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The theoretical framework and statements from the data collection instrument developed and used by Smith and Andrews (1989) were used to gather data for this study. Of 27 schools, 17 schools participated in the survey, with a response rate of 63%, with 212 respondents returning the instrument.

Based on an analysis of the data using a combination of Pearson’s Product Moment Correlation, analysis of variance (ANOVA), and Tukey’s HSD test, the following conclusions were drawn. Teachers in schools with quality music programs perceive their principals to have strong instructional leadership characteristics in four areas, as identified and defined by Smith and Andrews (1989). These areas are the principal as: (1) resource provider, (2) instructional resource, (3) communicator, and (4) visible presence. There is a significant relationship between teachers’ perceptions among the four areas of principals’ instructional leadership characteristics identified by Smith and Andrews (1989). There is a significant difference between teachers’ perceptions of the instructional leadership characteristics of principals in schools with quality music programs at the elementary school and high school levels. One limitation of the study is that only nine teachers from one elementary school were in the population which included teachers from 2 middle schools, 3 junior high schools, and 11 high schools.
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ABSTRACT

This study identified teachers' perceptions of instructional leadership characteristics of principals in schools with quality music programs, specifically, principals in 17 public schools in a six-state Northwestern region whose music teachers had applied for school groups to perform musical selections at the 1999 Northwest Music Educators Conference. In addition, this study determined if there was a relationship between teachers' perceptions among the four categories of instructional leadership characteristics identified by Smith and Andrews (1989). Lastly, this study determined if there was a difference in teachers' perceptions of instructional leadership characteristics of principals between multiple comparisons of groups of principals of various grade levels of schools with quality music programs.

The theoretical framework and statements from the data collection instrument developed and used by Smith and Andrews (1989) were used to gather data for this study. Of 27 schools, 17 schools participated in the survey, with a response rate of 63%, with 212 respondents returning the instrument.

Based on an analysis of the data using a combination of Pearson's Product Moment Correlation, analysis of variance (ANOVA), and Tukey's HSD test, the following conclusions were drawn. Teachers in schools with quality music programs perceive their principals to have strong instructional leadership characteristics in four areas, as identified and defined by Smith and Andrews (1989). These areas are the principal as: (1) resource provider, (2) instructional resource, (3) communicator, and (4) visible presence. There is a significant relationship between teachers' perceptions among the four areas of principals' instructional leadership characteristics identified by Smith and Andrews (1989). There is a significant difference between teachers' perceptions of the instructional leadership characteristics of principals in schools with quality music programs at the elementary school and high school levels. One limitation of the study is that only nine teachers from one elementary school were in the population which included teachers from 2 middle schools, 3 junior high schools, and 11 high schools.
INTRODUCTION

Introduction

Background

Instructional leadership characteristics of principals directly influence the academic achievement and development of students in their schools. Research on instructional leadership characteristics of principals of effective schools, in which all students have high academic achievement levels, i.e., continued progress at the 80 percentile level or mastery of academic material, indicates that principals have a positive impact on improved instruction and academic achievement in students (Edmonds, 1982, Sweeney, 1982, Wilson, 1982, Glasman, 1984, & Manasse, 1984).

The Importance of Principal's Leadership

The main purpose of principals' instructional leadership in public schools is to help all students develop to their fullest potential through improving instruction and learning, providing for diverse educational needs, and competent academic achievement. In a study of how principals make a difference in promoting excellence in education, Smith and Andrews (1989) concluded that strong instructional leader principals functioned as forceful and dynamic leaders with high energy, initiative, tolerance for ambiguity, a sense of humor, analytical ability, and a practical stance toward life. These strong leadership qualities could be further identified as the principals' excelling in the four broad characteristics of leadership: 1) resource provider, 2) instructional resource, 3) communicator, and 4) visible presence (Smith & Andrews, 1989). Research by Smith and Andrews (1989) demonstrated the importance of principals' leadership in giving prime attention to teaching and learning in the school (Teddlie, Kirby, & Stringfield, 1989).
Becker, Withycombe, Doyel, Miller, Morgan, DeLoretto, and Aldridge (1971) found that successful principals displayed leadership supported by a belief system of strong commitment to students, instruction, and teachers. Schools with successful principals had high student and teacher morale, enthusiasm, and adaptability, and were uplifting places to visit and inhabit. Principals recognized problems but confronted them with inspiring leadership and hard work to affect necessary change. The leadership characteristics of successful principals included a concern for student academic achievement.

The following studies illustrate the crucial importance of principals’ leadership in improving student academic achievement. In analyzing student achievement outcomes, Andrews and Soder (1987a, 1987b), Andrews, Soder, and Jacoby (1986), and Andrews, Houston, and Soder (1985) found when the behavioral descriptors of the principal with the strong characteristics of 1) resource provider, 2) instructional resource, 3) communicator, and 4) visible presence were used to group schools in which teachers perceived their principals to be strong, average, or weak instructional leaders, there were significant differences in incremental growth in student achievement. Schools with principals who were perceived by their teachers to be strong instructional leaders exhibited significantly greater gain scores in achievement in reading and mathematics than did schools with average and weak instructional leader principals.

As further examples of the importance of principals’ leadership in improving teaching and learning, Teddlie, Kirby, and Stringfield (1989) conducted a study to investigate principals’ leadership in eight schools in Louisiana. The schools were paired in terms of consistent superior or inferior academic performance over a two-year period, matching the schools according to socioeconomic status of the community. Results indicated that the paired schools differed significantly in measures of teaching effectiveness, such as time on task, presentation of new material, high expectations, positive reinforcements, and discipline. Schools with high academic performance, teaching effectiveness, and standards of discipline also had principals with strong leadership
characteristics. Furthermore, research by Mortimore, Sammons, Stoll, Lewis, and Ecob (1988), showed in a longitudinal study of 50 British schools that the principal’s strong leadership of the staff was a key factor in schools effective in academic and nonacademic criteria. Ultimately, principals with strong instructional leadership characteristics affect improvement in student academic achievement, one of the main purposes of principals’ instructional leadership in public school education.

Through monitoring, supporting, or correcting progress toward goals, principals who are strong instructional leaders translate visions into instructional expectations for teachers, students, and administrators (Rutherford, 1985, Sergeovanni, 1995). To further clarify, the principal with strong leadership characteristics communicates the vision or purpose of the school through daily activities, words and examples to bond students, teachers, parents, and the community as believers in the work of the school (Sergiovanni, 1984). Principals with strong instructional leadership characteristics consistently demonstrate a commitment to academic goals, and can develop and articulate a vision of instructional expectations and goals which prioritize school and classroom activities (Bamburg & Andrews, 1988). This vision results in coherence and integration to instructional planning by the school staff. This dissertation is concerned with expectations of principals’ performance in schools with quality music programs, as reflected in teachers’ perceptions of principals’ instructional leadership characteristics in the four major categories of activities of an instructional leader as resource provider, instructional resource, communicator, and visible presence.

Teachers’ Perceptions of the Role of Instructional Leadership of Principals

To obtain more clarity and precision about the complex role of instructional leadership of principals, Smith and Andrews (1989) studied the leadership behavior of 1,200 school principals to construct a definition of instructional leadership that is observable and measurable, and to develop a school-based supervision and evaluation model for
assessing principals and assisting them in achieving objectives. With the assumption that teachers are the best evaluators of the principal’s instructional leadership, Smith and Andrews (1989) reviewed research findings and conducted a study on teachers’ perceptions of the leadership characteristics of their principals. Smith and Andrews’ definition of the principal as an instructional leader signifies strong leadership characteristics as (1) resource provider, (2) instructional resource, (3) communicator, and (4) visible presence. Respectively, these leadership characteristics mean: (1) providing necessary resources to achieve the school’s academic goals; (2) knowledgeable in curriculum and improving instruction, (3) skilled in communication, and (4) physical and philosophical visible presence at the school (Smith & Andrews, 1989). Smith and Andrews’ definition of the principal as an instructional leader was formulated through considering results of research, including studies by Persell and Cookson (1982), who reviewed more than 75 studies and reported these recurrent behaviors associated with strong principals: (1) commitment to academic goals, (2) climate of high expectations, (3) functioning as an instructional leader, (4) being a forceful and dynamic leader, (5) consulting with others, (6) creating order and discipline, (7) marshaling resources, (8) using time well, and (9) evaluating results. In addition, Smith and Andrews also examined the leadership characteristics of 21 principals identified as strong instructional leaders by superintendents and peer principals, and analyzed the relationship between instructional leadership and high student academic achievement.

In the study previously mentioned to determine teachers’ perceptions of the instructional leadership characteristics of principals, Smith and Andrews (1989) asked teachers in schools identified with strong, average, and weak instructional leader principals to respond to 18 positive statements in a questionnaire about instructional leadership (see Appendix A). The questionnaire included statements such as, “My principal mobilizes resources and district support to help achieve academic achievement goals” (Smith & Andrews, 1989, p. 32). Findings by Smith and Andrews (1989) corroborated results of studies by Andrews and Soder (1985, 1987a, 1987b), Andrews, Houston, and Soder (1985),
and Andrews, Soder, and Jacoby (1986), which determined that schools with strong instructional leader principals had significantly greater gain scores in achievement in reading and mathematics than did schools with average and weak instructional leader principals.

**Limited Research in Area for This Study**

Although the research by Smith & Andrews represents a “monumental study” (Sergeovanni, 1995, p. 12), no studies have been conducted on identifying the instructional leadership characteristics of principals in public schools with quality music programs. Studies on the attributes of effective instructional leaders, as identified and articulated by Smith and Andrews, have focused on schools, but the studies did not particularly address schools with quality music programs. For the purposes of this dissertation, the term “schools with quality music programs” designates the total number of 37 public schools in a six-state Northwestern region (Alaska, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Washington, and Wyoming), whose music teachers submitted applications for music groups to perform musical selections at the 1999 Northwest Music Educators Conference. Grade levels of the schools in the study included elementary schools, middle schools, junior high schools, and high schools. The Northwest Music Educators Conference accepts applications from elementary school through university level schools, as well as community groups. Selection to perform at the conference, as an example of musical excellence for particular grade levels, is competitive, and is accomplished through adjudication of taped auditions of musical performances by the school music groups. This study considered schools which were known for having quality music programs, among other achievements. Therefore, do the principals of these schools, i.e., those with quality music programs, exhibit the attributes of strong instructional leaders as articulated by Smith and Andrews?

**Need for Research in Area of Study**

There is a need for research in this area because studies have suggested that music may benefit student academic achievement and development (McCaffrey, 2000, Weinberger,
Problem Statement

It is not known if principals of schools with identified quality music programs are considered to be strong instructional leaders, as identified by Smith and Andrews (1989). It is possible that principals in schools with quality music programs could be strong instructional leaders in music areas, but not in other general academic areas. Studies on the attributes of strong instructional leaders, as identified and articulated by Smith and Andrews, have focused on schools, but the studies did not particularly address schools with quality music programs.

Purpose

Context of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to identify teachers’ perceptions of instructional leadership characteristics of principals in schools with quality music programs. The four areas of instructional leadership being examined included the principal as (1) resource provider, (2) instructional resource, (3) communicator, and (4) visible presence, as these categories relate to general academic areas (Smith & Andrews, 1989). To further explain, these areas focus respectively on the principals’ leadership characteristics as: (1) providing necessary resources to achieve the school’s academic goals; (2) knowledgeable in
curriculum and improving instruction, (3) skilled in communication, and (4) a physical and philosophical visible presence at the school (Smith & Andrews, 1989).

Significance of the Study

The significance of the problem is that no studies have been conducted on instructional leadership, as identified by Smith and Andrews (1989), in schools with quality music programs. Furthermore, research by Smith and Andrews was conducted more than ten years ago (published in 1989). Since that time, changes in education, such as advances in the use of technology, expanding academic and social responsibilities of schools, and changing patterns in ethnicity and socioeconomic status of populations, warrant the need for a study to determine if the results of research by Smith and Andrews (1989) apply to current schools.

For the first time, a study on teachers' perceptions of the instructional leadership characteristics of principals in schools noted for strengths in a particular area, i.e., quality music programs, was conducted. This study provided a continuation of Smith and Andrews' use of teacher perceptions to examine the instructional leadership of principals. In addition, this study presented updating, current information relating to the 1989 study by Smith and Andrews, by examining the perspective of principals' instructional leadership characteristics from the point of view of teachers in schools with identified quality music programs.

Research Questions

The following research questions were addressed by this study.

1. What are teachers', in schools with quality music programs, perceptions of instructional leadership characteristics of principals in four areas: (1) resource provider, (2) instructional resource, (3) communicator, and (4) visible presence?
communicator, and (4) visible presence?

2. Is there a relationship between teachers' perceptions of instructional leadership characteristics of principals among the four categories of leadership characteristics identified by Smith and Andrews (1989)?

3. Is there a difference in teachers' perceptions of instructional leadership characteristics of principals between multiple comparisons of groups of principals of various grade levels of schools with quality music programs, e.g., elementary school principals compared with middle school, junior high school, or high school principals?

Theoretical Framework

Basis for Current Study

The theoretical framework of this study was based on the study conducted by Smith and Andrews (1989), which identified teachers' perceptions of the leadership characteristics of their principals in four areas of instructional leadership: (1) resource provider, (2) instructional resource, (3) communicator, and (4) visible presence. The data collection instrument for the current study contained the same 18 positive statements for teacher response (used by permission) which were used by Smith and Andrews (1989). The study by Smith and Andrews (1989) focused on the attributes of effective instructional leader principals in schools, but it did not particularly address schools with quality music programs.

Differences for Current Study

This study differed from that of Smith and Andrews (1989) in considering only schools which were known for having quality music programs in a six-state Northwestern region. The current study determined if the principals of these schools, i.e., those with quality music programs, exhibited the attributes of strong instructional leaders as identified
conducted more than ten years previously, applied to current schools, in spite of changes in
education, such as advances in the use of technology, expanding academic and social
responsibilities of schools, and changing patterns in ethnicity and socioeconomic status of
populations.

Design of the Study

Design

This study surveyed teachers in 17 schools with quality music programs about
teachers' perceptions of instructional leadership characteristics of their principals, using a
data collection instrument (see Appendix C) containing statements developed and used by
Smith and Andrews (1989). Principals of 27 schools agreed to participate in the study;
however, principals of 17 schools actually participated in the study. The schools, located in
a six-state Northwestern region (Alaska, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Washington, and
Wyoming) included elementary schools, middle schools, junior high schools, and high
schools. The twelve week study, which was begun November 10, 2001, used a variation of
Dillman's "Total Design Method for Surveys," (Dillman, 1978, p. 21) a four-tier approach
consisting of an advance letter (see Appendix D), phone call, cover letter and first mailing of
survey questionnaires and instructions, thank you/reminder postcard, and second thank
you/reminder postcard to nonrespondents. Principals (see Appendix E) could decide
whether teachers could participate in the survey, and the number of questionnaires to
distribute. Principals distributed, collected, and returned questionnaires. These factors were
limitations of the study, since they impacted the rate of response.

Data analysis included multiple comparisons of the responses regarding teachers’
perceptions of principals’ leadership characteristics. There was a comparison of the means
of teacher responses regarding perceptions of each category of leadership characteristics of
the principal as resource provider, instructional resource, communicator, and visible
presence within certain types of schools, e.g., elementary school or high school. Next, the
means of responses regarding teachers' perceptions of principals' leadership characteristics for each category of leadership characteristics were compared between different types of schools, e.g., middle school and high school. The results of Pearson's Product Moment Correlation showed that within schools of identical grade levels (types), there was a high relationship between teachers' perceptions of principals' leadership characteristics. However, there were variances in the means between types of schools, so an oneway analysis of variance (ANOVA) was done to determine if the differences were significant. The differences were significant; therefore, the Tukey HSD test was done to determine exactly where the differences were. The differences in the means between teachers' perceptions of instructional leadership characteristics of high school principals and teachers' perceptions of instructional leadership characteristics of elementary school principals were significant.

Definition of Terms

Following are the definitions of terms used throughout this study. Other terms and concepts will be defined in the text of this dissertation.

Schools with quality music programs: For the purposes of this dissertation, this term denotes public schools whose music teachers submitted applications for music groups to perform musical selections at the 1999 Northwest Music Educators Conference.

Northwest Music Educators Conference: An annual informational meeting for music educators from a six-state Northwestern region, including Alaska, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Washington, and Wyoming. The annual conference has been held for more than fifty years. Select music groups from elementary schools, middle schools, junior high schools, high schools, colleges, universities, and community groups are chosen by application and adjudication of taped audition to perform musical selections at the conference, as an example of excellence in music performance for particular school grade levels.
example of excellence in music performance for particular school grade levels. Adjudication of taped audition is conducted by a panel of music educators and includes evaluation of level of difficulty, appropriate intonation, articulation, phrasing, dynamics, tempo, rhythm, and interpretation of musical selections. Decisions regarding the application of a school music group to perform at the conference are based on availability of funds and time for additional rehearsal, school district policies on travel, and the music teacher's assessment of the group's ability to excel in performing two challenging musical selections.

**Standards:** Defining indicators contained in a document of voluntary standards, the National Standards for Arts Education (1994). This document was developed in 1994, and was underwritten by the U.S. Department of Education. The National Standards for Music are contained in the National Standards for Arts Education.

**Arts literacy:** Education in the visual and performing arts. Art forms include visual, music, dance, and theater (Boyer, 1994).

**Effective music programs:** Music programs which enhance student learning and development (Hanshumaker, 1980). Music programs are not measured in this dissertation.

**Instructional leadership characteristics:** Recurrent behaviors and attributes associated with principals in an educational leadership role (Smith & Andrews, 1989).

**Principal:** The main administrator in the school (Sergeovanni, 1995).

**Music teacher:** A music specialist, band teacher, orchestra teacher, or choral teacher in a school (National Standards for Arts Education, 1994).
Limitations and Delimitations

Limitations

The limitations of this study were as follows:

1. The population included teachers in only 17 schools with quality music programs in Alaska, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Washington, and Wyoming.
2. Principals could decide whether to allow teachers to participate in the study.
3. Principals could decide the number of questionnaires to distribute to teachers.
4. Principals distributed, collected, and returned the questionnaires.
5. Gender and ethnicity factors were not be equalized for this study.
6. There was variation in the years of experience as a principal or classroom teacher in the schools for this study. It was assumed that the quality music programs for all students in the schools, along with commitment to find reliable results, would offset these effects.

Delimitations

Delimitations of this study were as follows:

1. Schools in this study included one elementary school, two middle schools, three junior high schools, and eleven high schools.
2. The period of the study was twelve weeks.

Summary

Background

This chapter presented background information supporting the need for a study of teachers' perceptions of the instructional leadership characteristics of principals in schools.
with identified quality music programs, which are, for the purposes of this dissertation, defined as those 17 schools in a six-state Northwestern region whose music teachers applied for music groups to perform musical selections at the 1999 Northwest Music Educators Conference. Smith and Andrews’ studies (1989) reviewed research findings and teachers’ perceptions of instructional leadership characteristics principals in schools to create a definition of instructional leadership for principals, which they defined as being a strong leader in four areas: (1) resource provider, (2) instructional resource, (3) communicator, and (4) visible presence. Smith and Andrews (1989) also conducted behavioral analyses of principals’ activities, and analyzed instructional leadership and student academic achievement.

Previous Findings

Studies by Andrews and Soder (1985, 1987a, 1987b), Andrews, Houston, and Soder (1985), and Andrews, Soder, and Jacoby (1986) determined that when the four behavioral descriptors previously mentioned were used to group schools in which teachers perceived their principals to be strong, average, or weak instructional leaders, there were significant differences in incremental growth in student academic achievement. Schools with strong instructional leader principals had significantly greater gain scores in achievement in reading and mathematics than did schools with average and weak instructional leaders. When teachers perceived principals to be above average on 18 specific, positive statements of leadership, student academic growth tended to be high. Conversely, when teachers perceived principals to be below average on these statements, student academic growth tended to be low.

Need for Current Study

Considerable research is in the literature on effective instructional leaders. Smith and Andrews’ studies (1989) focused on schools, identifying and articulating attributes of principals as instructional leaders; however, the studies did not particularly address schools
with quality music programs. This study investigated teachers' perceptions of instructional leadership characteristics of principals in schools which were known for having quality music programs, among other achievements, to determine if principals of these schools exhibited the attributes of strong instructional leaders, as identified and articulated by Smith and Andrews (1989). This study presented updating, current information relating to the 1989 study by Smith and Andrews, by examining the perspective of principals' instructional leadership characteristics from the point of view of teachers in schools with identified quality music programs. Results of this study will provide ideas for effective instructional leadership and will enrich the literature on educational leadership.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

Background

This chapter provides a review of literature related to this descriptive study on teachers' perceptions of the instructional leadership characteristics of principals in schools with quality music programs. A synthesis of major areas related to the research, and evidence for limited research in the area to be studied will be discussed. The following major areas will be reviewed: (a) context of the problem, (b) previous research and findings, and (c) summary.

Context of the Problem

Characteristics of Instructional Leadership

Many definitions of leadership have been suggested. Studies by Bennis (1984) and Bennis and Nanus (1985) note that more than 350 definitions of leadership are recorded in the literature. This dissertation will discuss definitions of instructional leadership of principals. Bennis (1984) lists four competencies of educational leaders: management of meaning, of attention, of trust, and self-management. To further explain, Bennis states that competency as an educational leader involves being able to "manage" the meaning of education, thereby having a clear understanding of the purpose for schools and management of the organization toward fulfilling that purpose. Management of attention denotes helping teachers to focus their energies toward teaching students, the purpose of the school. Management of trust means acting in a way which inspires others to believe in one's leadership capabilities. Management of self applies to knowing one's strengths and weaknesses, using the areas of strength, while working to improve the weaknesses.
transformative. Transactional leadership involves leader and followers' exchanging needs and services, to accomplish independent objectives. This type of leadership can be viewed as a type of bartering, in which the leader's and followers' needs are traded, to strike a bargain, such as receiving positive reinforcement or merit pay for good work. Transformative leadership, by contrast, involves leader and followers' being united in higher-level common goals. This type of leadership in schools leads to leadership by bonding, in which the leader raises the focus of school goals and purposes to a level which bonds together the leader and followers in a moral commitment toward goals. Leadership by binding follows, when the leader connects the people to a set of ideas and ideals about the work of the school, thus providing guidelines for people to become self-managing (Sergeovanni, 1995).

Further, Etzioni (1988) maintains that morality, emotion, and social bonds are more powerful motivators than the extrinsic concerns of transactional leadership and the intrinsic concerns of transformative leadership. Etzioni states that an instructional leader's task is to transcend the basic requirements for competence by inspiring extraordinary commitment and performance. The principal who is a strong instructional leader can use these leadership strategies to inspire commitment and extraordinary performance in staff, students, parents, and community members. (Sergeovanni, 1995).

Theories of Instructional Leadership Behavior

A leader's behavior may be modified or adapted to fit particular situations. Many theories on leadership behavior abound; however, this dissertation is concerned with theories regarding instructional leadership. The following three theories: role, expectancy, and adaptive-reactive theory, provide insight into how conditions shape leader behavior, as considered in this study on instructional leadership characteristics of principals in schools with quality music programs. The role theory (Kahn and Rosenthal, 1964, Pfeffer and Salancik, 1975) states the principal's leadership behavior is shaped by the perceptions of
how others, such as superintendents, peer principals, teachers, parents, and students want the leader to act. Daily orders, requests, job descriptions, and the school’s mission and tasks influence the principal’s perception of role requirements.

The expectancy theory (Nebecker & Mitchell, 1974) suggests the principal’s behavior can be predicted from the principal’s expectations regarding the consequences of the behavior. Principals act in ways they perceive will obtain desired outcomes, such as taking precautions in administration of the school budget or keeping an orderly school building.

The adaptive-reactive theory (Osborn and Hunt, 1975) assumes the principal adapts to the size, structure, and external environment, and reacts to teacher attributes and traits. The type of school (grade level and size) and the type of community (stable or changing) influence the principal’s behavior.

In addition to considering the three previously mentioned theories of principal behavior, research by Schon (1983) suggests that three types of reflective practice may influence principal behavior. The first type, “reflection in action,” exists when the principal reflects about the action, rather than acts impulsively. The second type, “reflection on action,” exists when the principal thinks critically about an action already completed. The third type, “reflection while in action,” suggests the principal routinely performs well-established administrative tasks while simultaneously actively engaging in critical inquiry about other matters.

Current Background of Instructional Leadership

Current Background

Current lists of competencies and proficiencies delineate job descriptions for educational administration (Sergeovanni, 1995). In 1986 the National Association of Elementary School Principals (NAESP) issued the document “Elementary and Middle School Proficiencies for Principals,” which contained a list of 74 proficiencies grouped into
10 categories that define “expertness” in the principalship. The 10 categories included “leadership behavior, communication skills, group processes, curriculum, instruction, performance, evaluation, organization, fiscal, and political” (Sergeovanni, 1995, pp. 4-6). These categories of proficiencies define excellence in the principalship, and directly relate to the leadership areas investigated for this study: the principal as (1) resource provider, (2) instructional resource, (3) communicator, and (4) visible presence (Smith & Andrews, 1989). Although these proficiencies are inherent in job descriptions for educational administration, more emphasis is now being placed on outcomes of school goals and student performance, rather than upon lists of tasks.

Principals with different personalities and leadership styles can be equally effective, and they appear to have leadership traits in common. Wilson and Corcoran (1988) studied a large number of effective secondary schools and found that no single leadership style appeared dominant. The most important factor appeared to be the “fit” between the principal’s leadership style and the subcultures in the school (Wilson & Corcoran, 1988, p. 80-81). “In some cases, there are dynamic powerful principals who seem to be everywhere and orchestrating everything…. In other cases, the principals are collegial and low-key, relying on persuasion, delegation, and their ability to select and develop strong faculty members” (Wilson & Corcoran, 1988, pp. 80-81). Different leadership styles existed, but effective principals all focused on active leadership, motivating staff, motivating students, reaching the community, and continually improving the school.

Case Studies

Seven Effective Instructional Leaders

Smith and Andrews (1989) identified seven principals as case studies to determine if principals could be strong instructional leaders, regardless of grade level of school, personality, or leadership style. The seven principals identified for case studies by Smith and Andrews (1989) were enrolled in The Danforth Program for Preparation of School
Leaders, at the University of Washington. Selection of the principals was from portraiture of 23 schools given by three-member teams including professors, graduate students, and public school administrators, trained in portraiture methodology, explained in Good High School Portraits of Character and Culture (New York: Basic Books, 1985). Some principals were strong, aggressive, and fearless, while others were quiet, nurturing, and supportive. However, all principals studied by Smith and Andrews (1989) rated highly on the four areas of instructional leadership identified and examined by Smith and Andrews: resource provider, instructional resource, communicator, and visible presence.

Smith and Andrews' findings (1989) in seven case studies of effective instructional leaders with similar insights, yet different grade levels of schools and styles of leadership, corroborate the findings of Wilson and Corcoran (1988). The significance of the case studies being used in this study is that they illustrate the ability of principals to be effective instructional leaders, regardless of grade level of school, personality, or leadership style.

High School Principal

A high school principal in the case studies (Smith & Andrews, 1989) modeled being a resource provider and instructional resource by being informed on educational research and placing copies of journal articles in the faculty room. Teacher professionalism was supported by a drawing a faculty name from an envelope each week, to enable the winning teacher to be released for a half day learning experience outside of school. The principal used departmental meetings to develop curriculum, and supported points on educational policy with information. In addition, he provided teachers with feedback as they prepared presentations for board meetings. Regarding student activities, he commented that his experience supports the research that student involvement in activities correlates with future success, and stated that the school band numbered 180 students, a testimony to his encouragement of student activities. An aggressive fundraiser, he supported the school music program and various school programs for students of all abilities, needs, and interests. Parents, staff, and students respected his understanding, openness to new ideas...
interests. Parents, staff, and students respected his understanding, openness to new ideas and flexibility, and also his ability to be strong, forthright, and energetic. As communicator, he was a good listener and articulate spokesperson for not labeling students or putting them on educational tracks. As visible presence, he was seen throughout the school at all times and events, and represented his values and school ideals.

**Elementary School Teacher**

An elementary school teacher in the case studies (Smith & Andrews, 1989) showed instructional leader behavior as a resource provider by encouraging teachers’ ideas to inspire others, by seeking and providing staff retraining, and by using all staff, including the custodian, to teach students. As instructional resource, she used classroom visits to stimulate teachers to use different instructional methods, and encouraged staff to discuss curriculum and instruction. As communicator, the principal led teacher support and communicated expectations through modeling, using themes and symbols. As visible presence, the principal was seen before and after school, in the halls and at social functions, and was a visible reminder of her ideals and values for the staff and students.

Each principal in the case studies (Smith & Andrews, 1989) used the characteristics of leadership previously discussed in this dissertation. All of the case studies described principals who were strong instructional leaders, but whose actions were tempered by different methods and styles depending upon their personality and circumstances of events. The significance of the case studies for this dissertation is they illustrate the ability for principals with all methods and styles of administration to be instructional leaders, regardless of type of school, personality, or leadership style. All principals studied by Smith and Andrews (1989) rated highly on the four areas of instructional leadership articulated by Smith and Andrews: resource provider, instructional resource, communicator, and visible presence.
Previous Research Findings

Characteristics of Instructional Leaders

Characteristics of principals who are highly effective instructional leaders are shown in studies by Leithwood and Stager (1986). These studies determined that highly effective principals are more task-oriented and reflective, give priority to substance over management processes, and view people as resources which are important to the work of the school (Sergeovanni, 1995). These findings underscore those of Goldhammer, Becker, Withycombe, Doyel, Miller, Morgan, DeLoreto, and Aldridge (1971) who found that successful principals have an ability to work effectively with people and secure their cooperation, are aggressive in acquiring recognition of the needs of their schools, and are able strategists who can identify objectives and plan means to achieve them through the most appropriate procedures (Sergeovanni, 1995). Studies by Leithwood and Montgomery (1982) reported similar findings in a review of research in which they compared the behavior of effective and average principals.

Recurrent Behaviors of Instructional Leaders

Strong principals appear to have recurrent behaviors associated with leadership characteristics. Persell and Cookson (1982, p. 22) reviewed more than 75 studies and reported these recurrent behaviors associated with strong principals: (1) demonstrating a commitment to academic goals, (2) creating a climate of high expectations, (3) functioning as an instructional leader, (4) being a forceful and dynamic leader, (5) consulting effectively with others, (6) creating order and discipline, (7) marshaling resources, (8) using time well, and (9) evaluating results. Persell and Cookson's review of research indicated that strong principals are assertive, have high energy and the ability to assume the initiative. In addition, strong instructional leaders are open to new ideas and are tolerant of ambiguity. They have a sense of humor, analytic ability, and a practical view of life.

Similar findings by Sergeovanni (1995) determined that successful principals
ensure the academic achievement of all students, have strong interpersonal communication skills, promote teacher professional growth, and create a shared vision of an outstanding school through collaboration with faculty, parents, and community members. Furthermore, research by Leithwood and Montgomery (1982) reported similar findings in a review of research in which they compared the behavior of effective and average principals.

Research by Smith and Andrews (1989) corroborates these findings. Principals as instructional leaders rated significantly higher across four dimensions of interaction between principal and teachers, the principal in the role of (1) resource provider, (2) instructional resource, (3) communicator, and (4) visible presence (Smith & Andrews, 1989).

Leadership Characteristics of Effective Elementary and Secondary School Principals

Leithwood (1987) compared the characteristics of effective elementary and secondary school principals. In a comparison of 34 leadership characteristics, 23 were common to principals of both levels of schools. Important differences included: principals of secondary schools pursued a more complex and broader range of goals, considered more factors to exercise influence, had less need for close parent involvement, but more need for working with business and social institutions in the community and affiliation among staff and students.

Rutherford (1985, p. 32) states that effective principals:

1. have clear, informed visions of what they want their schools to become - visions that focus on students and their needs;
2. translate these visions into goals for their schools and expectations for their teachers, students and administrators,
3. continuously monitor progress; and
4. intervene in a supportive or corrective manner when this seems necessary.

Similar differences between “strong” and “average” school principals were found in studies by Andrews and Hallett (1983a, 1983b). Although strong high school principals spent more time on educational program improvements than did average high school
principals; they spent less time on improvement than did middle school, junior high school, or elementary school principals. Strong high school principals also spent more time on building management, operations, and district relations than did their colleagues at earlier grade levels.

**Principals as Strong Instructional Leaders and The Use of Time**

To further explain the use of time by principals considered strong instructional leaders, studies by Krajewski (1978) and the Lake Washington School District, Kirkland, Washington (1980) found that principals regard instructional and program improvement as the most important aspects of their job; however, they spend the greatest amount of time on school management and operations, the areas which they view as least important. To compare how an average principal spends time doing school-related duties, with how a principal considered to be a strong instructional leader spends time at school, Andrews and Hallett (1983a, 1983b) used the definition of principal as resource provider, instructional resource, communicator, and visible presence, and asked a sample of superintendents in school districts in the Pacific Northwest to identify principals whom they considered to be instructional leaders. Next, principals who were colleagues of those principals selected by superintendents were asked to name principals whom they considered to be instructional leaders. When there was concurrence between superintendent and peer principals’ nominations, Andrews and Hallett (1983a, 1983b) asked permission to measure the 28 principals in staff perceptions of their performance as instructional leaders. Twenty-five of the 28 principals selected agreed to answer a questionnaire developed as part of an effective schools project, which had a key factor which measured teachers’ perceptions of their principal as an instructional leader.

To be considered a strong instructional leader by the staff, the principal had to score at least one standard deviation above an average principal on instructional leadership. Twenty-one of the 25 principals qualified, based on staff perceptions of instructional
leadership. To qualify, using the mean score and standard deviation derived from a sample of approximately 250 principals over a two-year period, these principals had a mean score of 82 or greater on a scale from 19 to 95. The sample of principals who qualified for the study included 5 high school, 5 middle school, and 11 elementary school principals. The principals administered schools ranging from a high school with 2,600 students to an elementary school with 125 students. The sample included 11 female and 10 male principals, with a range of experience from 3 years to over 16 years. Each principal kept a time log of activities, using methodology developed by Andrews and Hallett.

Through a synthesis of research, Andrews and Hallett (1983a, 1983b) determined that principals ranked the most important part of their job as educational program improvement, followed by school-community relations, student-related services and activities, building management and operations, and district relations. Using these rankings, Andrews and Hallett found that principals who were considered strong instructional leaders spent time differently than the average principal. Although average principals considered educational program improvement as deserving the most time, they spent more time on management (39 percent) and student services (28 percent) than they did on educational improvement (27 percent). A comparison of the percentages of time spent on job dimensions is as follows: Education Program Improvement (Average Principals: 27 percent, Strong Instructional Leaders: 41 percent), School-community Relations (Average Principals: 6 percent, Strong Instructional Leaders: 7 percent), Student-related Services and Activities (Average Principals: 28 percent, Strong Instructional Leaders: 18 percent), Building Management, Operations, and District Relations (Average Principals: 39 percent, Strong Instructional Leaders: 34 percent), Average Hours Per Day (Average Principals: 10+, Strong Instructional Leaders: 10.75+) (Andrews & Hallett, 1983a, 1983b).

Data from this investigation suggest that principals who are strong instructional leaders do not take time away from building management activities in favor of instructional leadership functions. Rather, they spend almost the same amount of time on management.
functions, 3.7 hours per day (34% x 10.75 hours), as does the average principal who spends 3.9 hours per day (39% x 10.1 hours). Strong instructional leaders spend less time on student-related activities, 1.9 hours per day (18% x 10.75 hours), compared to the average principal who spends 2.8 hours per day (28% x 10.1 hours), or nearly an hour less. In contrast, the average principal spends only 2.7 hours per day on curriculum and instruction, staff selection and evaluation, and supervision of staff. Strong instructional leaders spend 4.4 hours per day (41% x 10.75 hours) in this area. These data suggest that the 21 principals in the study by Andrews and Hallett (1983a, 1983b) were strong building managers, as well as strong instructional leaders, who were able to organize their day to focus time and attention on instructional matters, rather than the routine matters of building management.

Strong Instructional Leadership and Increased Average Gain Scores

Andrews, Soder, and Jacoby (1986) conducted a study to investigate the relationship between perceptions of the principal as instructional leader and average gain scores of students in reading and mathematics in 67 elementary schools in the Seattle (Washington) School District. Mentioned earlier, this study relates to the current study because it establishes validity for the data collection instrument used by Smith and Andrews (1989), and the statements on the data collection instrument used in the current study.

The study by Andrews, Soder, and Jacoby (1986) begun in 1982 and completed in 1985, as part of the Effective Schools Project of the Seattle School District and the University of Washington College of Education, was initiated as a collaborative effort to improve the district's schools and special programs. Based on reviews of the literature, the means developed to assess perceptions of leadership in each district elementary school centered on four general characteristics of the role of a principal: (1) mobilizing resources, (2) communicating, (3) serving as instructional resource, and (4) being a visible presence. The variables constructed for each elementary school included school means for aggregated
student improvement on Total Reading and Total Mathematics of the California Achievement Test (CAT), a principal leadership scale, and other school characteristics.

In April 1982, 1983, and 1984 the California Achievement Test was administered to all children by classroom groups. Subjects for the sample in the study had to be enrolled in the same school over the two-year test time. Of the original 67 elementary schools designated for the study, 33 schools had a sufficient number of students in each subgrouping to be included in the study, giving a total of 3,515 students included in the data analysis. The ethnicity and socioeconomic groupings of students were: 1,633 White, 1,021 Black, 1,226 free-lunch students, and 2,114 non-free lunch students (Andrews, Soder, & Jacoby, 1986).

Reliability of the strong leadership factor was estimated by several procedures. Internal consistency of the analysis of spring 1984 data gave a Cronbach Alpha of .93. Further, the Staff Assessment Questionnaire was administered to a random sample of 125 teachers in five urban schools, and 139 teachers in six rural school districts, yielding Cronbach Alphas of .97 and .93, respectively. Regarding the principal leadership variable, test-retest reliability based on a three-week interval with an N of 30 teachers was .89; based on a one-year interval with the same principals in the same schools, (N = 63), test-retest reliability was estimated at .723 (Andrews, Soder, & Jacoby, 1986).

Andrews, Soder, and Jacoby (1986, p. 9) used student gain scores to measure academic achievement. Since a concern exists using gain scores as measures of improvement for individual student scores, Andrews, Soder, and Jacoby (1986) used a three-step process to investigate the relationship between student academic achievement and strong principal leadership.

The data used for analysis included school gain scores, i.e., prior achievement scores from the individual student normal curve equivalent (NCE) scores for spring 1982 California Achievement Test, and individual student normal curve equivalent (NCE) scores for spring 1984 California Achievement Test. First, in the three-step process to minimize
the lack of reliability of individual student gain scores, multiple regressions were used to determine the strength of the leadership score and student achievement gain scores and to assess the relationship between the leadership of the principal and other school characteristics. Second, regression analyses were used to predict spring 1984 California Achievement Test scores from prior achievement (spring 1982 individual student normal curve equivalent (NCE) scores) and the leadership of the school principal variable. If no significant relationship was found between prior achievement and spring 1984 individual student normal curve equivalent (NCE) scores, simple regressions were used to estimate the relationship between the leadership of the principal and gain scores. Third, analysis of variance was used to assess the effect of the leadership treatment condition on gain scores in both Total Reading and Total Math. The elimination of schools with less than 10 students in any subgroup results in means less sensitive to the vagaries of testing. The correlation between individual 1982 and 1984 California Achievement Test scores for all students in the same school for the 1982-1985 project period was .79 for Reading and .73 for Mathematics (p < .001) (Andrews, Soder, & Jacoby, 1986, pp. 9-10).

In the analysis of the data, there were no significant differences between the various groups of schools in the mean scores for all students in Total Reading (p < .533) and Total Mathematics (p < .453) scores. The mean score for Total Reading of students in schools with principals who were strong instructional leaders was 53.73; the mean score for Total Reading of students in schools with principals who were average leaders was 56.95, and the mean score for Total Reading of students in schools with principals who were weak instructional leaders was 53.81. The Total Mathematics mean scores were 56.13, 57.72, and 54.93, respectively for the Strong Leader, Average Leader, and Weak Leader schools (Andrews, Soder, & Jacoby, 1986, p. 16).

There were no significant differences between the ethnic groups of students or between the three leadership groups, or when the students were grouped by Free Lunch or No Free Lunch. However, when students were compared within groups, Total Reading
average achievement of White students was 63.20, and Black students 46.96, and for Total Math of White students 62.62, and Black Students 45.17. It is important to note that these differences were consistent across the three groups of schools when the study began in 1982. Total Reading and Total Math scores when disaggregated by the Free Lunch or No Free Lunch status also showed differences. Students in the Free Lunch group scored on average 14 to 16 individual student normal curve equivalent (NCE) points below the students in the No Free Lunch group. However, there were no significant differences between the three leadership groups of schools when compared on their NCE scores at the beginning of the study.

The results of the analyses of variance using leader group as the independent variable and average gain scores as the dependent variable did show significant differences between the three groups of schools (F = 4.35; p < .017). The Tukey (a) procedure for testing differences between simple mean scores resulted in these conclusions: (1) Students in schools administered by principals who were rated by their teachers as strong instructional leaders had significantly greater gain scores in Total Reading (X = 4.40) than did students in schools having principals rated as average instructional leaders (X = 1.57) or schools with principals rated as weak instructional leaders (X = 1.82); (2) Students in schools administered by principals who were rated as their teachers as strong instructional leaders had significantly greater gain scores in Total Reading for students who received Free Lunch (F = 6.05; p < .003).

The Tukey (a) procedure resulted in the conclusion that free lunch students who attended schools which had principals who were strong instructional leaders had significantly higher gain scores (X = 5.87) than did students who attended schools administered by principals with average leadership characteristics (X = 2.00), or students in schools having principals who were weak instructional leaders (X = 1.10).

All subgroups of student achievement showed a positive direction for schools with principals who were strong instructional leaders. Regarding Black student Total Reading
gain scores, Black students in strong leader schools gained an average of 4.57 points, compared to 1.38 and .092 for the average and weak instructional leader groups, respectively; however, these differences were not sufficient to achieve the .05 level of significance (Andrews, Soder, & Jacoby, 1986, pp.18-19).

The results of the analyses of gains scores for Total Math were similar to those in Reading, but a greater number of significant differences were found. Significant differences were found for Total Math gain scores (F = 3.52; p < .034); White student gains (F = 3.60; p < .039); Black student gains (F = 6.50; p < .009); and free lunch student gains (F = 5.93; p < .005). Significant differences in favor of students in schools with principals who were strong leaders were found using the Tukey (a) analyses. Black students had the most significant gains (X = 4.43), and free lunch students had gains of X = 5.97 in schools with principals who were strong instructional leaders. Further, Black students attending schools with principals who were strong instructional leaders gained on the average 4.43 points over the two-year period, but Black students in schools administered by weak instructional leaders lost on the average 2.34 points over the two-year period of time. Free lunch students gained an average of 5.97 points in schools with strong instructional leader principals, but lost on the average of .09 points during the same period of time in schools having weak instructional leaders (Andrews, Soder, & Jacoby, 1986, p. 19).

This study also examined the relationship between the strong leadership variable and eight additional school staff variables measured in the questionnaire. The correlations between these staff variables and the strong leader variable showed that the leadership of the principal was related to six of the eight variables: Early Identification, Frequent Monitoring of Student Progress, High Expectations, Multicultural Education, Positive Learning Climate, and Sex Equity. The leadership of the principal was not significantly related to Curriculum Continuity and Staff Dedication (Andrews, Soder, & Jacoby, 1986, pp. 19-20).

The study by Andrews, Soder, and Jacoby (1986) was explained in detail because of its important connection with the current study on teachers' perceptions of instructional
leadership characteristics of principals in schools with quality music programs. The findings of Andrews, Soder, and Jacoby (1986) establish that perceptions of the principal as a strong instructional leader can influence gains or losses in the reading and mathematics achievement scores of students, particularly among low-achieving groups of students. These findings establish validity for the statements in the questionnaire used in further research by Smith and Andrews (1989) on the principal in the role as (1) resource provider, (2) instructional resource, (3) communicator, and (4) visible presence. The statements in the questionnaire used by Smith and Andrews (1989) were used in the data collection instrument in the current on instructional leadership characteristics of principals in schools with quality music programs.

Research by Smith and Andrews (1989)

Strong Instructional Leadership

Smith and Andrews (1989) studied the leadership behavior of 1,200 school principals of 200 schools with over 2,500 teachers to construct a definition of instructional leadership that is observable and measurable in the school, and to develop a school-based supervision and evaluation model that can be used by supervisors of school principals to assess principals as instructional leaders and assist them in achieving their objectives. To find whether distribution of time between strong instructional leaders and average principals was the only difference between the two groups, Smith and Andrews (1989) asked 1,100 teachers in “strong,” “average,” and “weak” instructional leader schools which activities and behaviors they regarded as the most important for a principal to be considered a strong instructional leader and to describe the activities and behaviors by responding to each of 18 specific, Likert scale positive behavioral descriptors (see Appendix A). Previous studies by Andrews and Soder (1985, 1987a, 1987b), Andrews, Houston, and Soder (1985), and Andrews, Soder, and Jacoby (1986) found when these 18 behavioral descriptors were used to group schools in which teachers perceived their principals to be strong, average, or weak
instructional leaders, there were significant differences in incremental growth in student academic achievement. These 18 specific, positive behavioral descriptors form categories of four core leadership characteristics which define the principal as a strong instructional leader: (1) the principal as resource provider, (2) the principal as instructional resource, (3) the principal as communicator, and (4) the principal as visible presence (Smith & Andrews, 1989, p. 9). Validity of the data collection instrument for the Smith and Andrews' study (1989) was established through previously mentioned research by Andrews, Soder, and Jacoby (1986) which found that teachers' perceptions of the principal as an instructional leader can influence gains or losses in the reading and mathematics achievement scores of students, particularly among low-achieving groups of students. In each case in the study by Smith and Andrews (1989), strong principals received more positive ratings than average and weak, and average principals received more positive ratings than weak. In addition, this study emphasized the importance of principals' giving their time to the main purpose of the schools - teaching and learning (Sergeovanni, 1995). Teacher responses in the study by Smith and Andrews (1989) included 800 teachers from Strong Leader schools, 2,146 teachers from Average Leader schools, and 300 teachers from Weak Leader schools (see Appendix B).

**Resource Provider**

The first instructional leadership characteristic which defines the principal as a strong instructional leader is that of resource provider (Smith & Andrews, 1989). In this area the principal gathers personal, building, district, and community resources to achieve the vision and goals of the school. Resources include materials, information, and people. Principals who are strong resource providers view the entire district and community as potential sources for resources for school use, and believe that the principal’s job is to acquire and use these resources.

Strong resource providers are knowledgeable about people, research, and new developments in education. They accept and use new ideas from teachers, use staff
members as staff developers and peer coaches for other staff members. Teachers and support staff in the school are assigned to duties that use their strengths in content and personal skills. People outside the school are contacted to help staff solve instructional problems and provide opportunities for development of students, staff, parents, and community members. Curriculum materials are provided through skillful management of the instructional materials budget, and staff members are drawn into setting priorities to maximize the budget.

In the role of resource provider, the principal encourages staff members to share in decision-making processes, and group processes are used to get appropriate expertise and to disseminate up-to-date information on studies relating to curriculum, grants, workshops, professional conferences, college courses, and volunteer efforts.

The principal in the role of resource provider maximizes instructional effectiveness and student achievement by encouraging human resources which help faculty and students achieve success. The strong instructional leader who is a resource provider has the ability to analyze and manage resources to allow the entire school to strive toward its goals and achieve its potential.

**Instructional Resource**

The second instructional leadership characteristic which defines the principal as a strong instructional leader is that of instructional resource (Smith & Andrews, 1989). The principal who is a strong instructional resource is actively engaged in improvement of instructional materials and teaching strategies that enhance student learning. The principal acts as facilitator of new knowledge by suggesting that teachers try new strategies at a mutually convenient time for observation, with the premise that other strategies can be attempted if certain ones are not effective. By acting as encourager, facilitator, counselor, and “cheerleader,” the principal gives more support as an instructional resource than by just providing a list of different instructional strategies and slight encouragement to use them (Smith & Andrews, 1989, pp. 32-22).
The principal is cognizant of new developments in education, and maintains a personal development program which includes regular reviewing of educational research, curriculum development, and learning styles. The principal as instructional resource gives prime importance to the main purpose of the school: teaching and learning (Teddle, Kirby, & Stringfield, 1989). In addition, the principal shows comprehensive knowledge of instructional activities, and participates fully in them (Fullan, 1991). Clinical supervision aligns with teacher evaluation and emphasizes professional growth and development. The principal shows teachers and students that what they do makes a difference (Sergeovanni, 1984).

Communicator

The third instructional leadership characteristic is that of communicator. The principal is viewed as a good communicator at three levels: one-on-one, as a small-group facilitator, and as having the ability to create a sense of vision for the school (Smith & Andrews, 1989). Strong principals have the ability to communicate vision and can focus on basic goals and purposes of the school (Sergeovanni, 1984). Sergeovanni (1984) states that the role of the principal in communicating is that of seeking to define, strengthen, and articulate enduring values, beliefs, and cultural strands which give the school its identity. The main effect of vision communication is a bonding of students, staff, parents, and the community as believers in the work of the school.

The principal as communicator uses communication as the basis for developing good relationships with staff through actions which are fair, consistent, and objective (Smith & Andrews, 1989). The principal who is a good communicator imparts a sense of professionalism to staff members by clinically supervising them according to their performance as teachers and varying the model when necessary, by counseling teachers, rather than by evaluating them out of teaching, and by providing high performance standards in their own behavior and expecting that from their teaching staff (Smith & Andrews, 1989, pp. 35-36).
Visible Presence

The fourth leadership characteristic is the principal as a visible presence in the school (Smith & Andrews, 1989). The principal in the role of visible presence is seen interacting with students and teachers in classrooms and hallways of the school, and at school events away from the building. The principal constantly reinforces school values and has a personal knowledge of daily occurrences at the school. The visible presence of the principal is seen and felt specifically when the principal gives positive attention to staff and student accomplishments (Smith & Andrews, 1989). Teachers view the principal to be a visible presence when the principal makes frequent classroom observation, is accessible for discussing instructional matters, is seen regularly in the building, and actively participates in staff development (Smith & Andrews, 1989).

Further, studies by Iannaccone and Jamgochian (1985) found that being positive, cheerful, and encouraging; being accessible to the staff, and causing the staff to express and set their own goals are overlapping elements of positive school climates and effective, visible principals. In addition, the principal in the role of visible presence protects the school from others' special interests.

Need for Current Study

Limited Research in Area to be Studied

Although considerable research has been conducted on teachers' perceptions of principals as strong instructional leaders, an exhaustive search of the extant literature indicated that no research has been conducted to date on the area for this study: Teachers' Perceptions of Instructional Leadership Characteristics of Principals in Schools With Quality Music Programs. Thus, little is known about the instructional leadership characteristics of principals in schools which are noted for, among other achievements, quality music programs. Studies suggest that using music as a resource for teaching and learning may enhance student academic achievement and development (McCaffrey, 2000,
Weinberger, 1998, Rauscher, Shaw, Levine, Wright, Dennis, & Newcomb, 1997, Rauscher, Shaw, Levine, & Ky, 1994, Rauscher, Shaw, Levine, & Wright, 1993, Lamb & Gregory, 1993, Frith, 1985, Hanshumaker, 1980, and Hurwitz, Wolff, Bortnick, and Kokas, 1975). Using music as a resource to enhance student academic achievement and development is pertinent for discussion because the schools selected for this study are termed schools with "quality music programs," defined as those public schools whose music teachers submitted applications for school music groups to perform musical selections at the 1999 Northwest Music Educators Conference. Principals of those schools, which use music as a resource, may have unique, strong instructional leadership characteristics which can be identified to provide ideas for effective leadership for all principals. A review of research on music as a resource for academic achievement and development will clarify the inherent reasons for this study.

**Music as a Resource for Student Academic Achievement and Development**

**Background**

Studies suggest that using music as a resource for teaching and learning may enhance student academic achievement and development (McCaffrey, 2000, Weinberger, 1998, Rauscher, Shaw, Levine, Wright, Dennis, & Newcomb, 1997, Rauscher, Shaw, Levine, & Ky, 1994, Rauscher, Shaw, Levine, & Wright, 1993, Lamb & Gregory, 1993, Frith, 1985, Hanshumaker, 1980, and Hurwitz, Wolff, Bortnick, and Kokas, 1975). To further explain the studies on music briefly discussed previously, the following research indicates the importance of using music as a resource for student academic achievement and development in early childhood education, elementary school, middle school, high school, and university levels of education.

**Music in Early Childhood Education**

Rauscher, Shaw, Levine, Ky, and Wright (1994) found that early music training
enhances spatial task performance in young children. Following a pilot study showing that ten three-year-old children scored substantially better on a spatial reasoning test after receiving music lessons (Rauscher, Shaw, Levine, & Wright, 1993), twenty-two preschool children aged three and four years enrolled at two Los Angeles County preschools were given eight months of keyboard and group singing lessons to determine the effects of early music training on spatial reasoning abilities. Fifteen children of the same preschool did not receive any music training. Music training consisted of weekly 15-minute private electronic keyboard lessons taught by professional piano instructors, and 30-minute group singing sessions led by a professional voice instructor. Lessons were provided at the preschools and included finger coordination exercises, the association of fingers with numbers, creativity exercises, the association of numbers with musical pitches, musical memory exercises and the introduction of standard musical notation using numbered finger symbols. Children could practice their keyboard lesson daily. Music literature included popular children’s songs and folk tunes.

Four tasks from the Performance subtest of the Wechsler Preschool and Primary Scale of Intelligence-Revised (Wechsler, 1989) and one task from the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scale (Thorndike, Hagen, and Jerome, 1986) were used to test the children’s spatial reasoning. The results reflected the same predictions as the pilot study, and showed that the group of children who received music lessons scored significantly higher on the Object Assembly task than the children who did not receive music training. A two (music vs. no-music group) by five (task) multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) showed that the scores of the 19 children who completed the eight months of music lessons were approximately 80% higher on the Object Assembly task (ANOVA) than those 15 children who did not have music lessons. The Object Assembly scores of the children who had music lessons were 14.0; while the scores of the children who did not receive music lessons were 10.4.
Application of Findings to Current Study

Although the subjects of the study just described were preschool students, the findings have application to the current study because many school districts have preschool programs to supplement kindergarten through grade five classes, e.g., Head Start programs for children at risk. In addition, many children attend private preschools before entering kindergarten. If music can be used as a resource to increase spatial reasoning abilities of children, those children who have music in their preschool experience may enter kindergarten with higher reading and mathematics readiness skills than those children who do not have music in their preschool curriculum. Teaching materials and curricula for those students entering kindergarten, who had strong music programs in preschool, would need to meet their needs. Principals who are strong instructional leaders would be able to provide appropriate curriculum materials and suggest instructional strategies for teaching a more able and diverse student population.

Music as a Resource in Elementary School

Hurwitz, Wolff, Bortnick, and Kokas (1975) found that first graders who received instruction in music listening scored significantly higher in scores on first grade reading tests than those students who did not receive instruction in music listening. After training in folk songs, the music group scored in the 88th percentile on reading tests, while the control group scored in the 72nd percentile (Hurwitz, Wolff, Bortnick, & Kokas, 1975). Frith determined that music facilitates reading by improving the decoding of phonemes, or sounding-out stage in reading, in which children attempt to pronounce the consonant or consonant-vowel combinations in words. Mohanty and Hejmadi’s studies (1992) found that musical dance training raised scores on the Torrance Test of Creativity. Lamb and Gregory (1993) found a high degree of correlation between how well children could read standard and phonetic reading material and how well they could determine the pitch of musical notes.
Music as a Resource in Middle School and High School

Music as a resource for learning appears to enhance a wide range of academic and social skills (Jensen, 1998). Further, studies by Dowling (1993) determined that music activates procedural (body) memory, and causes learning that lasts. Through a survey of 36 studies, Hanshumacher (1980) concluded that arts education facilitates language development, creativity, reading readiness, social development, personality development, and general intellectual achievement. Specifically, Hanshumacher found that music can foster positive attitudes toward school and learning, and can lower truancy in middle school and high school (Hanshumacher, 1980). Furthermore, a study of 8th and 9th graders showed that students' reading comprehension substantially improved with background music (Giles, 1991).

Regarding high school students, the Educational Testing Service in Princeton, New Jersey reported that in 1998 students with four or more years of study in the arts outscored students with six months or less of arts instruction by a combined total of 82 points on the verbal and mathematics portions of the Scholastic Aptitude Tests (Kupferberg, 1999). In addition, Mazourek's studies (1995) on high school students in band and chorus found a significant correlation between ratings of high musicality and being on the high honor roll for academic achievement.

Regarding social development, responses from more than 25,000 children aged 9 to 17 on a survey from the National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign indicated that music was the number one factor which kept them from using illicit drugs (McCaffrey, 2000). Family and football were listed second and third in responses in the form of single words, photographs, or expressions in art, music, or poetry (McCaffrey, 2000).

Music as a Resource for University Level

Rauscher, Shaw, Levine, Ky, and Wright (1993) conducted a study in which 36 undergraduate students from the Psychology Department of the University of California,
Irvine, scored 8 to 9 points higher on the spatial IQ reasoning subtest of the Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scale (Thorndike, Hagen, & Sattler, 1986) after listening to 10 minutes of Mozart’s “Sonata for Two Pianos in D Major, K. 448,” directly previous to taking the test, as compared to taped self-hypnosis instructions or silence. This study, popularly termed, “The Mozart Effect,” was the first to show listening to music as the cause of improved spatial reasoning, a causal relationship, not a correlation. Other studies had previously shown that music was a contributing factor or had indirect correlations to improvement (Rauscher, Shaw, Levine, Ky, & Wright, 1993).

Music and Cognition

Research suggests that participation in music may further student learning and development (Weinberger, 1998). Studies on cognition and the functions of the brain (Jensen, 1998) indicate that participation in music “may lay critical neural pathways important for later development” (Jensen, 1998, p. 12). If children learn to play a musical instrument, they appear to develop strong pattern extraction and abilities that are essential to higher brain functions in logic, math, and problem solving. Research suggests that the auditory cortex responds to pitch and tones, rather than to raw sound frequencies, and individual brain cells process melodic contour. Hence, music may be critical for later cognitive activities (Jensen, 1998).

Music is a resource for learning in “at least three possible categories: for arousal, as a carrier of words, and as a primer for the brain” (Jensen, 1998, p. 37). Arousal signifies that the music increases or decreases the attentional neurotransmitters of the brain, and can affect the mental state of the learners, thereby affecting learning.

The second use of music as a resource for learning is as a carrier, or vehicle for words. When children learn the alphabet, most of them have previously heard the alphabet song numerous times, and they simply attach the letters to the notes of the melody of the song, resulting in improvement in achievement of knowledge of the entire alphabet (Jensen, 1998).
The third use of music as a resource for learning is in priming the brain, or setting a pattern of speed, sequence, and strength of connections which result in a pattern of firing of neurons which can help the person complete a task (Jensen, 1998). Hurwitz, Wolff, Bortnick, and Kokas (1975) found that first graders who received instruction in music listening scored significantly higher in scores on first grade reading tests than those students who did not receive instruction in music listening. Mazourek’s studies (1995) on high school students in band and chorus found a significant correlation between ratings of high musicality and being on the high honor roll for academic achievement.

Examples of Music as a Resource in Schools

Instructional leadership characteristics of principals in the role of resource provider and instructional resource can be seen in the way principals have used music as a resource for learning in their schools. In Milwaukee, Wisconsin, a comprehensive education partnership termed Arts in Community Education (ACE) between the Milwaukee Symphony Orchestra and 25 private and parochial schools in eight school districts uses music as a resource for learning in kindergarten through high school classrooms. The goal of Arts in Community Education is to advance each student’s overall learning through a series of culturally diverse arts experiences structured around a coordinating theme for each grade. Kindergarten students learn about the “family of music”, i.e., composer, conductor, performer, and audience, a theme that emphasizes social development and the relationships found within all types of families. Third and fourth grade students develop cultural awareness, sensitivity, and pride by exploring cultural heritages and cross-influences in communities in Wisconsin and around the world. Fifth grade students become inventors and explore interdependence in artistic and scientific processes and problem solving (Longley, 1999).

Benefits of Using Music as a Resource

Music facilitates learning and cognitive development, and motivates students to
attend school and be receptive to learning, thus enhancing student academic achievement and development (Ohler, 2000). Further, music develops various symbol systems, expanding students' ability for expression and communication with others. In addition, music develops multicultural awareness and personal growth, from motor-skill development to self-knowledge and an increased knowledge of humanity, to development of teamwork skills (Ohler, 2000). These skills result in lifelong learning skills which will prepare students to succeed in the future.

Summary

This chapter has presented the theory underlying the reason for the study, synthesized major areas related to the research, and has given evidence for limited research in the area to be studied, thus showing a need for this descriptive study on teachers' perceptions of the instructional leadership characteristics of principals in schools with quality music programs. The following major areas were reviewed: (a) context of the problem, (b) current understanding of the problem, (c) previous research and findings, and (d) summary.

Bennis and Nanus' studies (1985) note that more than 350 definitions of leadership are recorded in the literature. This dissertation is concerned with instructional leadership characteristics of principals. Bennis lists four competencies of educational leaders - "management of meaning, of attention, of trust, and self-management." Burns (1978) identified two broad types of leadership: transactional and transformative. Transactional leadership involves trading of leaders' and followers' needs; whereas, transformative leadership involves leader and followers being untied in common goals. Etzioni (1988) maintains that morality, emotion, and social bonds are the highest forms of motivators. Sergeovanni (1995) states that an instructional leader's task is to transcend the basic requirements for competence by inspiring extraordinary commitment and performance.

Many theories of leadership abound; however, this dissertation is concerned with theories of instructional leadership. Three theories articulated by Smith and Andrews
(1989) explain how conditions shape leader behavior: role, expectancy, and adaptive-reactive theory.

Emphasis is currently placed on what principals are to accomplish in schools, regarding outcomes of school goals and student performance, rather than upon lists of tasks (Sergeovanni, 1995). The findings of Wilson and Corcoran's studies (1988) concurred with Smith and Andrews' research (1989) which found that different leadership styles existed, but effective principals all focused on active leadership, motivating staff and students, reaching the community, and continually striving to improve the school. Studies by Smith and Andrews (1989) identify four areas of instructional leader characteristics of principals as: 1) resource provider, 2) instructional resource, 3) communicator, and 4) visible presence (Smith & Andrews, 1989).

Studies by Andrews, Soder, and Jacoby (1986) showed that in schools where principals were strong instructional leaders, reading and mathematics achievement scores increased, particularly in low-achieving students. These studies also established validity and reliability for the data collection instrument used by Smith and Andrews (1989) in their study asking teachers to rate their principals on instructional leader characteristics.

Research on the use of music as a resource for teaching and learning suggests that music may increase students' academic achievement and development. Because of this factor, students in schools with quality music programs may have higher academic achievement and development than those students without quality music programs.

Principals in schools with quality music programs may have unique leadership characteristics in areas of instructional leadership. Although considerable research has been conducted on teachers' perceptions of principals as strong instructional leaders, an exhaustive search of the extant literature indicated that no research has been conducted to date on teachers' perceptions of instructional leadership characteristics of principals in schools with quality music programs.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter presents the methodology for this study to identify teachers' perceptions of the instructional leadership characteristics of principals in schools with quality music programs. The following areas are discussed: (1) population and sample, (2) data collection instrument, (3) research design, (4) data collection strategy, (5) data analysis, (6) time frame, and (7) summary.

Procedure

Population

The population for this study consisted of classroom teachers in a six-state Northwestern region (Alaska, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Washington, and Wyoming) in 37 public schools with quality music programs. For the purposes of this study, schools with quality music programs were those schools in which music teachers submitted applications for school music groups to perform musical selections at the 1999 Northwest Music Educators Conference. Of the initial population of teachers in 37 schools with quality music programs, principals in 27 schools agreed to have teachers participate in the study; however, principals from only 17 schools actually participated. Teacher respondents were of elementary grades through high school. The names of schools were obtained from the Great Falls Public Schools' Music Supervisor, who was the organizing chairperson of the Northwest Music Educators Conference in 1999 (Granlie, 2000). Select music groups from elementary schools, middle schools, junior high schools, high schools, colleges,
universities, and community groups are chosen by application and adjudication of taped audition to perform musical selections at the conference, as an example of excellence in music performance for particular school grade levels. Adjudication of taped audition is conducted by a panel of music educators and includes evaluation of level of difficulty, appropriate intonation, articulation, phrasing, dynamics, tempo, rhythm, and interpretation of musical selections. Decisions regarding the application of a school music group to perform at the conference are based on school district policies for travel, availability of funds, time for additional rehearsal, and the music teacher’s assessment of the group’s ability to excel in performing two challenging musical selections.

The rate of response from the population for this study was 63%. Rates for return of educational surveys are frequently in the 40% to 60% range (Gay, 1996); however, a higher rate of return of questionnaires from the population for this study was expected, due to an advance letter to principals prior to phoning principals for permission to conduct the study, and having the principals distribute, collect, and return the questionnaires for teachers. A higher rate of return is assured by having a person of authority ask the respondent to complete the survey (Gay, 1996).

Data Collection Instrument

A questionnaire was constructed in a Likert scale format (see Appendix C), using (by permission) the 18 positive statements regarding characteristics of principal leadership, from the data collection instrument in the study by Smith and Andrews (1989). The choice of response indicated: (1) Strongly Disagree, (2) Disagree, (3) Agree, and (4) Strongly Agree to each of the 18 positive statements (Gay, 1996). The questionnaire was one page in length and took less than two minutes to complete. The questionnaire addressed teachers’ perceptions of instructional leadership of the principal in four areas: (1) resource provider, (2) instructional resource, (3) communicator, and (4) visible presence.

The data collection instrument for this study (see Appendix C) used the same
statements as the questionnaire by Smith and Andrews (1989) because the research by
Smith and Andrews focused on “constructing a definition of instructional leadership that is
observable and measurable in the school” (Smith & Andrews, 1989, p. viii). When
teachers perceived their principals to be strong instructional leaders on these 18 positive
statements regarding characteristics of principal leadership, incremental growth in student
academic achievement tended to be high. Conversely, when teachers perceived their
principals to be weak instructional leaders, incremental growth in student academic
achievement tended to be low (Andrews & Soder, 1987a, 1987b).

Reliability of the data collection instrument used by Smith and Andrews (1989) was
shown by a significant difference in the gain scores in both Total Reading and Total
Mathematics and the corresponding strength of principals’ instructional leadership
characteristics (Andrews, Soder, & Jacoby, 1986). Reliability of the strong leadership
factor was estimated by several procedures. Internal consistency of the analysis of spring
1984 data gave a Cronbach Alpha of .93. Further, the Staff Assessment Questionnaire, a
questionnaire containing the positive statements in the instrument used by Smith and
Andrews (1989), was administered to a random sample of 125 teachers in five urban
schools, and 139 teachers in six rural school districts, yielding Cronbach Alphas of .97 and
.93, respectively. Regarding the principal leadership variable, test-retest reliability based on
a three-week interval with an N of 30 teachers was .89; based on a one-year interval with the
same principals in the same schools, (N = 63), test-retest reliability was estimated at .723

Possible scores for the questionnaire ranged from a low score of 18 to a high score
of 72, calculated from adding the points for each response to the 18 statements. Each
statement had a point value assigned to the choice of four responses: 1 point for Strongly
Disagree, 2 points for Disagree, 3 points for Agree, and 4 points for Strongly Agree. A
grade level identification number was placed in the upper right corner of each data collection
instrument, to track the type of school which returned questionnaires, and allow for comparisons (Dillman, 1978). No names were put on questionnaires to ensure anonymity. This procedure was explained in the cover letter. Principals were instructed to return the completed teacher surveys in one week or as soon as possible. Directions on the questionnaire for teachers to complete stated, “Please respond TODAY to this survey.” A higher rate of return is ensured by placing a specific deadline date for returning questionnaires (Gay, 1996). Teachers returned completed questionnaires to a central collection area, where questionnaires were placed in a stamped return envelope and returned to the researcher. Anonymity to the teachers was assured through the process.

Research Design

This study was conducted by surveying teachers in 17 schools with quality music programs in a six-state Northwestern region (Alaska, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Washington, and Wyoming). Grade level distribution of the schools was: one elementary school, two middle schools, three junior high schools, and eleven high schools. Because the selection of teachers was not random, generalization to all teachers in schools with quality music programs is not possible from this study.

Data Collection Strategy

An advance letter (see Appendix D) explaining the study was mailed to principals of the 17 schools with quality music programs, followed one week later by a phone call to each principal to request permission to conduct the survey, and the number of questionnaires needed. Following the advance letter and phone call to principals (see Appendix E), a packet including a cover letter (see Appendix F), questionnaires, instructions (see Appendix G), and an addressed, stamped return envelope was sent to principals requesting the survey.

Principals distributed, collected, and returned questionnaires. Using Dillman’s “Total Design Method for Surveys,” (Dillman, 1978, p. 21), which frequently ensures a
rate of return higher than 60%, a postcard (see Appendix H) thanking principals for allowing teachers to participate in the survey, and reminding principals to distribute questionnaires to teachers was sent one week after mailing the surveys (Dillman, 1978, Gay, 1996). Nonrespondent principals received a second postcard and phone call. Questionnaires were optically scanned and scored by Montana State University Information Technology Center. Principals could request a copy of the results by putting their name, address, and e-mail on the back of the return envelope.

**Time Frame**

The time frame for the study was twelve weeks. In November 2001, the cover letter explaining the research was mailed to principals of schools with quality music programs. This was followed one week later by a phone call to request permission to conduct the survey, and the number of questionnaires needed. One week after the first mailing of surveys, a thank you/reminder postcard (see Appendix P) was sent to all principals, thanking them for conducting the survey and returning the data collection instruments, or reminding them to do the survey (Dillman, 1978, Gay, 996). Four days after mailing the thank you/reminder postcard, a second phone call was made to nonrespondent principals to remind them of the survey, and to ask if they needed more questionnaires.

Three weeks after the second phone call to nonrespondent principals, a second mailing of thank you/reminder postcards was sent to nonrespondents (Dillman, 1978, Gay, 1996). Collection of survey questionnaires ended twelve weeks after the original mailing. Twelve weeks were allowed for the study because of a holiday break for schools, occurring before the end of the collection period. Table 1 provides a visual representation of the time frame for the study.
Table 1. Time frame for the study.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 10, 2001</td>
<td>Send advance letter to principals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 16, 2001</td>
<td>Phone principals for permission to do research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 23, 2001</td>
<td>Send cover letter and first mailing of surveys.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 8, 2001</td>
<td>Send thank you/reminder postcards to all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 11, 2001</td>
<td>Phone nonrespondent principals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 4, 2002</td>
<td>Send second postcard to nonrespondents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 2, 2002</td>
<td>Conduct final collection of surveys.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

This chapter has presented the methodology for this study to identify teachers’ perceptions of the instructional leadership characteristics of principals in schools with quality music programs. The following areas were discussed: (1) introduction, (2) population and sample, (3) data collection instrument, (4) research design, (5) initial data analysis strategy, (5) time frame, and (5) summary. Results of this study will provide ideas for effective leadership for all principals and will add to the literature regarding educational leadership.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Introduction

Background

This chapter presents the results of the study to identify teachers’ perceptions of the instructional leadership characteristics of principals in schools with quality music programs. The following areas are discussed: introduction, results of data analysis, discussion of results, and summary of results.

Results of Data Analysis

Percentage of Return of Survey Questionnaires

Of an initial 37 schools with quality music programs, principals in 27 schools agreed to participate in the research. However, principals of only 17 schools actually participated in the study by distributing questionnaires to their teachers and returning completed questionnaires. Principals’ reasons for not participating in the study were: (a) current involvement in a district accreditation process, (b) large number of district surveys, (c) commitment to limit unnecessary work for teachers, and (d) yearly change of principals within the last three years. Of those 17 schools, 13 principals (76%) responded to the first mailing by administering, collecting, and returning survey questionnaires. After being sent the second thank you/reminder postcard (see Appendix H), five more (24%) principals responded. The percentage of return of survey questionnaires by type of school was: elementary schools: 25%, middle schools: 67%, junior high schools: 100%, and high schools: 65%. The mean percentage of return of questionnaires for all schools was 63% (see Table 2 and Figure 1).
Table 2. Percentage of return of questionnaires.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of School</th>
<th>No. Schools Sent Q</th>
<th>No. Schools Returned Q</th>
<th>Return Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Schools</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Schools</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior High Schools</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Schools</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean Percentage of Return for All Schools

63%

Figure 1. Percentage of Return of Questionnaires.
Teacher Respondents

Some 212 teacher respondents participated in the study, as shown in Table 3 and Figure 2. As previously mentioned, reasons for not participating were: current accreditation processes, district surveys, and commitment to limit workload for teachers, and yearly change of principals within the last three years. Table 3. Number of teacher respondents by state and type of school.

Table 3. Number of teacher respondents by state and type of school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of School</th>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>States</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary School</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>MT, WA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior High School</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>ID, WA, WY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>AK, MT, OR, WA, WY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>212</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Number of Teacher Respondents
A limitation of the study is the fact that only nine teacher respondents from one elementary school participated in the survey. The percentage of teacher responses by type of school were: elementary school: 5%, middle school: 12%, junior high school: 16%, and high school: 67%. The percentage of teacher respondents by type of school is shown in Figure 3.

Data Analysis

The means of teachers’ responses to 18 items on the survey questionnaire regarding teachers’ perceptions of instructional leadership characteristics of principals in schools with quality music programs indicated that teachers in schools with quality music programs perceived their principals to have strong instructional leadership characteristics as resource provider, instructional resource, communicator, and visible presence, the four areas identified and articulated by Smith and Andrews (1989). On a 4-point scale (4 being the highest, strongly disagree to strongly agree), the mean response and standard deviation of teacher
responses for items 1 through 6 from teachers of all types of schools are shown in Table 4. Regarding statement 1 on the questionnaire, "My principal promotes staff development activities for teachers," nine elementary school teachers had a mean response of 3.67; twenty-five middle school teachers had a mean response of 3.64; thirty-three junior high school teachers had a mean response of 3.58, and one hundred forty-five high school teachers had a mean response of 3.34, giving a total mean teacher response of 3.43, with a standard deviation of .74 for statement 1. Figure 4 provides a visual representation of the mean teacher response for statement 1, all school types.

Statement 2 on the data collection instrument, "My principal encourages the use of different instructional strategies," drew a mean teacher response of 3.78 from elementary school teachers, 3.71 from middle school teachers, 3.67 from junior high school teachers, and 3.49 from high school teachers, with a total mean teacher response of 3.55, and a standard deviation of .71 for item 2 on the data collection instrument. Figure 5 shows the mean teacher response for statement 2, all school types.

![Figure 4: Mean Teacher Response for Statement 1](image)

Figure 4. Mean Teacher Response for Statement 1.

My principal promotes staff development activities for teachers.
Table 4. Number of teacher respondents, mean and standard deviation of teacher responses for statements 1-6.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Types</th>
<th>Statement 1</th>
<th>Statement 2</th>
<th>Statement 3</th>
<th>Statement 4</th>
<th>Statement 5</th>
<th>Statement 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior High School</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mean Teacher Response for Statement 2

![Mean Teacher Response for Statement 2](image)

Regarding statement 3 on the questionnaire, "Improved instructional practice results from interactions with my principal," eight elementary school teachers had a mean response of 3.38; twenty-five middle school teachers had a mean response of 3.20; thirty-three junior high school teachers had a mean response of 3.27, and one hundred thirty-eight high school teachers had a mean response of 2.93, giving a total mean teacher response of 3.04, with a standard deviation of .87 for statement 3. Figure 6 provides a visual representation of the mean teacher response for statement 3, all school types.

Statement 4 on the data collection instrument, "My principal makes frequent classroom observations," elicited a mean response of 3.56 from elementary school teachers, 2.76 from middle school teachers, 2.73 from junior high school teachers, and 2.84 from high school teachers, with a total mean teacher response of 2.84, and a standard deviation of .90 for item 4 on the data collection instrument. Figure 7 shows the mean teacher response for statement 4, all school types.
Figure 6. Mean Teacher Response for Statement 3.
Improved instructional practice results from interactions with my principal.

Figure 7. Mean Teacher Response for Statement 4.
My principal makes frequent classroom observations.
Regarding statement 5 on the questionnaire, "My principal is knowledgeable about instructional resources," nine elementary school teachers had a mean response of 3.67; twenty-four middle school teachers had a mean response of 3.71; thirty-two junior high school teachers had a mean response of 3.31, and one hundred forty high school teachers had a mean response of 3.27, giving a total mean teacher response of 3.35, with a standard deviation of .73 for statement 5. Figure 8 provides a visual representation of the mean teacher response for statement 5.

Statement 6 on the data collection instrument, "My principal is sought out by teachers who have instructional concerns or problems," elicited a mean response of 3.78 from elementary school teachers, 3.21 from middle school teachers, 3.00 from junior high school teachers, and 2.96 from high school teachers, with a total mean teacher response of 3.03, and a standard deviation of .80 for item 4 on the data collection instrument. Two hundred five teachers answered item 6. Figure 9 illustrates the mean teacher response for statement 6.

On a 4-point scale (4 being the highest, strongly disagree to strongly agree), the mean response and standard deviation of responses for items 7 through 12 from teachers of all types of schools are shown in Table 5. Regarding statement 7 on the questionnaire, "My principal leads formal discussions concerning instruction and student achievement," eight elementary school teachers had a mean response of 3.88; twenty-five middle school teachers had a mean response of 3.56; thirty-three junior high school teachers had a mean response of 3.52, and one hundred forty-four high school teachers had a mean response of 3.15, giving a total mean teacher response of 3.28, with a standard deviation of .84 for statement 7. Figure 10 provides a visual representation of the mean teacher response for statement 7.

Statement 8 on the data collection instrument, "My principal is accessible to discuss matters dealing with instruction," drew a mean response of 4.00 from elementary school teachers, 3.68 from middle school teachers, 3.52 from junior high school teachers, and 3.48
from high school teachers, with a total mean teacher response of 3.53, and a standard deviation of .69 for item 2 on the data collection instrument. Figure 11 shows the mean teacher response for statement 8.

Figure 8. Mean Teacher Response for Statement 5.
My principal is knowledgeable about instructional resources.

Figure 9. Mean Teacher Response for Statement 6.
My principal is sought out by teachers who have instructional concerns or problems.
Table 5. Number of teacher respondents, mean and standard deviation of teacher response for statements 7-12.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Types</th>
<th>Statement 7</th>
<th>Statement 8</th>
<th>Statement 9</th>
<th>Statement 10</th>
<th>Statement 11</th>
<th>Statement 12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior High School</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 10. Mean Teacher Response for Statement 7.
My principal leads formal discussions concerning instruction and student achievement.

Figure 11. Mean Teacher Response for Statement 8.
My principal is accessible to discuss matters dealing with instruction.
Regarding statement 9 on the questionnaire, "My principal mobilizes resources and district support to help achieve academic achievement goals," nine elementary school teachers had a mean response of 4.00; twenty-five middle school teachers had a mean response of 3.71; thirty-three junior high school teachers had a mean response of 3.33, and one hundred forty-four high school teachers had a mean response of 3.23, giving a total mean teacher response of 3.33, with a standard deviation of .69 for statement 9. Figure 13 provides a visual representation of the mean teacher response for statement 9.

![Mean Teacher Response for Statement 9](image_url)

Figure 12. Mean Teacher Response for Statement 9.
My principal mobilizes resources and district support to help achieve academic achievement goals.

Statement 10 on the data collection instrument, "My principal’s evaluation of my performance helps improve my teaching," drew a mean response of 4.00 from elementary school teachers, 3.68 from middle school teachers, 3.52 from junior high school teachers, and 3.48 from high school teachers, with a total mean teacher response of 3.53, and a standard deviation of .69 for item 2 on the data collection instrument. Figure 13 shows the mean teacher response for statement 10.
Statement 11 on the data collection instrument, “My principal uses clearly communicated criteria for judging staff performance,” elicited a mean response of 3.33 from elementary school teachers, 3.72 from middle school teachers, 3.47 from junior high school teachers, and 3.23 from high school teachers, with a total mean teacher response of 3.33, and a standard deviation of .77 for item 11 on the data collection instrument. Figure 14 illustrates the mean teacher response for statement 11.

Regarding statement 12 on the questionnaire, “My principal is a “visible presence” in the building to both staff and students,” nine elementary school teachers had a mean response of 4.00; twenty-five middle school teachers had a mean response of 3.36; thirty-three junior high school teachers had a mean response of 3.36, and one hundred forty-five high school teachers had a mean response of 3.50, giving a total mean teacher response of 3.48, with a standard deviation of .81 for statement 12. Figure 15 illustrates the mean teacher response for statement 12.
Figure 14. Mean Teacher Response for Statement 11.
My principal uses clearly communicated criteria for judging staff performance.

Figure 15. Mean Teacher Response for Statement 12.
My principal is a “visible presence” in the building to both staff and students.
On a 4-point scale (4 being the highest, strongly disagree to strongly agree), the mean response and standard deviation of responses for items 13 through 18 from teachers of all types of schools are shown in Table 6. Regarding statement 13 on the questionnaire, "My principal is considered an important instructional resource person in this school," nine elementary school teachers had a mean response of 3.78; twenty-five middle school teachers had a mean response of 3.32; thirty-three junior high school teachers had a mean response of 3.15, and one hundred forty-three high school teachers had a mean response of 3.08, giving a total mean teacher response of 3.15, with a standard deviation of .82 for statement 13. Figure 16 provides a visual representation of the mean teacher response for statement 13.
Table 6. Number of teacher respondents, mean and standard deviation of teacher response for statements 13-18.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Types</th>
<th>Statement 13</th>
<th>Statement 14</th>
<th>Statement 15</th>
<th>Statement 16</th>
<th>Statement 17</th>
<th>Statement 18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior High School</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>2.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>143</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>210</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regarding statement 14 on the questionnaire, "My principal helps faculty interpret test results," nine elementary school teachers had a mean response of 4.00; twenty-four middle school teachers had a mean response of 3.71; thirty-three junior high school teachers had a mean response of 3.61, and one hundred thirty-nine high school teachers had a mean response of 3.09, giving a total mean teacher response of 3.29, with a standard deviation of .79 for statement 14. Figure 17 provides a visual representation of the mean teacher response for statement 14.

![Mean Teacher Response for Statement 14](image_url)

Figure 17. Mean Teacher Response for Statement 14.
My principal helps faculty interpret test results.

Statement 15 on the data collection instrument, "My principal provides a clear vision of what our school is all about," elicited a mean response of 3.89 from elementary school teachers, 3.83 from middle school teachers, 3.67 from junior high school teachers, and 3.30 from high school teachers, with a total mean teacher response of 3.45, and a standard deviation of .74 for item 15 on the data collection instrument. Figure 18 illustrates the mean teacher response for statement 15.
Regarding statement 16 on the questionnaire, "My principal is an active participant in staff development activities," nine elementary school teachers had a mean response of 3.89; twenty-four middle school teachers had a mean response of 3.75; thirty-three junior high school teachers had a mean response of 3.70, and one hundred forty-five high school teachers had a mean response of 3.34, giving a total mean teacher response of 3.47, with a standard deviation of .76 for statement 16. Figure 19 provides a visual representation of the mean teacher response for statement 16.

Statement 17 on the data collection instrument, "My principal communicates clearly to the staff regarding instructional matters," elicited a mean response of 3.78 from elementary school teachers, 3.44 from middle school teachers, 3.42 from junior high school teachers, and 3.19 from high school teachers, with a total mean teacher response of 3.28, and a standard deviation of .75 for item 17 on the data collection instrument. Figure 20 illustrates the mean teacher response for statement 17.
Figure 19. Mean Teacher Response for Statement 16. My principal is an active participant in staff development activities.

Figure 20. Mean Teacher Response for Statement 17. My principal communicates clearly to the staff regarding instructional matters.
Regarding statement 18 on the questionnaire, "My principal provides frequent feedback to teachers regarding classroom performance," nine elementary school teachers had a mean response of 3.22; twenty-five middle school teachers had a mean response of 3.28; thirty-two junior high school teachers had a mean response of 3.13, and one hundred forty-three high school teachers had a mean response of 2.97, giving a total mean teacher response of 3.04, with a standard deviation of .80 for statement 18. Figure 21 provides a visual representation of the mean teacher response for statement 18.

![Mean Teacher Response for Statement 18](image)

Figure 21. Mean Teacher Response for Statement 18.
My principal provides frequent feedback to teachers regarding classroom performance.

The mean teacher response for each statement on the questionnaire regarding teachers' perceptions of instructional leadership characteristics of their principals may be summarized in four subcategories, according to the four instructional leadership characteristics identified by Smith and Andrews (1989): the principal as (1) resource provider, (2) instructional resource, (3) communicator, and (4) visible presence. As resource provider, the principal is knowledgeable about people, research, and new developments in
education. Principals who are strong resource providers view the entire district and community as potential sources for resources for school use, and use skillful management to acquire and use these resources for the entire school. Statements 1, 5, 9, and 13 on the questionnaire pertained to the principal as resource provider. On a 4-point scale (4 being the highest, strongly disagree to strongly agree), teachers marked their responses to each item on the data collection instrument. Regarding statement 1 on the questionnaire, "My principal promotes staff development activities for teachers," nine elementary school teachers had a mean response of 3.67; twenty-five middle school teachers had a mean response of 3.64; thirty-three junior high school teachers had a mean response of 3.58, and one hundred forty-five high school teachers had a mean response of 3.34, giving a total mean teacher response of 3.43, with a standard deviation of .74 for statement 1.

Regarding statement 5 on the questionnaire, "My principal is knowledgeable about instructional resources," nine elementary school teachers had a mean response of 3.67; twenty-four middle school teachers had a mean response of 3.71; thirty-two junior high school teachers had a mean response of 3.31, and one hundred forty high school teachers had a mean response of 3.27, giving a total mean teacher response of 3.35, with a standard deviation of .73 for statement 5. Regarding statement 9 on the questionnaire, "My principal mobilizes resources and district support to help achieve academic achievement goals," nine elementary school teachers had a mean response of 4.00; twenty-five middle school teachers had a mean response of 3.71; thirty-three junior high school teachers had a mean response of 3.33, and one hundred forty-four high school teachers had a mean response of 3.23, giving a total mean teacher response of 3.33, with a standard deviation of .69 for statement 9. Regarding statement 13 on the questionnaire, "My principal is considered an important instructional resource person in this school," nine elementary school teachers had a mean response of 3.78; twenty-five middle school teachers had a mean response of 3.32; thirty-three junior high school teachers had a mean response of 3.15, and one hundred forty-three high school teachers had a mean response of 3.08, giving
a total mean teacher response of 3.15, with a standard deviation of .82 for statement 13.

Statements 2, 6, 10, and 14 on the data collection instrument pertained to the second instructional leadership characteristic which identifies the principal as a strong instructional leader: the principal as instructional resource. The principal who is a strong instructional leader is involved in improvement of instructional materials and teaching strategies which enhance learning. Statement 2 on the data collection instrument, “My principal encourages the use of different instructional strategies,” drew a mean teacher response of 3.78 from elementary school teachers, 3.71 from middle school teachers, 3.67 from junior high school teachers, and 3.49 from high school teachers, with a total mean teacher response of 3.55, and a standard deviation of .71 for item 2 on the data collection instrument. Statement 6 on the data collection instrument, “My principal is sought out by teachers who have instructional concerns or problems,” elicited a mean response of 3.78 from elementary school teachers, 3.21 from middle school teachers, 3.00 from junior high school teachers, and 2.96 from high school teachers, with a total mean teacher response of 3.03, and a standard deviation of .80 for item 4 on the data collection instrument. Statement 10 on the data collection instrument, “My principal’s evaluation of my performance helps improve my teaching,” drew a mean response of 4.00 from elementary school teachers, 3.68 from middle school teachers, 3.52 from junior high school teachers, and 3.48 from high school teachers, with a total mean teacher response of 3.53, and a standard deviation of .69 for item 2 on the data collection instrument. Regarding statement 14 on the questionnaire, “My principal helps faculty interpret test results,” nine elementary school teachers had a mean response of 4.00; twenty-four middle school teachers had a mean response of 3.71; thirty-three junior high school teachers had a mean response of 3.61, and one hundred thirty-nine high school teachers had a mean response of 3.09, giving a total mean teacher response of 3.29, with a standard deviation of .79 for statement 14.

Statements 3, 7, 11, 15, 17, and 18 pertained to the third instructional leadership characteristic: the principal as communicator. As communicator, the principal uses
communication as basis for developing good relationships with staff through actions which are fair, consistent, and objective (Smith & Andrews, 1989). Regarding statement 3 on the questionnaire, "Improved instructional practice results from interactions with my principal," eight elementary school teachers had a mean response of 3.38; twenty-five middle school teachers had a mean response of 3.20; thirty-three junior high school teachers had a mean response of 3.27, and one hundred thirty-eight high school teachers had a mean response of 2.93, giving a total mean teacher response of 3.04, with a standard deviation of .87 for statement 3. Regarding statement 7 on the questionnaire, "My principal leads formal discussions concerning instruction and student achievement," eight elementary school teachers had a mean response of 3.88; twenty-five middle school teachers had a mean response of 3.56; thirty-three junior high school teachers had a mean response of 3.52, and one hundred forty-four high school teachers had a mean response of 3.15, giving a total mean teacher response of 3.28, with a standard deviation of .84 for statement 7.

Statement 11 on the data collection instrument, "My principal uses clearly communicated criteria for judging staff performance," elicited a mean response of 3.33 from elementary school teachers, 3.72 from middle school teachers, 3.47 from junior high school teachers, and 3.23 from high school teachers, with a total mean teacher response of 3.33, and a standard deviation of .77 for item 11 on the data collection instrument. Statement 15 on the data collection instrument, "My principal provides a clear vision of what our school is all about," elicited a mean response of 3.89 from elementary school teachers, 3.83 from middle school teachers, 3.67 from junior high school teachers, and 3.30 from high school teachers, with a total mean teacher response of 3.45, and a standard deviation of .74 for item 15 on the data collection instrument.

Statement 17 on the data collection instrument, "My principal communicates clearly to the staff regarding instructional matters," elicited a mean response of 3.78 from elementary school teachers, 3.44 from middle school teachers, 3.42 from junior high school
teachers, and 3.19 from high school teachers, with a total mean teacher response of 3.28, and a standard deviation of .75 for item 17 on the data collection instrument. Regarding statement 18 on the questionnaire, "My principal provides frequent feedback to teachers regarding classroom performance," nine elementary school teachers had a mean response of 3.22; twenty-five middle school teachers had a mean response of 3.28; thirty-two junior high school teachers had a mean response of 3.13, and one hundred forty-three high school teachers had a mean response of 2.97, giving a total mean teacher response of 3.04, with a standard deviation of .80 for statement 18.

Statements 4, 8, 12, and 16 on the questionnaire addressed the fourth instructional leadership characteristic identified by Smith and Andrews (1989): the principal as visible presence. Teachers perceive the principal to be a visible presence when the principal makes frequent classroom observation, is accessible for discussing instructional matters, is seen regularly in the school, and actively participates in staff development (Smith & Andrews, 1989). Statement 4 on the data collection instrument, "My principal makes frequent classroom observations," elicited a mean response of 3.56 from elementary school teachers, 2.76 from middle school teachers, 2.73 from junior high school teachers, and 2.84 from high school teachers, with a total mean teacher response of 2.84, and a standard deviation of .90 for item 4 on the data collection instrument. Statement 8 on the data collection instrument, "My principal is accessible to discuss matters dealing with instruction," drew a mean response of 4.00 from elementary school teachers, 3.68 from middle school teachers, 3.52 from junior high school teachers, and 3.48 from high school teachers, with a total mean teacher response of 3.53, and a standard deviation of .69 for item 2 on the data collection instrument.

Regarding statement 12 on the questionnaire, "My principal is a "visible presence" in the building to both staff and students," nine elementary school teachers had a mean response of 4.00; twenty-five middle school teachers had a mean response of 3.36; thirty-three junior high school teachers had a mean response of 3.36, and one hundred
forty-five high school teachers had a mean response of 3.50, giving a total mean teacher response of 3.48, with a standard deviation of .81 for statement 12. Regarding statement 16 on the questionnaire, "My principal is an active participant in staff development activities," nine elementary school teachers had a mean response of 3.89; twenty-four middle school teachers had a mean response of 3.75; thirty-three junior high school teachers had a mean response of 3.70, and one hundred forty-five high school teachers had a mean response of 3.34, giving a total mean teacher response of 3.47, with a standard deviation of .76 for statement 16.

Table 7 shows the means of teacher responses by school types and the overall mean, regarding teachers' perceptions of the instructional leadership characteristics of their principals in four areas: (1) resource provider, (2) instructional resource, (3) communicator, and (4) visible presence. The teacher responses were indicated on a 4-point scale (strongly disagree = 1, disagree = 2, agree = 3, strongly agree = 4). As resource provider, the mean teacher responses were: elementary school: 3.78, standard deviation of .23; middle school: 3.49, standard deviation of .43; junior high school: 3.35, standard deviation of .51; high school: 3.22, standard deviation of .70. As instructional resource, the mean teacher responses were: elementary school: 3.81, standard deviation of .21; middle school: 3.58, standard deviation of .41; junior high school: 3.41, standard deviation of .51; high school: 3.16, standard deviation of .71. As communicator, the mean teacher responses were: elementary school: 3.58, standard deviation of .27; middle school: 3.49, standard deviation of .45; junior high school: 3.41, standard deviation of .51; high school: 3.12, standard deviation of .71. As visible presence, the mean teacher responses were: elementary school: 3.86, standard deviation of .13; middle school: 3.38, standard deviation of .56; junior high school: 3.33, standard deviation of .50; high school: 3.29, standard deviation of .67. The overall mean teacher response for elementary school (n = 9) was 3.74, standard deviation of .16. Middle school teachers (n = 25) had an overall mean teacher response of 3.50, standard deviation of .43. The overall mean teacher response for junior high school
The total overall mean teacher response was for all four areas of principal’s leadership characteristics as: resource provider, instructional resource, communicator, and visible presence, as shown in Table 7. The mean teacher response for all schools regarding teachers’ perceptions of the principal as resource provider was 3.30, standard deviation of .65. The mean teacher response for all schools regarding teachers’ perceptions of the principal as instructional resource was 3.28, standard deviation of .65. In the area of communicator, the mean teacher response for all schools regarding teachers’ perceptions of the principal as communicator was 3.23, standard deviation of .66. Regarding the principal as visible presence, the mean teacher response for all schools regarding teachers’ perceptions of the principal as visible presence was 3.33, standard deviation of .63.

From an examination of the means, teachers in schools with quality music programs perceived their principals to have strong instructional leadership characteristics in four areas as identified and articulated by Smith and Andrews (1989). On a 4-point scale, strongly disagree to strongly agree, with 4 being strongly agree, the overall mean teacher response from all schools was 3.28, regarding the 18 positive statements concerning teachers’ perceptions of the instructional leadership characteristics of the principal. The highest mean teacher response was 4.0 for elementary schools for statements 8, 9, 12, and 14. The lowest mean teacher response for elementary schools was 3.22 for statement 18. The highest mean teacher response for middle schools was 3.83 for statement 15, while the lowest mean teacher response was 2.76 for statement 4. The highest mean teacher response for junior high schools was 3.67 for statements 2 and 15, whereas the lowest mean teacher response was 2.73 for statement 4. The highest mean teacher response for high schools was 3.50 for statement 12, while the lowest mean teacher response for high schools was 2.93 for statement 3.

Pearson’s Product Moment Correlation (see Table 8) was used to determine if
teacher responses to the statements on the questionnaire regarding teachers' perceptions of instructional leadership characteristics of principals indicated a high relationship between the subcategories of leadership characteristics; i.e., the principal as (1) resource provider, (2) instructional resource, (3) communicator, and (4) visible presence, as identified and articulated by Smith and Andrews (1989). As shown in Table 8, correlation between all four areas were significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). As such, all appeared to be measuring a single leadership construct. This analysis justified using the mean teacher response for all questions in the subsequent analysis.
Table 7. Number of teacher responses by school types and overall mean.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Types</th>
<th>Resource Provider (Mean)</th>
<th>Instructional Resource (Mean)</th>
<th>Communicator (Mean)</th>
<th>Visible Presence (Mean)</th>
<th>Overall (Mean)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>3.7778</td>
<td>3.8056</td>
<td>3.5833</td>
<td>3.8611</td>
<td>3.7392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.2320</td>
<td>.2083</td>
<td>.2700</td>
<td>.1318</td>
<td>.1580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>3.5867</td>
<td>3.5700</td>
<td>3.4947</td>
<td>3.3800</td>
<td>3.5021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.4333</td>
<td>.4052</td>
<td>.4537</td>
<td>.5642</td>
<td>.4280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior High School</td>
<td>3.3485</td>
<td>3.4091</td>
<td>3.4091</td>
<td>3.3258</td>
<td>3.3779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.5114</td>
<td>.5019</td>
<td>.5091</td>
<td>.4980</td>
<td>.4606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>3.2161</td>
<td>3.1603</td>
<td>3.1222</td>
<td>3.2931</td>
<td>3.1848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.6995</td>
<td>.7084</td>
<td>.7131</td>
<td>.6714</td>
<td>.6680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.3042</td>
<td>3.2753</td>
<td>3.2303</td>
<td>3.3252</td>
<td>3.2758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>.6494</td>
<td>.6532</td>
<td>.6618</td>
<td>.6288</td>
<td>.6173</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8. Correlation of teachers’ mean responses to statements regarding teachers’ perceptions of the principal as resource provider, instructional resource, communicator, and visible presence.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations of Means of Resource Provider</th>
<th>Resource Provider (Mean)</th>
<th>Instructional Resource (Mean)</th>
<th>Communicator (Mean)</th>
<th>Visible Presence (Mean)</th>
<th>Overall (Mean)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resource Provider Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.878**</td>
<td>.877**</td>
<td>.797**</td>
<td>.945**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2 - tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Resource Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.878**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.879**</td>
<td>.762**</td>
<td>.937**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2 - tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communicator Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.877**</td>
<td>.879**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.830**</td>
<td>.964**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2 - tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visible Presence Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.797**</td>
<td>.762**</td>
<td>.830**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>.902**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2 - tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.945**</td>
<td>.937**</td>
<td>.964**</td>
<td>.902**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2 - tailed)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
Regarding subcategories of principal's leadership areas, statements 1, 5, 9, and 13 on the questionnaire were concerned with teachers' perceptions of the principal as resource provider. Statements 2, 6, 10, and 14 dealt with teachers' perceptions of the principal as instructional resource. Statements 3, 7, 11, 15, 17, and 18 applied to teachers' perceptions of the principal as communicator. Statements 4, 8, 12, and 16 were concerned with teachers' perceptions of the principal as visible presence. As illustrated in Table 8, correlation of the means of statements referring to teachers' perceptions of principals' leadership in four areas as resource provider, instructional resource, communicator, and visible presence was significant at the 0.01 level.

Because of variances in the means, a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to determine that there was a significant difference in the overall means of teachers' responses between groups (F = 4.361, p < .005, df = 3). Table 9 illustrates the one-way ANOVA, overall means of groups.

Table 9. One-way ANOVA, overall means of groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall (Mean)</th>
<th>ANOVA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sum of Squares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>4.758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>75.634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>80.391</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tukey's HSD test was used to determine where the differences in the means were between means of teacher responses in all types of schools, using the overall mean as the dependent variable (see Table 10). Elementary school mean teacher responses were compared with middle school mean teacher responses, junior high school, and high school. Middle school mean teacher responses were compared with elementary school mean teacher
responses, junior high school, and high school. Junior high schools mean teacher responses were compared with the means of teacher responses from elementary school, middle school, and high school. High school mean teacher responses were compared with the mean teacher responses from elementary school, middle school, and junior high school. As illustrated in Table 10, the mean difference between elementary school and high school, .55, was significant, .037, p < .05.

Table 10. Post hoc tests: multiple comparisons: Tukey HSD, overall means of all types of schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multiple Comparisons</th>
<th>Overall (Mean)</th>
<th>Tukey HSD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(I) School Types</td>
<td>(J) School Types</td>
<td>Mean Difference (I-J)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>.2371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Junior High School</td>
<td>.3613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>.5544*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>-.2371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Junior High School</td>
<td>.1242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>.3173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior High School</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>-.3613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>-.1242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>.1931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>-.5544*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>-.3173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Junior High</td>
<td>-.1931</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

Overall (Mean)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tukey HSD a,b</th>
<th>Overall (Mean)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Types</td>
<td>Subset for alpha = .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior High School</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.

a. Uses Harmonic Mean Sample Size = 21.241
b. The group sizes are unequal. The harmonic mean of the group sizes is used.
Type 1 error levels are not guaranteed.
Discussion of Results

Participation in Study

Of the 37 schools with quality music programs, principals of 27 schools agreed to participate in the study. Questionnaires for teachers were sent to principals of 27 schools; however, principals in 17 schools actually participated in the study by administering, collecting, and returning survey questionnaires. Principals could decide whether teachers could participate in the survey, and the number of questionnaires to request. The percentage of return of questionnaires was: elementary schools: 25%, middle schools: 67%, junior high schools: 100%, and high schools: 65%. The percentage of return of questionnaires for all schools was 63%, as shown in Table 2 and Figure 1.

Principals' reasons for not participating in the study were: (a) current involvement in a district accreditation process, (b) large number of district surveys, (c) commitment to limit unnecessary work for teachers, and (d) yearly change of principals within the last three years. The following comments received from principals further explain the reasons for not participating in the study. “We just finished doing a 40-minute survey for the district last week. We are involved in an accreditation process and will not be able to do the survey at this time.” (One elementary school and one high school were involved in district accreditation processes). “We are not interested. There are too many surveys and assessments already. We only do the required assessments.” “No. The teachers have too much to do.” “Although I believe in the value of some surveys, I have promised my teachers that I would eliminate extraneous work for them. For this reason, I will have to decline to do the survey at this time.” “Our staff has been surveyed out. I kept waiting for some lag time to administer, only to have them hit up with another mandatory survey. I cannot/will not subject them to another survey. Sorry.” “I am a new principal this year, and this won’t work for us right now.” “I am the third principal at this middle school in three years. Since we have had a new principal every year for three years, the teachers were
confused as to which principal to consider when marking their responses. We had a well-established music program before I got here, so I feel the survey would not give you valid information."

In contrast, some principals were pleased to be asked to participate in the research, and one high school principal stated he believed the school’s strong music program was one of the reasons the community highly supported the school. "We have a strong music program here. We have a comprehensive high school which offers a senior-type program of four courses of music and the arts. (We have to pay for four extra teachers to do this!) Of course, we also have comprehensive offerings of performing arts courses, band, choir, as well as applied vocational courses. Our taxes are not cheap here; they are high, but the mill levies have passed two to one since the 1970’s. We have a strong tax base. People really support the school."

Research Questions and Data Analysis

Research Question 1 stated: What are teachers’, in schools with quality music programs, perceptions of instructional leadership characteristics of principals in four areas: (1) resource provider, (2) instructional resource, (3) communicator, and (4) visible presence? On a 4-point scale, strongly disagree to strongly agree, with 4 being strongly agree, the overall means of teacher responses from all schools was 3.28, regarding the 18 positive statements concerning teachers’ perceptions of principals’ instructional leadership characteristics. The means of teacher responses showed that teachers in schools with quality music programs, which were surveyed in the study, perceive their principals to have strong instructional leadership characteristics, as defined and articulated by Smith and Andrews (1989).

These principals, as resource providers, demonstrated effective use of time and resources, skill in implementing change, and the ability to motivate staff. In addition, the principals knew which instructional resources could build on staff members’ strengths to
help achieve academic goals. The principals, as instructional resources, demonstrated the ability to evaluate and reinforce appropriate instructional strategies, supervised staff, using strategies which focused on improvement of instruction, used student information directly related to instructional issues, and demonstrated successful application of the district’s personnel evaluation policies. The principals, as communicators, could evaluate and deal effectively with others, displayed coherence in oral and written communication, and were skilled in conflict management. As communicators, the principals were skilled in facilitating groups to seek courses of action through problem-solving techniques, demonstrated the ability to use group process skills, and skill in working as a team member.

Although the teachers in the schools with quality music programs were surveyed on their perceptions of the instructional leadership characteristics of their principals, these comments from teachers noted the principal and support of the music program. “Our principal is very strong, but also our music teacher is truly exceptional. She constantly amazes and delights all of us with her expertise.” “Our music teacher is exceptional and a leader in her field. Our principal supports her program.”

Furthermore, this teacher’s comment summed up the principal’s strong instructional leadership characteristics: “Our principal is outstanding. He enthusiastically endorses and uses a variety of programs and strategies, depending on the need. He is flexible, and expertly adapts to every situation.”

The following comments from high school teachers clarified lower ratings for three responses on their data collection instruments. Regarding statement 1 on the data collection instrument, “My principal promotes staff development activities for teachers;” the teacher marked response 2 (Disagree), and wrote the comment, “We have no money.” All of the other responses on the data collection instrument were marked 3 (Agree), giving the principal a higher rating. Regarding statement 11 on the data collection instrument, “My principal uses clearly communicated criteria for judging staff performance,” the teacher marked response 3 (Agree), and wrote the comment, “District Evaluation,” indicating that
teachers are evaluated by the principal's using district criteria. In addition, statement 14, "My principal helps faculty interpret test results," was marked 3 (Agree), and the comment, "Counselors," was added. The remaining statements were all marked 4 (Strongly Agree), the highest rating.

Research Question 2 stated: Is there a relationship between teachers' perceptions of instructional leadership characteristics of principals among the four categories of leadership characteristics identified by Smith and Andrews (1989)? The results of Pearson's Product Moment Correlation showed that within schools of identical grade levels (types), there was a high relationship between teachers' perceptions of principals' leadership characteristics in the four areas identified by Smith and Andrews (1989), as shown in Table 8. The results of a one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) determined that the difference in the means of teacher responses was significant at the 0.01 level (F = 4.361, p < .005, df = 3). This is illustrated in Table 9.

Research Question 3 stated: Is there a difference in teachers' perceptions of instructional leadership characteristics of principals between multiple comparisons of groups of principals of various grade levels of schools with quality music programs, e.g., elementary school principals compared with middle school, junior high school, or high school principals? The differences were significant; therefore, Tukey's HSD test was used to determine exactly where the differences were between multiple comparisons of the overall means of teacher responses in all types of schools, using the overall mean as the dependent variable. Elementary school mean teacher responses were compared with the mean teacher responses from middle school, junior high school, and high school. Middle school mean teacher responses were compared with the mean teacher responses from elementary school, junior high school, and high school. Junior high school mean teacher responses were compared with the mean teacher responses from elementary school, middle school, and high school. High school mean teacher responses were compared with the mean teacher responses from elementary school, middle school, and junior high school. The mean
difference between elementary school and high school, .55, was significant, .037, p < .05 (see Table 10).

Summary of Results

This study identified teachers’ perceptions of the instructional leadership characteristics of principals in schools with quality music programs, using an instrument developed by Smith and Andrews (1989). Of an initial 37 schools with quality music programs, principals of 27 schools agreed to participate in the study; however, principals of 17 schools actually participated in the survey by distributing questionnaires to teachers, with a 63% percentage of return of questionnaires (see Table 2 and Figure 1). An examination of the means of responses from teachers in schools with quality music programs showed that teachers perceived their principals to have strong instructional leadership characteristics in four areas, as identified and articulated by Smith and Andrews (1989). These areas were the principal as: (1) resource provider, (2) instructional resource, (3) communicator, and (4) visible presence. Pearson’s Product Moment Correlation was used to determine if a relationship existed between the four subcategories of leadership characteristics of the principal as a strong instructional leader: resource provider, instructional resource, communicator, and visible presence. As shown in Table 8, correlation of the means of all four areas was significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

An analysis of variance (ANOVA) determined that the difference between the overall means of responses of groups of teachers in types of schools, e.g., elementary school, as compared with middle school, junior high school, or high school, was significant (F = 4.361, p < .005, df = 3), as shown in Table 9. Tukey’s HSD test to assess the significance of pairwise post hoc differences was then used to determine where the differences were between multiple comparisons in the responses between types of schools. The mean difference between elementary school and high school, .55, was significant, .037, p < .05 (see Table 10).
CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS

Introduction

Background

A body of research indicates that strong instructional leadership characteristics of principals directly influence the academic achievement and development of students in their schools (Edmonds, 1982, Sweeney, 1982, Wilson, 1982, Glasman, 1984, & Manasse, 1984, Andrews, Soder, & Jacoby, 1986). Further research by Smith and Andrews (1989) identified principals' strong leadership characteristics as: (1) resource provider, (2) instructional resource, (3) communicator, and (4) visible presence. However, no studies have been conducted on identifying the instructional leadership characteristics of principals in public schools with quality music programs. A need exists for research in this area because studies have suggested that music may benefit student academic achievement and development (McCaffrey, 2000, Weinberger, 1998, Rauscher, Shaw, Levine, Wright, Dennis, & Newcomb, 1997, Rauscher, Shaw, Levine, & Ky, 1994, Rauscher, Shaw, Levine, & Wright, 1993, Lamb & Gregory, 1993, Frith, 1985, Hanshumaker, 1980, and Hurwitz, Wolff, Bortnick, & Kokas, 1975). The purpose of this study was to identify teachers' perceptions of instructional leadership characteristics of principals in schools with quality music programs. For the purposes of this dissertation, schools with quality music programs, were defined as 37 public schools in a six-state Northwestern region, whose music teachers applied for school music groups to perform music selections at the 1999 Northwest Music Educators Conference.
Conclusions

Using the theoretical framework and data collection instrument in the research by Smith and Andrews (1989), the following conclusions can be drawn from this study.

1. Teachers in schools with quality music programs, which were surveyed in the study, perceive their principals to have strong instructional leadership characteristics as (1) resource provider, (2) instructional resource, (3) communicator, and (4) visible presence, as defined by Smith and Andrews (1989). This supports the research by Smith and Andrews (1989) which indicates that principals who are strong instructional leaders, as resource providers, demonstrated effective use of time and resources, skill in implementing change, and the ability to motivate staff. In addition, the principals knew which instructional resources could build on staff members’ strengths to help achieve academic goals. As instructional resources, the principals demonstrated the ability to evaluate and reinforce appropriate instructional strategies, supervised staff, using strategies which focused on improvement of instruction, used student information directly related to instructional issues, and demonstrated successful application of the district’s personnel evaluation policies. The principals, as communicators, could evaluate and deal effectively with others, displayed coherence in oral and written communication, and were skilled in conflict management. As communicators, the principals were skilled in facilitating groups to seek courses of action through problem-solving techniques, demonstrated the ability to use group process skills, and skill in working as a team member. In addition, this also supports the body of research which indicates that successful principals displayed a strong commitment to students,
instruction, and teachers, were concerned with student academic achievement, and confronted problems with inspiring leadership and hard work to affect necessary change (Goldhammer, Becker, Withercombe, Doyel, Miller, Morgan, DeLoretto, & Aldridge, 1971).

2. There is a significant correlation between teachers’ perceptions of their principals at schools with quality music programs in all four characteristics of the principal as an instructional leader as: resource provider, instructional resource, communicator, and visible presence in schools with quality music programs at the elementary school, middle school, junior high school, and high school levels.

3. There is a significant difference between teachers’ perceptions of the instructional leadership characteristics of principals in schools with quality music programs at the elementary school and high school levels.

Discussion of the Findings

Several hypotheses may explain the difference between the higher response means of elementary school teachers and the lower response means of high school teachers regarding principal’s instructional leadership characteristics. First, the larger numbers of high school students necessitates using departmental heads or assistant principals or vice principals for duties performed by the principal in elementary, middle school, or junior high school.

Second, more specialized curriculum in high schools does not present frequent opportunities for classroom observation by the principal, whereas frequent classroom visitation by elementary school principals to influence instruction is common. Although the concerns of effective principals are similar in all levels and sizes of schools, research shows some differences in elementary school and high school principals (Fullan & Steigelbauer, 1991). A systematic review of research by Leithwood (1987) compared 34 characteristics
of leadership of effective elementary and secondary schools. Of the 34 characteristics, 23 were common to both levels of schools; however, the following important differences existed. Secondary schools had a more complex and broader range of goals; require principals to consider more factors to exercise influence; have less opportunity for close parent involvement, but more need for working with business and social institutions in the community, and are more concerned with developing a sense of community and affiliation among staff and students (Leithwood, 1987). Research by Smith and Andrews (1989) corroborates the findings of Leithwood (1987). Smith and Andrews (1989) found that strong high school principals spent less time on educational program improvement than did middle school, junior high school, or elementary principals. Strong high school principals also spent more time on building management, operations, and district relations than principals at earlier grade level schools. Descriptions of effective high school principals (Louis & Miles, 1990, Wilson & Corcoran, 1988) show an active leader working on program and instruction, collaborative and professional work cultures, resource acquisition, work environments, engagement of staff and students, and monitoring for results. However, secondary school principals have traditionally been less concerned with the matters illustrated in these effective high school principals, and they spend less time on direct classroom observations with teachers. Since more secondary school principals are becoming involved as school improvement leaders, they may be focusing on more comprehensive organizational concerns than elementary teachers (Fullan & Steigelbauer, 1991).

Third, gender differences of principals in elementary and secondary schools may influence their leadership characteristics. The principalship is dominated by men, with women constituting approximately 25% of the principalships/vice principalships (Fullan & Steigelbauer, 1991). Women elementary principals are in the 20%-50% range; whereas, women secondary school principals are in the 5%-20% range (Marshall & Mitchell, 1989, Mertz, McNeely, & Venditti, 1989, Schneider, 1988). Research by Schneider (1988)
showed that in a small school district in Wisconsin, only 19% of elementary principals were women, and only 4% of secondary principals were women. Marshall and Mitchell (1989) stated that nationally, 25% of elementary school principals were women; only 8% of secondary school principals were women. Smith and Andrews (1989) found that female principals, as a group, were more likely to evidence behavior associated with instructional leadership than male principals. Female principals spent more time in educational program improvement activities than did males (Smith & Andrews, 1989). A review of research by Marshall and Mitchell (1989) showed that women are more concerned with curriculum issues, instructional leadership, teachers’ concerns, parent involvement, staff development, collaborative planning strategies, and community building. Shakeshaft (1987) found that women are more likely to possess characteristics associated with effective leadership and effective schooling. Since more elementary school principals are women, this factor may have impacted this study because only nine teachers from one elementary school participated in the study. There is a high probability that the principal of the elementary school was a woman, and teachers may relate differently to women than to men, regarding perceptions of principals’ instructional leadership characteristics. These findings regarding gender refer to women on average, or in a group; however, Fullan and Steigelbauer (1991) emphasize that research shows many examples of male, as well as female, principals performing effectively or poorly.

Summary

This study identified teachers’ perceptions of instructional leadership characteristics of principals in schools with quality music programs. Data were collected using the theoretical framework and statements from the data collection instrument developed and used by Smith and Andrews (1989). Based on analysis of the data using a combination of Pearson’s Product Moment Correlation, analysis of variance (ANOVA), and the Tukey HSD test, the following conclusions can be drawn from this study. Teachers in schools with quality music programs perceive their principals to have strong instructional leadership
characteristics as (1) resource provider, (2) instructional resource, (3) communicator, and (4) visible presence, as defined by Smith and Andrews (1989). There is a significant relationship between teachers' perceptions among the four categories of instructional leadership characteristics of the principal as an instructional leader as: resource provider, instructional resource, communicator, and visible presence in schools with quality music programs at the elementary school, middle school, junior high school, and high school levels. There is a significant difference between teachers' perceptions of the instructional leadership characteristics of principals in schools with quality music programs at the elementary school and high school levels.

Implications for Further Research

Several questions remain at the conclusion of this study.

1. What results would be noted with different demographics or a larger number of teachers, particularly elementary teachers? One limitation of this study was the respondents included only 9 elementary teachers from one school.

2. What results would be noted by matching years of experience of teachers and/or principals in each type of school?

3. What results would be noted if gender and ethnicity factors were equalized?

4. What results would be noted if teachers’ perceptions of instructional leadership characteristics of principals were investigated in schools with “quality” science programs, mathematics programs, or literacy programs?

5. What results would be noted if questionnaires were distributed directly to teachers, rather than through the principals’ distribution?

In conclusion, more research is needed to support the findings of this study. Because the selection of teachers for this study was not random, generalization to all
More research is needed to further investigate the instructional leadership characteristics of the principal as (1) resource provider, (2) instructional resource, (3) communicator, and (4) visible presence in various educational settings to support the findings of this study. A greater understanding of the effects of principals’ instructional leadership characteristics on students’ academic achievement and development, teachers, parents, and the community will provide a basis for improvement and continued progress in educational leadership.

**Recommendations**

The body of educational leadership theories and research provides a foundation for explaining and changing principal behavior to meet current needs in education. To further the development of principals as strong instructional leaders, job descriptions compatible with fulfilling this role must be developed. Evaluation of the performance of principals must be conducted within these dimensions.

Administrators and educators in national and state elementary and secondary school administration and educational leadership organizations can review current certification and endorsement requirements, formulate revisions, and make recommendations to state offices of public instruction, if necessary. Faculty in universities and colleges can review current programs for educational leadership and adapt course offerings and internships to provide for the development of principals as strong instructional leaders. Teachers and parents must be educated on the value of the role of principal as resource provider, instructional resource, communicator, and visible presence (Smith & Andrews, 1989).

In addition, numerous activities can be implemented in the practicum or internship areas of educational leadership programs to further the development of principals as strong instructional leaders. Opportunities for internship mentoring in the four areas of instructional leadership, i.e., resource provider, instructional resource, communicator, and visible presence, can provide valuable experience in developing principals as strong instructional leaders.
REFERENCES CITED
REFERENCES CITED


APPENDIX A

DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENT STATEMENTS
FOR STUDY BY SMITH AND ANDREWS (1989)
DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENT STATEMENTS
USED IN STUDY BY SMITH AND ANDREWS (1989).

Principal as Resource Provider

1. My principal promotes staff development activities for teachers.
2. My principal is knowledgeable about instructional resources.
3. My principal mobilizes resources and district support to help achieve academic achievement goals.
4. My principal is considered an important instructional resource in this school.

Principal as Instructional Resource

1. My principal encourages the use of different instructional strategies.
2. My principal is sought out by teachers who have instructional concerns or problems.
4. My principal helps faculty interpret test results.

Principal as Communicator

1. Improved instructional practice results from interactions with my principal.
2. My principal leads formal discussions concerning instruction and student achievement.
3. My principal uses clearly communicated criteria for judging staff performance.
4. My principal provides a clear vision of what our school is all about.
5. Instructional matters.
6. My principal provides frequent feedback to teachers regarding classroom performance.

Principal as Visible Presence

1. My principal makes frequent classroom observations.
2. My principal is accessible to discuss matters dealing with instruction.
3. My principal is a “visible presence” in the building to both staff and students.
4. My principal is an active participant in staff development activities.

(Smith & Andrews, 1989, pp.32-37)
APPENDIX B

PERCENTAGE OF POSITIVE RATINGS OF TEACHER RESPONSES
FROM STUDY BY SMITH AND ANDREWS (1989)
PERCENTAGE OF POSITIVE RATINGS OF TEACHER RESPONSES FROM STUDY BY SMITH AND ANDREWS (1989).

EXHIBIT 1-2  How Teachers Rate Their Principals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal as Resource Provider</th>
<th>Percentage of Positive Ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strong Leader (n = 800)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. My principal promotes staff development activities for teachers.</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. My principal is knowledgeable about instructional resources.</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My principal mobilizes resources and district support to help achieve academic achievement goals.</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. My principal is considered an important instructional resource person in this school.</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Principal as Instructional Resource

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal as Instructional Resource</th>
<th>Percentage of Positive Ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My principal encourages the use of different instructional strategies.</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. My principal is sought out by teachers who have instructional concerns or problems.</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My principal’s evaluation of my performance helps improve my teaching.</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. My principal helps faculty interpret test results.</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Principal as Communicator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal as Communicator</th>
<th>Percentage of Positive Ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Improved instructional practice results from interactions with my principal.</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. My principal leads formal discussions concerning instruction and student achievement.</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My principal uses clearly communicated criteria for judging staff performance.</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. My principal provides a clear vision of what our school is all about.</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. My principal communicates clearly to the staff regarding instructional matters.</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. My principal provides frequent feedback to teachers regarding classroom performance.</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Principal as Visible Presence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal as Visible Presence</th>
<th>Percentage of Positive Ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. My principal makes frequent classroom observations.</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. My principal is accessible to discuss matters dealing with instruction.</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. My principal is a “visible presence” in the building to both staff and students.</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. My principal is an active participant in staff development activities.</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Sergeovanni, 1995, p. 15)
APPENDIX C

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR CLASSROOM TEACHERS
MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY
FACULTY--COURSE EVALUATION FORM
SURVEY FOR CLASSROOM TEACHERS
Please respond TODAY to this survey. Thank you.
Strongly Disagree = 1, Disagree = 2
Agree = 3, Strongly Agree = 4
© California State University, Long Beach. Used by permission.

Indicate the correct response by filling in the appropriate circle completely.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  My principal promotes staff development activities for teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  My principal encourages the use of different instructional strategies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  Improved instructional practice results from interactions with my principal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  My principal makes frequent classroom observations.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5  My principal is knowledgeable about instructional resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6  My principal is sought out by teachers who have instructional concerns or problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7  My principal leads formal discussions concerning instruction and student achievement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8  My principal is accessible to discuss matters dealing with instruction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9  My principal mobilizes resources and district support to help achieve academic achievement goals.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 My principal's evaluation of my performance helps improve my teaching.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My principal uses clearly communicated criteria for judging staff performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My principal is a &quot;visible presence&quot; in the building to both staff and students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My principal is considered an important instructional resource person in this school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My principal helps faculty interpret test results.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My principal provides a clear vision of what our school is all about.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My principal is an active participant in staff development activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My principal communicates clearly to the staff regarding instructional matters.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My principal provides frequent feedback to teachers regarding classroom performance.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX C—Continued

TEACHER QUESTIONNAIRE (STATEMENTS 11-18)
APPENDIX D

ADVANCE LETTER TO PRINCIPALS
November 10, 2001

Dear (Name of Principal):

Your elementary school is one of 37 schools with quality music programs in a six-state Northwestern region (Alaska, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Washington, and Wyoming). Because one of your music teachers submitted an application for a music group from your school to perform at the 1999 Northwest Music Educators Conference, your school was selected for this survey to identify instructional leadership characteristics of principals in schools with quality music programs. This information will provide ideas for effective educational leadership and instruction, and will ultimately benefit students, parents, teachers, administrators, and the community.

The survey questionnaire for classroom teachers consists of 18 positive statements regarding instructional leadership characteristics of principals. The Likert Scale, mark sense questionnaire takes less than 2 minutes to complete by using a pencil to color the appropriate circle for strongly disagree, disagree, agree, strongly agree.

Since a small number of schools were selected for this study, it is extremely important that the teachers from your school respond to the surveys. I will call next week to ask permission to do the survey and to request the number of questionnaires you need. Principals will be asked to distribute the questionnaires to a minimum of 2 teachers per grade level (K-5) and return questionnaires. This could be done by putting the questionnaires in teachers' mailboxes, or distributing them at a staff meeting. Teachers could complete and return the questionnaires to a collection box in the school office, where the forms could be placed in the enclosed, addressed, stamped envelope, and returned to me. Principals may survey all of the classroom teachers, if they wish. Principals can receive a copy of the results of the entire survey, as well as the results for your grade level of school, by putting name, address, and e-mail on the back of the return envelope. This is an anonymous survey, and no names will be put on questionnaires. An identification number is on each survey, used to check off schools as surveys are returned. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Jeanne M. Tonkovich
(406) 761-4365  jeannemt@sofast.net
Doctoral Student in Educational Administration
Montana State University-Bozeman
Dear (Name of Principal):

Your middle school is one of 37 schools with quality music programs in a six-state Northwestern region (Alaska, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Washington, and Wyoming). Because one of your music teachers submitted an application for a music group from your school to perform at the 1999 Northwest Music Educators Conference, your school was selected for this survey to identify instructional leadership characteristics of principals in schools with quality music programs. This information will provide ideas for effective educational leadership and instruction, and will ultimately benefit students, parents, teachers, administrators, and the community.

The survey questionnaire for classroom teachers consists of 18 positive statements regarding instructional leadership characteristics of principals. The Likert Scale, mark sense questionnaire takes less than 2 minutes to complete by using a pencil to color the appropriate circle for strongly disagree, disagree, agree, strongly agree.

Since a small number of schools were selected for this study, it is extremely important that the teachers from your school respond to the surveys. I will call next week to ask permission to do the survey and to request the number of questionnaires you need. Principals will be asked to distribute the questionnaires to a minimum of 1 teacher per grade level (6, 7, 8) per four subject areas (English, mathematics, science, social studies) and return questionnaires. This could be done by putting the questionnaires in teachers’ mailboxes, or distributing them at a staff meeting. Teachers could complete and return the questionnaires to a collection box in the school office, where the forms could be placed in the enclosed, addressed, stamped envelope, and returned to me. Principals may survey all of the classroom teachers, if they wish. Principals can receive a copy of the results of the entire survey, as well as the results for your grade level of school, by putting name, address, and e-mail on the back of the return envelope. This is an anonymous survey, and no names will be put on questionnaires. An identification number is on each survey, used to check off schools as surveys are returned. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Jeanne M. Tonkovich
(406) 761-4365 jeannemt@sofast.net
Doctoral Student in Educational Administration
Montana State University-Bozeman
Dear (Name of Principal):

Your junior high school is one of 37 schools with quality music programs in a six-state Northwestern region (Alaska, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Washington, and Wyoming). Because one of your music teachers submitted an application for a music group from your school to perform at the 1999 Northwest Music Educators Conference, your school was selected for this survey to identify instructional leadership characteristics of principals in schools with quality music programs. This information will provide ideas for effective educational leadership and instruction, and will ultimately benefit students, parents, teachers, administrators, and the community.

The survey questionnaire for classroom teachers consists of 18 positive statements regarding instructional leadership characteristics of principals. The Likert Scale, mark sense questionnaire takes less than 2 minutes to complete by using a pencil to color the appropriate circle for strongly disagree, disagree, agree, strongly agree.

Since a small number of schools were selected for this study, it is extremely important that the teachers from your school respond to the surveys. I will call next week to ask permission to do the survey and to request the number of questionnaires you need. Principals will be asked to distribute the questionnaires to a minimum of 1 teacher per grade level (7,8,9) per four subject areas (English, mathematics, science, social studies) and return questionnaires. This could be done by putting the questionnaires in teachers' mailboxes, or distributing them at a staff meeting. Teachers could complete and return the questionnaires to a collection box in the school office, where the forms could be placed in the enclosed, addressed, stamped envelope, and returned to me. Principals may survey all of the classroom teachers, if they wish. Principals can receive a copy of the results of the entire survey, as well as the results for your grade level of school, by putting name, address, and e-mail on the back of the return envelope. This is an anonymous survey, and no names will be put on questionnaires. An identification number is on each survey, used to check off schools as surveys are returned. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Jeanne M. Tonkovich (406)761-4365 jeannemt@sofast.net
Doctoral Student in Educational Administration
Montana State University-Bozeman
ADVANCE LETTER TO HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

November 10, 2001

Dear (Name of Principal):

Your high school is one of 37 schools with quality music programs in a six-state Northwestern region (Alaska, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Washington, and Wyoming). Because one of your music teachers submitted an application for a music group from your school to perform at the 1999 Northwest Music Educators Conference, your school was selected for this survey to identify instructional leadership characteristics of principals in schools with quality music programs. This information will provide ideas for effective educational leadership and instruction, and will ultimately benefit students, parents, teachers, administrators, and the community.

The survey questionnaire for classroom teachers consists of 18 positive statements regarding instructional leadership characteristics of principals. The Likert Scale, mark sense questionnaire takes less than 2 minutes to complete by using a pencil to color the appropriate circle for strongly disagree, disagree, agree, strongly agree.

Since a small number of schools were selected for this study, it is extremely important that the teachers from your school respond to the surveys. I will call next week to ask permission to do the survey and to request the number of questionnaires you need. Principals will be asked to distribute the questionnaires to a minimum of 1 teacher per grade level (9,10,11,12) per four subject areas (English, mathematics, science, social studies) and return questionnaires. This could be done by putting the questionnaires in teachers' mailboxes, or distributing them at a staff meeting. Teachers could complete and return the questionnaires to a collection box in the school office, where the forms could be placed in the enclosed, addressed, stamped envelope, and returned to me. Principals may survey all of the classroom teachers, if they wish. Principals can receive a copy of the results of the entire survey, as well as the results for your grade level of school, by putting name, address, and e-mail on the back of the return envelope. This is an anonymous survey, and no names will be put on questionnaires. An identification number is on each survey, used to check off schools as surveys are returned. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Jeanne M. Tonkovich

Jeanne M. Tonkovich (406) 761-4365 jeannemt@sofast.net
Doctoral Student in Educational Administration
Montana State University—Bozeman
APPENDIX E

PRINCIPALS OF SCHOOLS WITH QUALITY MUSIC PROGRAMS
### Elementary Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Phone Number</th>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City, State Zip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Melinda Reynvaan</td>
<td>(360) 412-7650</td>
<td>Lacey Elementary</td>
<td>1800 Homann Dr SE</td>
<td>Lacey, WA 98503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pam Hanson</td>
<td>(360) 412-4710</td>
<td>Horizons Elementary</td>
<td>1899 Homann Dr SE</td>
<td>Lacey, WA 98503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristin Tammetta</td>
<td>(425) 489-6461</td>
<td>Canyon Creek Elementary</td>
<td>21400 35th Ave SE</td>
<td>Bothell, WA 98021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lynnette Hedden</td>
<td>(509) 942-2387</td>
<td>Marcus Whitman Elementary</td>
<td>1704 Gray</td>
<td>Richland, WA 99352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janice Coulter</td>
<td>(907) 243-2161</td>
<td>Sand Lake Elementary</td>
<td>7500 Jewell Lake Rd</td>
<td>Anchorage, AK 99502</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Middle Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Phone Number</th>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City, State Zip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dan Zenor</td>
<td>(503) 524-1345</td>
<td>Conestoga Middle School</td>
<td>12250 SW Conestoga Dr</td>
<td>Beaverton, OR 97008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rob Watson</td>
<td>(406) 542-4070</td>
<td>Rattlesnake Middle School</td>
<td>1220 Pineview</td>
<td>Missoula, MT 59803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mende Kloppel</td>
<td>(406) 268-6500</td>
<td>East Middle School</td>
<td>4040 Central Ave</td>
<td>Great Falls, MT 59405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roy Adler</td>
<td>(425) 837-5700</td>
<td>Pine Lake Middle School</td>
<td>3200 228th Ave SE</td>
<td>Issaquah, WA 98029</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Junior High Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Phone Number</th>
<th>School Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City, State Zip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Troy Claycomb</td>
<td>(307) 682-2225</td>
<td>Sage Valley Junior High</td>
<td>1000 W Lakeway</td>
<td>Gillette, WY 82718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Eberhart</td>
<td>(253) 945-5000</td>
<td>Saghalie Junior High</td>
<td>33914 19th Ave SW</td>
<td>Federal Way, WA 98002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christine Olsen</td>
<td>(360) 313-4600</td>
<td>Vancouver Schools for the Arts and Academics</td>
<td>3101 Main St</td>
<td>Vancouver, WA 98663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Prato</td>
<td>(253) 841-8723</td>
<td>Aylen Junior High</td>
<td>101 15th St SW</td>
<td>Puyallup, WA 98371</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cody Claver (208) 524-7850
Taylorview Junior High
350 Castlerock Lane
Idaho Falls, ID 83402

Tom Mitchell (253) 538-3600
Frontier Junior High
22110 108th Ave E
Graham, WA 98338

High Schools

Dr. Randal Wendling (307) 352-3440
Rock Springs High School
Box 1089
Rock Springs, WY 82901

Fred Anderson (406) 232-4920
Custer County Dist High School
20 South Center
Miles City, MT 59301

Callie Langhor (406)751-3500
Flathead High School
644 4th Ave W
Kalispell, MT 59901

Kenneth Piippo (406) 683-2361
Beaverhead County High School
104 N Pacific
Dillon, MT 59725

Dick Kloppel (406) 268-6100
Charles M Russell High School
228 17th Ave NW
Great Falls, MT 59404

Sylvia Reynolds (907) 262-7464
Soldotna High School
425 W Marydale
Soldotna, AK 99669

Pat Podbin (907) 346-2111
Service High School
5577 Abbott Rd
Anchorage, AK 99504

Andy Michael Burnett (541)874-2251
Riddle High School
PO Box 45
Riddle, OR 97469

Len Case (503) 259-5218
Westview High School
4200 NW 185th Ave
Portland, OR 97229

Dan McMinimee (503) 399-3261
Sprague High School
2373 Kuebler Rd, S
Salem, OR 97302

Patricia Siegwarth (425) 456-7400
Newport High School
4333 128th Ave SE
Bellevue, WA

Rollie Johnson (360) 575-7110
R A Long High School
2903 Nichols Blvd
Longview, WA 98632
Kenneth Anderson (208) 338-3575  
Boise High School  
1010 Washington St  
Boise, ID 83702

Marianne Carlson (907) 479-4221  
West Valley High School  
3800 Geist Rd  
Fairbanks, AK 99710

Jonathan Bentz (509) 354-6000  
Joel E Ferris High School  
3020 E 37th  
Spokane, WA 99223

Bruce Plato (503) 916-5120  
Cleveland High School  
3400 SE 26th Ave  
Portland, OR 97202

Mac Whyte (907) 746-9500  
Colony High School  
HC01 Box 6048  
Palmer, AK 99645

Dirlene Wheeler (307) 672-2495  
Sheridan High School  
1056 Long Drive  
Sheridan, WY 82801

Frank O'Connor (360) 753-8847  
Capital High School  
2707 Conger  
Olympia, WA 98502

Carrie Ehrhardt (360) 379-4520  
Port Townsend High School  
1500 Van Ness  
Port Townsend, WA 98368

Brad Diller (307) 577-4640  
Kelly Walsh High School  
3500 E 12th St  
Casper, WY 82609

Samara Gilroy-Hicks (360) 604-6100  
Mountain View High School  
1500 SE Blaimont Dr  
Vancouver, WA 98684

(Granlie, 2000)
APPENDIX F

LETTER EXPLAINING CONTENTS OF PACKET
November 23, 2001

Dear (Name of Principal):

Enclosed are the questionnaires and instructions for the survey on instructional leadership characteristics of principals in schools with quality music programs. Thank you for discussing the survey on the phone and agreeing to participate in it.

Please remind the teachers to not mark in the “5” or “N/A” columns. Please print your name, address, and e-mail on the back of the return envelope, to request a copy of the results of the entire survey, as well as the results for your grade level of school. In the return envelope, could you enclose a note with the total number of teachers in your school?

Thank you for your cooperation. For further questions, please contact me through e-mail or the phone number below.

Sincerely,

Jeanne M. Tonkovich
(406) 761-4365 jeannemt@sofast.net
Doctoral Student in Educational Administration
Montana State University – Bozeman
November 23, 2001

Dear (Name of Principal):

Enclosed are the questionnaires and instructions for the survey on instructional leadership characteristics of principals in schools with quality music programs. Since I called but was unable to reach you personally, I am sending the surveys you need.

Please remind the teachers to not mark in the “5” or “N/A” columns. Please print your name, address, and e-mail on the back of the return envelope, to request a copy of the results of the entire survey, as well as the results for your grade level of school. In the return envelope, could you enclose a note with the total number of teachers in your school?

Thank you for your cooperation. For further questions, please contact me through e-mail or the phone number below.

Sincerely,

Jeanne M. Tonkovich (406) 761-4365  jeannemt@sofast.net
Doctoral Student in Educational Administration
Montana State University – Bozeman
APPENDIX G

SURVEY INSTRUCTIONS
SURVEY INSTRUCTIONS FOR ELEMENTARY PRINCIPALS

Survey Instructions for Elementary School Principals

1. Distribute survey questionnaires to a minimum of 2 teachers per grade level (K-5). (Mailboxes, staff meetings, small group).

2. Explain reason for survey: to identify instructional leadership characteristics of principals in schools with quality music programs. Your school is one of only 37 schools in a six-state Northwestern region whose music teacher applied for a group to perform at the Northwest Music Educators Conference in 1999. Information gained from this survey will provide ideas for effective educational leadership and instruction, and will ultimately benefit students, parents, teachers, administrators, and the community. (Explanation could be given by e-mail, staff meeting, or small group.)

3. Teachers indicate response on each item of the questionnaire by using #2 pencil to color in the circle completely to indicate Strongly Disagree (SD) = 1, Disagree (D) = 2, Agree (A) = 3, Strongly Agree (SA) = 4. Erase completely any changed answers. Do not use ink pen, or fold or staple questionnaire. Do not use X or check marks to indicate responses. Do not erase number indicated in box in upper right corner. This is for checking off grade level of school, as surveys are returned. The survey is anonymous. No names will be put on questionnaires.

4. Collect completed questionnaires (box in school office), place forms in enclosed, addressed, stamped envelope. Principals print name, address, and e-mail on back of return envelope to receive the results of survey, as well as the results of schools with same grade level.

5. Mail return envelope of completed survey questionnaires within a week of receiving them.

Thank you for your assistance and cooperation:

Jeanne M. Tonkovich (406) 761-4365 jeannemt@sofast.net
Doctoral Student in Educational Administration
Montana State University - Bozeman
Survey Instructions for Middle School Principals

1. Distribute survey questionnaires to a minimum of 2 teachers per grade level (K-5). 
   (Mailboxes, staff meetings, small group).

2. Explain reason for survey: to identify instructional leadership characteristics of
   principals in schools with quality music programs. Your school is one of only 37
   schools in a six-state Northwestern region whose music teacher applied for a group to
   perform at the Northwest Music Educators Conference in 1999. Information gained
   from this survey will provide ideas for effective educational leadership and instruction,
   and will ultimately benefit students, parents, teachers, administrators, and the
   community. (Explanation could be given by e-mail, staff meeting, or small group.)

3. Teachers indicate response on each item of the questionnaire by using #2 pencil to color
   in the circle completely to indicate Strongly Disagree (SD) = 1, Disagree (D) = 2, Agree
   (A) = 3, Strongly Agree (SA) = 4. Erase completely any changed answers. Do not use
   ink pen, or fold or staple questionnaire. Do not use X or check marks to indicate
   responses. Do not erase number indicated in box in upper right corner. This is for
   checking off grade level of school, as surveys are returned. The survey is anonymous.
   No names will be put on questionnaires.

4. Collect completed questionnaires (box in school office), place forms in enclosed,
   addressed, stamped envelope. Principals print name, address, and e-mail on back of
   return envelope to receive the results of survey, as well as the results of schools with
   same grade level.

5. Mail return envelope of completed survey questionnaires within a week of receiving
   them.

Thank you for your assistance and cooperation.

Jeanne M. Tonkovich (406) 761-4365 jeannemt@sofast.net
Doctoral Student in Educational Administration
Montana State University – Bozeman
Survey Instructions for Junior High School Principals

1. Distribute survey questionnaires to a minimum of 2 teachers per grade level (K-5). (Mailboxes, staff meetings, small group).

2. Explain reason for survey: to identify instructional leadership characteristics of principals in schools with quality music programs. Your school is one of only 37 schools in a six-state Northwestern region whose music teacher applied for a group to perform at the Northwest Music Educators Conference in 1999. Information gained from this survey will provide ideas for effective educational leadership and instruction, and will ultimately benefit students, parents, teachers, administrators, and the community. (Explanation could be given by e-mail, staff meeting, or small group.)

3. Teachers indicate response on each item of the questionnaire by using #2 pencil to color in the circle completely to indicate Strongly Disagree (SD) = 1, Disagree (D) = 2, Agree (A) = 3, Strongly Agree (SA) = 4. Erase completely any changed answers. Do not use ink pen, or fold or staple questionnaire. Do not use X or check marks to indicate responses. Do not erase number indicated in box in upper right corner. This is for checking off grade level of school, as surveys are returned. The survey is anonymous. No names will be put on questionnaires.

4. Collect completed questionnaires (box in school office), place forms in enclosed, addressed, stamped envelope. Principals print name, address, and e-mail on back of return envelope to receive the results of survey, as well as the results of schools with same grade level.

5. Mail return envelope of completed survey questionnaires within a week of receiving them.

Thank you for your assistance and cooperation.

Jeanne M. Tonkovich (406) 761-4365 jeannemer@sfast.net
Doctoral Student in Educational Administration
Montana State University – Bozeman
SURVEY INSTRUCTIONS FOR HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

1. Distribute survey questionnaires to a minimum of 2 teachers per grade level (K-5). (Mailboxes, staff meetings, small group).

2. Explain reason for survey: to identify instructional leadership characteristics of principals in schools with quality music programs. Your school is one of only 37 schools in a six-state Northwestern region whose music teacher applied for a group to perform at the Northwest Music Educators Conference in 1999. Information gained from this survey will provide ideas for effective educational leadership and instruction, and will ultimately benefit students, parents, teachers, administrators, and the community. (Explanation could be given by e-mail, staff meeting, or small group.)

3. Teachers indicate response on each item of the questionnaire by using #2 pencil to color in the circle completely to indicate Strongly Disagree (SD) = 1, Disagree (D) = 2, Agree (A) = 3, Strongly Agree (SA) = 4. Erase completely any changed answers. Do not use ink pen, or fold or staple questionnaire. Do not use X or check marks to indicate responses. Do not erase number indicated in box in upper right corner. This is for checking off grade level of school, as surveys are returned. The survey is anonymous. No names will be put on questionnaires.

4. Collect completed questionnaires (box in school office), place forms in enclosed, addressed, stamped envelope. Principals print name, address, and e-mail on back of return envelope to receive the results of survey, as well as the results of schools with same grade level.

5. Mail return envelope of completed survey questionnaires within a week of receiving them.

Thank you for your assistance and cooperation.

Jeanne M. Tonkovich (406) 761-4365 jeannemt@sofast.net
Doctoral Student in Educational Administration
Montana State University – Bozeman
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THANK YOU/REMINDER POSTCARD
THANK YOU/REMINDER POSTCARD

Thank you for distributing and returning surveys on instructional leadership characteristics of principals in schools with quality music programs. Input from the teachers in your school is very important, due to the small number of schools which met criteria for this survey.

If you have not given the survey yet, please distribute and return forms as soon as possible. For more questionnaires, please contact me: jeannemt@sofast.net (406) 761-4365.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Jeanne M. Tonkovich
Doctoral Student in Educational Administration
Montana State University-Bozeman