a superintendent or designee, all of whom have administrative experience. During the year, interns must demonstrate through preparation of a portfolio and 27 hours of formal job observation that they have addressed the state administrator standards (Kentucky Administrative Regulation 20:470;

Kentucky Department of Education, 1999). A KPIP summative conference at year-end is used to determine the extension of each intern's professional administrative license.

Although KPIP has existed for over a decade, only three studies were found pertaining to the program. The first two were program evaluation studies conducted by the Kentucky Department of Education (KDE). In one study covering two years, Petrie, White, Wallman, & Prickett (1992) identified demographic trends among administrator interns ($n = 121$) and reported positive benefits of KPIP participation. A second study reported that interns ($n = 55$) rated KPIP participation as the most beneficial requirement in preparing them for their administrative positions (KDE, 1998). Most recently, in a dissertation study that utilized an instrument from the National Association of Secondary School Principals (NASSP) (Pellicer, Anderson, Keefe, Kelley, & McCleary, 1988), Wells (1999) identified primary job duty profiles of interns, examined school, gender, and position-related differences, and explored changes in the nature of Kentucky administrators' work over three decades.

This study seeks to expand the research on the Kentucky Principal Intern Program by examining work responsibilities, job readiness, and professional growth needs of administrator interns. The study seeks to address several questions:

1. What are job responsibilities of administrators, and how do responsibilities vary by demographic characteristics of (a) position, (b) gender, (c) school level, and (d) school size?
2. What job responsibilities do administrators report they are most or least ready for, and to what do they attribute this readiness?
3. What change efforts do administrators implement successfully and unsuccessfully?
4. What professional growth needs would enhance job performance of administrators,

and how do needs vary by demographic characteristics of (a) position, (b) gender, (c) school level, and (d) school size?

5. How does KPIP participation enhance professional growth of administrators?

Methodology

Study Participants

All 1998-99 KPIP administrator interns (N = 176) representing P-12 student populations were invited to participate in the study (see Table 1). Administrators serving in specialized schools such as preschools, treatment centers, and vocational schools were excluded since the focus of the study was on traditional public school administrators. All participants were principals or assistant principals first appointed to administration in Kentucky in 1998-99. Study participants mirrored the general population of KPIP administrator interns in regards to school level and gender.

Insert Table 1 Here

Participants' names and contact information were provided by the Kentucky Department of Education Division of Testing and Internship in January 1999. Packets containing a questionnaire, a letter explaining the study, and a stamped return envelope were mailed to participants in May 1999. A first and second mailing yielded 97 completed questionnaires resulting in a return rate of 55%.

Instrumentation

Self-reported data were collected in May 1999 using a questionnaire with most items adapted from the NAESP study of K-8 administrators (Doud & Keller, 1998). In addition to

reviewing literature on administrative induction, job succession, and professional development, the researcher examined the law (KRS 161.027) and the accompanying regulation (704 KAR 20:470) to analyze KPIP program requirements. Documents and prior research studies on KPIP were also reviewed (KDE, 1999; KDE, 1998; Petrie et al., 1992; Prickett, 1990; Wells, 1999).

The survey instrument contained three sections. The first part was used to collect information about subjects' demographic characteristics, prior work experience, schools, and job positions. In the second section, fourteen items, with thirteen adapted from an earlier instrument (Doud & Keller, 1998), were used to collect data about job responsibilities. The thirteen items had been designed by a panel of practitioners for the NAESP study and represented key job areas relevant for K-8 administrators. One additional area of administrative responsibility was added for this Kentucky study based on recommendations of pilot study participants. Since Kentucky schools are required to have site governance councils, "SBDM Council Responsibilities" was added as an item. A total of fourteen responsibilities were listed to include management tasks such as Budget Administration, interpersonal tasks such as Nondisciplinary Interaction with Students, and instructional tasks such as Curriculum Development Oversight. Additionally, two open-ended questions were used to collect information about subjects' job readiness.

In the third section, seventeen items adapted from the NAESP study (Doud & Keller, 1998) were listed to included professional growth needs in areas of (a) management, such as Planning and Organizing Time, (b) interpersonal effectiveness, such as Dynamics of Group Process, and (c) instructional leadership, such as Improving Student Performance. Subjects marked all professional development topics that might enhance their job performance. In the final section, three open-ended questions were used. Subjects provided information about a change they implemented that was successful and one that was unsuccessful. Additionally, they

answered a question about professional growth they experienced as KPIP interns.

The researcher pilot tested the instrument with ten administrators who participated as KPIP interns the prior year. Feedback was used to make minor revisions in two areas. The researcher clarified the wording of survey instructions. Additionally, the researcher added the item about site-council governance for the purpose of increasing the content validity of work responsibilities to those of Kentucky administrators.

Data Analysis

Data related to demographic characteristics, job responsibilities, and development needs were coded and entered into a computer for statistical processing. Frequencies and percentages were computed for analysis. A series of multiple regression analyses were performed using job responsibilities as dependent variables. In each regression analysis, four predictor variables were used (a) job position, (b) gender, (c) school level, and (d) school size. An exploratory factor analysis was performed to understand the correlations among ratings of professional development needs. Multiple regression analyses using five variables identified from the factor analysis were performed using the same four demographic characteristics as predictor variables. Qualitative data from open-ended questions were coded and grouped by using a process of identifying categories as they emerged from the responses (Fowler, 1993). Prior to interpretation, the qualitative responses also were verified and categorized by an independent researcher.

Results

Demographic Profile

Principals (n = 41) comprised 42 % of the sample, while assistant principals (n = 56) represented 58% of the sample. By level, 37% of administrators worked in elementary schools, 27% in high schools, and 36% in middle schools (see Table 2). Nearly 65% of subjects moved

directly from teaching positions into administration. Subjects averaged working 18 years in education prior to administrative appointments, having more experience than principals in the NAESP study (Doud & Keller, 1998) who averaged working 10 years before entering administration. Subjects had a mean age of 39.8 years when first hired as administrators, and were older on average than principals in the national study who entered administration at age 36. Males made up 51 % of participants compared with 58% of participants in the national study. Most Kentucky administrators (68%) worked in rural locations, reflecting the rural nature of the state. Due to the fact that Kentucky did not certify administrators at a masters level prior to 1998, the percentage of subjects (85%) whose educational level exceeded the masters degree was much higher than the number of subjects (43%) from the NAESP study who held degrees above a masters (Doud & Keller, 1998).

In comparing Kentucky principals and assistant principals, surprisingly, principals reported lower levels of formal education than did assistant principals, with 75% of principals holding degrees above the masters and 89% of assistant principals holding degrees above this level. Also, more principals than assistant principals entered administration with less than six years prior work experience in education. Approximately 17% of principals reported less than 6 years prior work experience, whereas only 2% of assistant principals reported less than 6 years work experience. Few principals had prior experience in building level administration, with only 12% having served as assistant principals. Most principals (70%) worked in elementary schools, while most assistant principals (84%) worked at middle and high schools. Assistant principals were place-bound in their hiring, with 43% hired from positions in their same schools and 36% hired from positions in their same districts but different schools. More principals (39%) were hired from outside their districts compared to the reports by assistant principals (21%).

Insert Table 2 Here

Current Job Responsibilities

Subjects used ratings of 1-3 to indicate three job responsibilities where they spent most time working during an average day (see Table 3). If subjects did not rank the responsibility as one of the top three, the item was scored zero. Student Discipline and Management was an area reported by 78% of participants as a top responsibility. Next, 55% reported Non-Disciplinary Interaction with Students as a primary responsibility and 52% reported Supervision of Staff as a major responsibility. Administrators spent far less time in areas such as (a) Curriculum Development (20%), (b) Safety and Security Issues (20%), (c) Parent and Community Contacts (20%), and (d) Student Evaluation and Placement (16%).

Insert Table 3 Here

Predictors of Current Job Responsibilities

For each job responsibility item, subjects marked a 1 for most time spent, a 2 for second most time spent, and a 3 for third most time spent, with items not marked scored as zero. In order to use these rating items in regression analyses, they were transformed so that rating scale values were defined as follows: zero meant no report of time spent, 1 meant third most time spent, 2 meant second most time spent, and 3 meant most time spent. The practical effect of the transformation was to produce variables that had values ranging from zero to three, with the values symbolizing the strength of time spent in the job responsibility, ranging from zero (low)

to three (high).

Dependent variables. A series of multiple regression analyses were performed, using eight of the transformed variables as dependent variables. Variables were selected only if they had sufficient variability, meaning that 10% or more of the cases marked rating scale values of 1 through 3. This screening process eliminated as dependent variables those rating scale items that had insufficient variability, meaning those that had a large proportion of subjects selecting the zero option. Low variability renders a variable unfeasible to use in regression analysis, because when the range of values on a variable is restricted it becomes difficult or impossible for it to be highly correlated with other variables.

Predictor variables. In each regression analysis, four predictor variables were used. Variables and numerical values for the variables were as follows: (a) school level had three values, elementary (1), middle (2), and high school (3); (b) gender had two values, female (0), and male (1); (c) position had two values, assistant principal (0), and principal (1); and school size had five possible values ranging from 0-250 students (1) to over 1000 students (5). Forced entry was used, with each predictor put into the regression equation.

Significant effects. Table 4 shows a summary of the regression results. For six of the eight variables studied, there was no significant prediction of the time spent on the job responsibility by the predictors school level, gender, position, and school size. The two dependent variables that had significant predictors were (a) discipline and student management, and (b) supervision and contact with staff.

Insert Table 4 Here

Table 5 shows a summary of the regression analysis for the dependent variable discipline and student management. Regression coefficients for school level, gender, and school size were not statistically significant. However, the variable position was significant. Examination of the mean scores on the dependent variable revealed the nature of the effect. Assistant principals had a much higher mean value ($\underline{M}$ = 2.70) than principals ($\underline{M}$ = 1.39). The regression analysis empirically confirmed that it is a common practice that the assistant principal has the primary responsibility of disciplining and managing students.

Insert Table 5 Here

Table 6 shows a summary of the regression analysis for the dependent variable supervision and contact with staff. Regression coefficients for gender, position, and school size were not statistically significant. The variable school level was significant. The values of the mean scores on the dependent variable for school size revealed the nature of the effect. The mean level of supervision of school staff was highest in elementary school ($\underline{M}$ = 1.29), intermediate in middle school ($\underline{M}$ = 0.78), and lowest in high school ($\underline{M}$ = 0.35). The regression analysis showed that the lower the school level, the more likely that administrators would report supervision of staff as a major job responsibility.

Insert Table 6 Here

Readiness for Job Responsibilities

Fifty -one percent of subjects reported they considered themselves most ready to handle

responsibilities in the area of student discipline and management. Nearly all of these subjects (84%) reported that prior work experience as a teacher prepared them for this area of responsibility. Conversely, 35% of subjects considered themselves least ready to manage job responsibilities in budget administration. Nearly 47% of these subjects reported they were ill-prepared due to their lack of prior work experience, and 44% reported they lacked university preparation in this area.

Experiences in Implementing Change

Subjects responded to the open-ended question, "What was the most important change you successfully implemented this year?" The 93 responses were transcribed and categorized into five areas. Most responses (27%) dealt with change efforts targeting instructional improvement for students. Participants had changed school schedules to accommodate learning goals, had aligned curricula with standards, and had implemented new programs and strategies such as drama instruction and certain pedagogical techniques. Next, 24% of responses dealt with changes to strengthen student discipline, with subjects reporting changes in school-wide procedures, implementing student incentive programs, and increasing administrative consistency in issuing disciplinary consequences. Relative to management functions, 21% of changes dealt with revising functions to include such as school safety improvements and legal compliance issues. Working to strengthen their interpersonal effectiveness, administrators made changes in several areas to include (a) increasing support and communication with teachers (15%) and (b) increasing parent communication and involvement (13%).

Subjects provided 70 responses to the question, "What change did you attempt, but were unable to implement this year?" The responses were categorized into four areas. Most attempted changes (44%) dealt with improvements targeting curriculum and instruction. Attempts included

redesigning programs and adding instructional resources and personnel. Other changes dealt with attempts to (a) improve student discipline (32%) and to improve faculty job performance (16%), and (c) to improve parent communication and involvement (8%). Subjects added that faculty resistance and fiscal limitations most often prevented successful change from occurring.

Professional Development Needs

Subjects indicated all professional growth areas that would most enhance their future job performance. Top needs were in the areas of (a) Improving Staff Performance, (b) Planning and Implementing Curricular Change, (c) Assessing the Instructional Program, (d) Effective Fiscal Administration, (e) School Improvement Planning, and (f) Improving Student Performance (see Table 7). Both principals and assistant principals indicated that improving staff performance was their primary development need. More assistant principals (50%) than principals (37%) indicated growth needs in the area of planning and implementing curricular change. Likewise, assistant principals (41%) indicated a need for training in supervising the instructional program, as compared to reports from principals (17%). In comparing findings with those from the Doud and Keller study (1998), half of NAESP principals reported they needed growth in understanding and applying technology, whereas only 22% of Kentucky administrators indicated this need. However, more Kentucky principals (44%) reported growth needs in fiscal administration than did NAESP principals (13%). Table 7 shows the percentages of administrators reporting development needs in the various areas.

Insert Table 7 Here

Exploratory Factor Analysis of Professional Development Areas

Subjects had selected those areas of professional growth that would improve their future job performance. Of the seventeen areas listed, subjects were instructed to check all areas they thought would enhance their job performance or leave the area blank if they thought it would not. To understand the correlations among these ratings, an exploratory factor analysis was performed. Potential areas of professional development that were checked were coded 1 and those that were not checked were coded zero. Stevens (1996) suggests that the sample size for a factor analysis should be at least five times the number of variables being analyzed. Here there were 17 variables, and 5 x 17 = 85. Since the number of subjects in this study was $\underline{n} = 97$, the criterion was met. However, the total was relatively small for a multivariate statistical procedure. Thus, the factor analysis results need to be replicated with additional groups before they can be considered reliable.

A principal component analysis was used to extract the factors and this was followed by varimax rotation. Two tests were performed to determine if the data were appropriate for factor analysis. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was .586. A value of .50 or greater means that a sample is adequate for factor analysis (Kinnear & Gray, 1994), so that criterion was met. In addition, the chi-square statistic for Bartlett's test of sphericity was 256.50, $\underline{p} < .0005$. This indicated that the correlation matrix to be factored had some non-zero off-diagonal correlations, meaning that a factor analysis was potentially useful.

Five factors were retained for rotation and interpretation. Each had an eigenvalue greater than 1.00. The percentages of variance accounted for factors 1 through 5 were 14.1, 11.8, 9.8, 8.4, and 8.4 respectively. The cumulative percentage of variance accounted for by the factors was 52.5%. Table 8 shows the highest factor loadings for each factor. The authors followed a

procedure outlined by Stevens (1996) who suggested that it is best to ignore loadings that are not significantly related to a factor. With an n of 97, a loading must have an absolute value greater than .512 to be significant, so those are the only ones shown in the table.

What does the factor analysis reveal? It shows what areas of professional development were perceived in a similar manner (i.e., in terms of potentially enhancing the job performance of respondents). Factor 1 shows that assessing and supervising the instructional program are correlated with one another, as is planning and implementing change. This suggests that change is viewed by administrators as being associated with instructional matters. The second factor is clearly related to school improvement as administrators associate improving staff performance, improving student performance, and school improvement planning. The third factor shows that administrators associate building partnerships with communication skills. The fourth factor ties together planning and organizing time with working with special interest groups. Finally, the fifth factor associates assessment of students with management of organizational change, both of which are inversely related to assessing and evaluating staff.

Insert Table 8 Here

Additionally, a series of regression analyses were performed using factor scores derived from the five factors as dependent variables. In each analysis, again four predictor variables were used to include: (a) school level with three values, elementary (1), middle (2), and high school (3); (b) gender with values female (0) and male (1); (c) position including values of assistant principal (0) and principal (1); and (d) school size with five values ranging from 0-250 students (1) to over 1000 students (5). Forced entry was used, with each predictor put into the regression

equation. For all five variables studied, no significant predictors of professional development need were found. The regression analysis showed that these independent variables were not reliable predictors of professional development need.

Professional Growth Enhanced by KPIP Participation

Administrators were asked to indicate using 1-3 the professional growth experiences considered most useful during the entry year. The three areas considered to be most beneficial dealt with interns interacting with administrative peers. Nearly 60% reported that support from other administrators not serving on the KPIP committee was most beneficial. Next, 59% indicated that interaction with KPIP mentor principals was useful. Nearly, 54% indicated that support from peer administrators in their own schools was beneficial. Other types of growth activities were considered less useful and included (a) participation in district and KDE-sponsored training (43%), (b) participation in university coursework (26%), (c) involvement in professional organizations (14%), (d) reading educational books and journals (14%), and (e) using technology to explore administrative issues (3%)

Lastly, subjects responded to the question "How did KPIP participation enhance your professional growth?" The 64 discrete responses were categorized into five activity areas providing for (a) professional feedback, (b) professional resources, (c) professional networks, (d) self-reflection, and (e) assistance for prioritizing work demands. Approximately, 27% of responses pertained to the value of professional feedback provided by KPIP committee members. Numerous responses suggested that interns valued feedback addressing both career and psychosocial assistance, as seen in this comment:

> My interactions during KPIP gave me the opportunity to learn about my strengths and weaknesses. For once I knew the areas of focus for my professional growth. This helped me grow more confident in my abilities throughout the year.

Participants also valued activities that connected them with peers, with 28% of responses pertaining to the importance of networking with and shadowing experienced administrators. Nearly 25% of responses dealt with how KPIP committee members served as information resources in areas such as special education and budgeting, as interns reported:

> The KPIP program brought me resources that I may not have had. My committee helped me in areas that I was not prepared for due to my lack of prior administrative experience in special education.

> I was able to gather knowledge from three administrators (on my committee) who had much more experience than I. This resource was invaluable to me during my first year as a principal, especially since I am the only administrator in the building in a very small district.

Nearly 11% of responses pertained to how KPIP activities helped interns prioritize their administrative work. Finally, 9% of responses dealt with how activities created opportunities for self-reflection that had been both encouraged and modeled by KPIP committee members.

Limitations

Several limitations of this study exist. Self-reported data is both useful and problematic. The researcher collected only perceptions about job experiences and development needs. Neither KPIP reporting documents nor formal performance evaluations were examined to determine interns' job performance or growth needs. Data were not collected from mentor principals, other KPIP committee members, or interns' supervisors. Although state laws and official KPIP materials provided helpful knowledge about the program; the study is limited due to its reliance on subjects' perceptions as the sole data source. Since this study involved both P-12 assistant principals and principals, caution must be taken in drawing comparisons with K-8 principals represented in the NAESP study (Doud & Keller, 1998). Regression analyses utilized only four demographic variables as possible predictors of job responsibilities and development need. Results may have differed if other demographic variables were used as predictors.

Discussion

Results reveal that new administrators in this sample spend little time working on curricular and instructional issues, areas ranked by the National Policy Board for Educational Administration (1990) as those most critical for improving student achievement in schools. Job responsibilities of Kentucky administrators are fairly similar to those reported by the NAESP principals (Doud & Keller, 1998). Although the NAESP study included principals who averaged eleven years administrative experience, participants from both studies reported spending most of their time in the same three areas. In comparing results of the two studies, few differences seemed to exist in the way novices and experienced administrators spend their workdays.

Significant differences were found in the work of Kentucky principals and assistant principal regarding discipline, and findings lend support to studies by Petrie et al. (1992) and

Wells (1999). The study does little to support the contention of Mizelle (1995) who reported that job roles of assistant principals extend beyond the traditional duties of discipline and supervision.

Several implications exist regarding the role of the assistant principal. First, anecdotal reports show that assistant principals may experience difficulty meeting KPIP requirements to address standards in areas such as instructional leadership and school vision building (Wells, 1999). It is not surprising that assistant principals gain little experience in these areas due to the fact they are burdened by responsibilities of student discipline and supervision. With adoption of new administrator standards from the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC), KPIP interns in 1999-2000 will be the first required to demonstrate competencies on the six standards that address a broad range of leadership responsibilities, all grounded in improving student achievement. Additional research is needed to understand the impact of ISLLC Standards on the actual work responsibilities of new administrators. Second, if assistant principals are being trained as future principals, assigning them responsibilities that exclude student learning and staff improvement is less than desirable. The KPIP internship may be doing little to substantially broaden the work responsibilities of assistant principals. Unless, assistant principals have more balanced work responsibilities, they may be ill equipped to lead schools in achieving the ambitious goals of the Kentucky Education Reform Act.

Another significant difference in job responsibilities was found regarding school level, with elementary administrators reporting greater responsibility in supervising faculty and staff. Considering that many faculties in middle schools are organized into interdisciplinary teams and high schools organized into subject area departments, the finding from this study is logical. However, due to the fact that administrators reported that change efforts were often blocked by

resistance from teachers, suggests that new administrators at all levels may wish to strengthen lines of communication and supervision with faculty.

Regarding job readiness, subjects considered themselves most ready for responsibilities of student discipline, crediting readiness to prior experience as teachers. With most subjects entering administration from teaching, it is likely that they are both experienced and comfortable with this duty. Although budget administration was not reported as a time-consuming responsibility, it was the area that administrators reported they were least ready to manage. Additionally, 40% of subjects indicated that they needed professional development in this area, even after working nearly for a full year as an administrator. Subjects credited their lack of readiness to work experiences and university training that apparently did not address fiscal management. The demographic characteristics of interns support this finding. As former teachers, most probably had limited experience with budgets. Likewise considering certification requirements, Kentucky principals may be appointed into administration before they complete a university course in school finance, and in some cases may serve up to five years before completing a finance course. Study findings indicate that additional research regarding specific skills and competencies of new administrators in fiscal management may be useful. With additional research, certification and university programs may need to alter requirements and course content related to finance. In the immediacy, KPIP mentors may wish to spend ample time with interns working on fiscal management issues, including how to manage the budget cycle and how to operationalize policies related to budget procedures and internal controls. This finding suggests another issue regarding the KPIP structure. Administrators have KPIP assistance for only one year, either when they are assistant principals or when they are principals. Given this, principals who participate in KPIP as assistant principals, may not have had the need to

focus on fiscal issues during the KPIP year since this responsibility is not assigned usually to assistant principals. When these individuals become principals, they don't have KPIP activities to support them if they need assistance with fiscal management. Questions have long existed about the appropriateness of KPIP assisting at one level, either the principalship or the assistant principalship. Given the nature of this study's finding, and the differences in work of principals and assistant principals, KPIP program planners may wish to explore this issue further.

Subjects reported areas of professional development that would enhance their job performance. Given the fact that KPIP is a one-year program, providing support to these new administrators beyond the first year may be useful particularly in areas related to their professional development needs. In their second administrative year, participants may find themselves "on their own", since the observation and mentoring hours provided by KPIP are no longer provided. District personnel are encouraged to build formal support structures that extend beyond KPIP year and address specialized needs of administrators. The study supports the contention that professional growth should extend throughout an administrator's career (National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1992; National Policy Board for Educational Administration, 1990).

Although the demographic variables used were not reliable predictors of growth needs, additional research on other variables related to prior work experience and situational contexts of schools may provide different results. Replication of the factor analysis with an additional group is needed. Understanding the correlations among development areas, particularly related to school improvement, may be useful to those planning professional development experiences for administrators.

KPIP administrators implemented numerous changes during the first year. Changes that

were most unsuccessful were in areas of (a) curriculum and instruction and (b) student discipline. If KPIP is to help administrators meet challenges of KERA, more focus on developing skills of new administrators in areas of instructional leadership, team process skills, and conflict management may be needed. Of course, this requires that KPIP mentors and committee members take seriously their obligations to model leadership behaviors and to develop abilities of interns in these areas. Additionally, KPIP committee members must know about effective instructional practices and the change process. Districts may wish to analyze their assignment process for KPIP mentors and committee members. Even though it is logistically difficult to cover KPIP assignments because of large numbers of interns and limited numbers of experienced administrators, districts are encouraged to appoint only the "best and most competent" to serve on KPIP committees.

Subjects reported that KPIP participation enhanced their professional growth in several ways. This finding supports work of Petrie et al. (1992) and Wells (1999), and suggests that KPIP is a useful conduit for inducting new administrators. This study and others on KPIP support work of succession researchers such as Hart (1993), who reported that much of new administrators' socialization to the profession occurs during the first year and that districts and peers play important roles in providing assistance.

In this study, more principals than assistant principals entered administration with less than six years work experience in education. This indicates for the first time in Kentucky that a group of administrators graduating with masters degrees in educational administration are beginning to enter the workforce as principals. This group should be tracked carefully over the next few years to determine if their lack of prior work experience or advanced graduate training hinders their performance as new administrators. The demographic trend is likely to continue

due to the recent certification changes that move administrator certification from a particular school level (P-6, 5-8, 7-12) at the post-masters level to a generic P-12 certification at the masters level. Prior to this change, Kentucky administrators were required to have a masters in a teaching area and additional hours in administration. Future studies may be useful in identify hiring trends regarding age, formal preparation, and prior work experience. Universities will also find younger, less experienced, less educated candidates entering principal preparation programs. Characteristics of these candidates may cause changes to be needed in university programs, KPIP requirements, and professional development programs offered for new administrators.

Additional research to provide a broader understanding of the roles of the KPIP committee is needed. Experiences of KPIP mentors, administrator educators, and superintendent designees should be explored. Given that attitudes and skills of committee members are important, studies are needed to explore the benefits of participation for those who serve on KPIP committees. Identifying incentives for committee member service also may be relevant, given that monetary compensation likely will remain low.

Finally, this study supports the notion that providing support to new administrators is a challenging, yet important practice. Daresh and Playko (1992) report that although induction programs have great promise, they generally have not achieved their full potential. KPIP has operated for a decade and was designed before the state reform act. Research is needed at this point to determine if KPIP participation actually improves the quality of leadership in Kentucky schools. With well-orchestrated research and careful program revision, the program may evolve into an induction model that reshapes roles of principals and assistant principals towards improvements in teacher and student performance.

References

Anderson, M. (1989). Training and selecting school leaders. In Office of Educational Research and Improvement (Ed.), School leadership: Handbook for excellence. Washington, DC: United States Department of Education.

Daresh, J. (1986). Status on research on administrator inservice. National Forum of Educational Administration and Supervision, 3, 23-31.

Daresh, J., & Playko, M. (1992). What do beginning leaders need? Aspiring and practicing principals perceptions of critical skills for novice administrators. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.

Daresh, J. C., & Playko, M. A. (1992). The professional development of school administrators: Preservice, induction, and inservice applications. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Doud, J. L., & Keller, E. P. (1998). A ten-year study: The K-8 principal in 1998. Reston, VA: National Association of Elementary School Principals.

Duke, D. L. (1986). The aesthetics of leadership. Educational Administration Quarterly, 22, 7-27.

Erlandson, D. A. (1994). Building a career: Fulfilling the lifetime professional needs of principals. Fairfax, VA: National Policy Board for Educational Administration.

Fowler, F. J. (1993). Survey research methods. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Hart, A. W. (1993). Principal succession: Establishing leadership in schools. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Kentucky Administrative Regulations. (1998). 704 KAR 20:470.

Kentucky Department of Education (1999). Kentucky Principal Internship Program Handbook. Frankfort, KY: Office of Teacher Education and Certification.

Kentucky Department of Education (1998). Kentucky Principal Intern Program 1997-98: Survey Results. Frankfort, KY: Office of Teacher Education and Certification

Kentucky Revised Statutes. (1996). KRS 61.872.

Kinnear, P. R. & Gray, C. D. (1994). SPSS for Windows made simple. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Knight, P. A., & Weiss, H. M. (1980). Effects of selection agent and leader origin on leader influence and group member perceptions. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 26, 7-21.

Knowles, M. (1988). The modern practice of adult education: From pedagogy to andragogy. Cambridge, MA: The Adult Education Co.

Levine, S. L., (1982). Promoting adult growth in schools: The promise of professional development. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Lyons, J. E. (1993). Perceptions of beginning public school principals. Journal of School Leadership, 3, 186-202.

Mizelle, T.K. (1995). An examination of the role of assistant principals in high schools in Virginia that are restructuring. (Doctoral dissertation, Old Dominion University, 1995). Dissertation Abstracts International, 56-10A, 3807.

Murphy, J., & Forsyth, P. B. (1999). Educational administration: A decade of reform. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

National Association of Secondary School Principals (1992). Developing school leaders: A call for collaboration. Reston, VA: Author.

National Policy Board for Educational Administration (1990). Principals for our changing schools: Preparation and certification. Fairfax, VA: Author.

Pellicer, L. O., Anderson, L. W., Keefe, J. W., Kelley, E. A., & McCleary, L. E. (1988). High school leaders and their schools. Volume I: A national profile. Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals.

Petrie, G., White, E., Wallman, D., & Prickett, R. (1992). Kentucky principal intern program evaluation report 1990-92. Bowling Green, KY: The Consortium for Educational Administration, Western Kentucky University.

Prickett, R. L. (1990). Opportunities for success: Kentucky's Beginning Principal Intern Program. ERIC Document ED 342115.

Stevens, J. H. (1996). Applied multivariate statistics for the social sciences (3rd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Wells, Z. (1999). Kentucky's induction-year internship for principals and assistant principals: 1997-98 demographics and job responsibilities. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Kentucky, Lexington.

Wiggins, T. (1975). The influence of roles and organizational climate upon principal behavior. In W. G. Monahan (Ed.), Theoretical dimensions of educational administration. New York: MacMillan.

Table 1

Population of KPIP Interns Compared to Subjects Returning Questionnaire

	KPIP Interns			Sample Subjects		
School Level	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total
Elementary	21 (23%)	46 (55%)	67 (38%)	15 (30%)	23 (49%)	38 (39%)
Middle	32 (35%)	16 (19%)	48 (27%)	19 (38%)	14 (30%)	33 (34%)
High	39 (42%)	22 (26%)	61 (35%)	16 (32%)	10 (21%)	26 (27%)
Total	92 (100%)	84 (100%)	176 (100%)	50 (100%)	47 (100%)	97 (100%)

Table 2

Demographic Characteristics of Subjects Classified by Job Title

	Principal Interns (n = 41)	Assistant Principal Interns (n = 56)
Gender	44% Male	57% Male
School Level		
	70% Elementary	16% Elementary
	15% Middle	48% Middle
	15% High	36% High
School Size		
	25% = < 250 Students	2% = < 250 Student
	34% = 251-500 Students	7% = 251-500 Students
	34% = 501-750 Student	45% = 501-750 Students
	7% = > 751 Students	46% = > 751 Students
School Location		
	78% Rural	61% Rural
	12% Suburban	27% Suburban
	10% Urban	12% Urban

Table 3

Job Responsibilities Indicated as First, Second, or Third in Priority

	Kentucky Sample			NAESP Sample
Job Responsibility	Total	Assistant Principals	Principals	Principals
Discipline and Student Management	78%	95%	56%	61%
Nondisciplinary Interaction with Students	55%	57%	51%	65%
Supervision and Contact with Staff	52%	39%	68%	81%
Duties Assigned by Central Office	21%	21%	20%	9%
Safety and Security Issues	20%	20%	20%	8%
Parent and Community Contacts	20%	22%	17%	25%
Curriculum Development Oversight	20%	11%	32%	11%
Student Evaluation and Placement	16%	16%	15%	11%
Facilities Management	10%	5%	17%	17%
Other Duties Not Listed	4%	7%	0%	41%
Budget Administration	3%	3%	3%	5%
Planning/Conducting Staff Development	2%	4%	0%	6%
Site-Based Council Responsibilities	1%	0%	2%	---
Interaction with Central Staff	0%	0%	0%	6%

Note. Dash indicates that data were not collected from subjects.

Table 4

Time Spent in Job Responsibilities Predicted by School Level, Gender, Position, and School Size

Job Responsibility	Statistics for Four Predictor Variables		
	F ratio[a]	Significance	Adjusted R squared
Curriculum Development Oversight	1.992	.102	.04
Discipline and Student Management	11.54	.000*	.31
Duties Assigned by Supervisor	1.309	.273	.05
Interaction with Students	0.247	.911	.00
Parent and Community Contacts	0.442	.778	.00
Student Evaluation and Placement	1.784	.139	.03
Safety and Security Issues	1.327	.266	.06
Supervision and Contact with Staff	4.490	.002*	.13

[a] df for $F = 4, 92$.

*$p < .05$.

Table 5

Job Responsibility Discipline and Student Management Predicted by School Level, Gender, Position, and School Size

Predictor Variables	Statistics for Predictor Variables		
	B	SE B	β
School Level	.143	.161	.095
Gender	.399	.211	.165
Position	-1.032	.259	-.421*
School Size	.009	.123	.081

*$p < .05$.

Table 6

Job Responsibility Supervision and Contact with Staff Predicted by School Level, Gender, Position, and School Size

Predictor Variables	Statistics for Predictor Variables		
	B	SE B	β
School Level	-.336	.151	-.267*
Gender	-.099	.197	-.049
Position	.185	.243	.090
School Size	-.090	.116	-.100

*$p < .05$.

Table 7

Reported Areas of Professional Development Need

Areas of Professional Development	Kentucky Sample			NAESP Sample
	Total	Assistant Principals	Principals	Principals
Improving Staff Performance	56%	61%	49%	35%
Planning/ Implementing Curricular Change	44%	50%	37%	27%
Assessing/ Evaluating Instructional Program	41%	42%	39%	27%
Effective Fiscal Administration	40%	38%	44%	13%
School Improvement Planning	37%	36%	39%	34%
Improving Student Performance	33%	31%	34%	32%
Supervising the Instructional Program	31%	41%	17%	22%
Assessing/ Evaluating Staff	23%	20%	27%	19%
Managing Organizational Change	23%	23%	22%	30%
Understanding and Applying Technology	22%	16%	29%	50%
Building Community Within the School	12%	14%	10%	25%
Dynamics of Group Process	12%	13%	12%	19%
Planning/ Organizing Time	17%	13%	22%	18%
Using Effective Communication Skills	8%	14%	0%	16%
Assessing/ Evaluating Students	7%	7%	7%	14%
Building Partnerships with External Groups	7%	9%	5%	28%
Working with Special Interest Groups	6%	7%	5%	13%
Other	2%	2%	2%	3%

Table 8

Significant Varimax Rotated Factor Loadings of Areas of Professional Development Identified by Principals as Enhancing Future Job Performance

Area of Professional Development	Factor 1	2	3	4	5
Building school partnerships			.68		
Improving staff performance		.75			
Improving student performance		.67			
Assessing the instructional program	.71				
Supervising the instructional program	.70				
Leaning about group dynamics					
Assessment of students					.60
Communication and presentation skills			.69		
Planning and implementing change	.78				
Understanding and applying technology					
School improvement planning		.63			
Managing organizational change					.67
Building community with the school					
Assessing and evaluating staff					-.62
Planning and organizing time				.67	
Effective fiscal administration					
Working with special interest groups				.70	

AERA

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC®

030950

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Perceptions of First-Year Administrators: Impact of Responsibilities & Preparation on Professional Growth Needs	
Author(s): Diane Ricciardi • Joseph Petrosko	
Corporate Source: Univ. of Louisville	Publication Date: 4-20-00

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

☒

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature: Diane Ricciardi	Printed Name/Position/Title: D. RICCIARDI ASST PROF
Organization/Address: #329 School of Education Univ. of Louisville Louisville, KY 40292	Telephone: 502 852-3999 FAX: 502 852-0616
	E-Mail Address: DIANER@LOUISVILLE.EDU Date: 4-20-00

(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
1129 SHRIVER LAB
COLLEGE PARK, MD 20772
ATTN: ACQUISITIONS

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com