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ABSTRACT

LUTHER MCDANIEL
ANDRAGOGICAL PRACTICES OF SCHOOL PRINCIPALS IN DEVELOPING THE LEADERSHIP CAPACITIES OF ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS
Under the direction of OLIVIA BOGGS, Ed.D.

The purpose this mixed methods study was to assess school principals’ perspectives of the extent to which they apply the principles of andragogy to the professional development of assistant principals in their schools. This study was conducted in school districts that constitute a RESA area in a southeastern state. The schools in these districts represent rural and urban populations with varying demographics. The participants were school principals and assistant principals. The principals self-reported on their use of the principles of andragogy to develop leadership capacities of their assistant principal(s). The assistant principals provided their perception of the use of the principles of andragogy by their supervising principal.

Forty-nine participants completed the modified Instructional Perspectives Inventory (MIPI) that included two open-ended questions. Additionally, six experienced principals with doctorate degrees participated in targeted interviews. The data were analyzed through a convergent parallel design. Quantitative data were contextualized through the analysis of qualitative data gleaned from responses to the open-ended
questions and interview questions. The findings indicate that while all principal participants indicated using the principles of andragogy at the average or above level, the assistant principal participants did not report that their supervising principal used the practices at as high a level. The findings further indicated that the size of the school was the only statistically significant predictor of total MIPI score.

The data from the responses to the open-ended questions by assistant principals revealed the common themes of relationships, communication, and inclusion. For principal participants, the dominant themes of the strategies they shared included opportunities, communication, and coaching. The information gained through the targeted interviews resulted in the researcher identifying the following themes—Inherent responsibility, Assistant Principal as a Goal, Development Strategies, Budget, Personnel, Leading School Improvement Team, and School Culture through Relationships and Communication. This study led to the development of the McDaniel’s Stages of Educational Leader Development model and is expected to have implications for school principals, assistant principals, school districts, and university programs. Recommendations for practice are offered.
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

There has been no shortage of research on the critical role of the school principal in providing clear direction and visionary leadership, particularly over the last several decades (Goldring, Gray, & Bitterman, 2013; Mora-Whitehurst, 2013; Niewenhuizen & Brooks, 2013; Stringer, 2016). The research and empirical literature increasingly includes articles detailing the changing role of the principal and the difficulty of finding effective leaders willing and able to do the job. It is particularly difficult for new principals to grasp the multifaceted nature of this critical position (Spillane & Lee, 2014). Additionally, research demonstrating the importance of principals for student learning has grown substantially since the era of No Child Left Behind (Leithwood & Louis, 2004; Branch, Hanushek, & Rivkin, 2012; Mitgang, 2012). It is upon this current state of the school principalship that this study was conducted in hopes of contributing to the process of improving the preparation of school principals.

The relationships between doctors and residents portrayed on the television show, “Grey’s Anatomy”, features a teaching hospital with the inherent responsibility of developing the skills and practices of the next generation of medical professionals (Ramani & Leinster, 2008). Doctors include residents in all surgeries and medical procedures, as participants and observers, to ensure that the residents are receiving a very broad and practical experience. This journey through medical residency is a vital step in
preparing residents to operate independently as doctors in the future. In addition to medicine, recent research reported by Beechler, Ciporen, & Yorks (2013) documents the critical role of incorporating theories of andragogy (adult learning principles) in preparing effective corporate executives. Margaret Orr’s study on leadership preparation of school district superintendents concluded that sustained learning occurs when grounded in adult learning and leadership development theories (Orr, 2006). While considering these examples of effective executive preparation in the fields of medicine (Drinkard & Henschke, 2004; Passmore & Morrison-Beedy, 2013; Procter, 2008), business (Groves, 2007; Lubin, 2013; Quinn, 2002), and education (Davis & Leon, 2011; Starmack, 2003; Williams, 2011), the question arises of whether school principals have the tools and knowledge of adult learning principles to enable them to effectively teach, train, motivate, and develop their assistant principals to become successful school principals (Davis & Leon, 2011; Rosenshine, 2012; Sticker, 2006). Furthermore, the extent to which current leadership capacity development strategies of current principals align with the principles of andragogy was explored.

According to Davis & Leon (2011), the role of medicine and education in the lives of people is quite similar. Both disciplines are charged with improving the lives of people, and specifically in the case of principals, students. Principals have an effect on more students in a school than teachers do because teachers typically affect only their particular students (Marzano, Waters, & McNulty, 2005). Traditionally, principals recommend the hiring of teachers (Donaldson, 2013), manage the budget (Gottfried, 2012), respond to community and parent concerns (Gordon & Louis, 2009), and set the
tone on everything from discipline to academic goals (Jacobs, 2013). These responsibilities are not limited to veteran school leaders. First-year principals’ decisions and strategies are critically important and influence their schools’ performance, their success as a school leader, and the likelihood that they will remain at that school (Burkhauser, Gates, Hamilton, & Ikemoto, 2012).

Like schools and the roles of principals, the assistant principal roles have changed dramatically since the era of No Child Left Behind (Niewenhuizen & Brooks, 2013). As late as 1999, Kaplan & Owings, (1999) found that most principals described the roles of their assistant principals as non-instructional. In 2005, however, Pounder & Crow, (2005) shared findings that indicated the role of APs had evolved to positions that incorporated more instructional leadership involvement and oversight. Despite the aforementioned evolution, the training of APs has not likewise developed (Niewenhuizen & Brooks, 2013).

Assistant principals need much more than the current, common principal training approach (Dodson, 2015; Lile, 2008; Ylimaki, Jacobson, & Drysdale, 2007). University programs, the avenue by which most teachers train to become school leaders, are not adequate training grounds for effective school leaders (Marshall & Hooley, 2006). According to Mitgang (2012), the content and assignments of these programs do not reflect the realities of the immediate needs of school principal positions. Those who complete these programs and begin their school administration experience in the role of assistant principal often find themselves assigned to duties and areas of responsibility that do not adequately prepare them for the principal position (Niewenhuizen & Brooks,
As a result, most assistant principals who strive to use the position as preparation for the next step, often feel they are not ready for the responsibilities of the principal position (Niewenhuizen & Brooks, 2013).

The problem of attracting assistant principals to and mentoring them for the principalship is further encumbered by perceptions that building principals are expected to “fix” schools in an improbable period of time (Clifford, 2013). New principals typically report expectations for unrealistically quick improvements in teacher performance (Khalifa, 2011; Sanders, 2013) and increases in student achievement (Dhuey & Smith, 2014). The widely accepted research that principal effectiveness takes a minimum of five years to materialize (Clark, Martorell, & Rockoff, 2009; Fuller & Hollingworth, 2014; Grissom, 2011) is comprised with high turnover and increasingly short tenures of new appointees to the position (Mascall & Leithwood, 2010).

Jim Hull (2012) at the Center for Public Education asserts, “The five years has less to do with scores and more to do with institutionalizing changes the principal had made that improve student achievement. Ideally, then, a turnaround strategy would identify highly effective principals and provide the proper incentives and support for them to implement and institutionalize improvements over five years.” (p, 1)

Recent studies document increasing turnover rates of principals and assistant principals. Twenty-five percent of U.S. principals quit their positions each year and nearly half leave during their third year (Miller, 2013). University of Texas professors studied 15 years of state data on assistant principals (1995 to 2010) and found the tenure of assistant principals is decreasing at a rate that parallels principal departures. These
premature departures have a negative impact on student growth. A 2014 study completed by researchers at Mount Holyoke College found that children suffer two years of academic decline due to high principal turnover (Miller, 2013).

Statement of the Problem

Research confirms that principals in their first year of service experience multiple challenges, many of which negatively influence their likelihood of improving school performance and continuing in their leadership position (Burkhauser et al, 2012; Cray & Weiler, 2011; Duncan, Range, & Scherz, 2011). These new principal challenges include monitoring teaching and learning quality (Ikemoto, Taliaferro, Fenton, & Davis, 2014; Mitgang, 2012; Robinson, Lloyd, & Rowe, 2008), managing a school staff (Branch, Hanushek, & Rivkin, 2014), hiring effective teachers and staff members (Burkhauser et al., 2012, Branch, Hanushek, & Rivkin, 2014), achieving buy-in from veteran teachers and staff members (Burkhauser et al., 2012), building or maintaining an effective school culture, evaluating the curriculum, understanding and using multiple budgets (Spillane & Lee, 2014) and determining and prioritizing professional development needs (Ikemoto et al., 2014; Burkhauser et al., 2012; Mitgang, 2012; Broad Foundation, 2003).

These areas of responsibility reflect the role of all school principals and can prove overwhelming for new principals. First-year principals’ decisions and strategies in the aforementioned areas are critically important and influence their schools’ performance, their success as a school leader, and the likelihood that they will remain at that school beyond the first or second school year (Burkhauser et al., 2012).
Because effective school leaders have a strong impact on student achievement (Branch, Hanushek, & Rivkin, 2013; Hill, Ottem, & DeRoche, 2016; Mitgang, 2012) second only to classroom teachers, effective principal preparation is crucial to school success and student achievement (Doyle, Locke, Finn, & Northern, 2014; Ikemoto et al., 2014; Mitgang, 2012).

Research Questions

The study was guided by the following research questions:

1. To what extent do the current leadership capacity development strategies of school principals align with the principles of andragogy?

2. What is the relationship between various demographic categories and the alignment of a principal’s leadership capacity development strategies with the principles of andragogy?

3. In what ways do principals use andragogical practices to develop leadership qualities in assistant principals?

Theoretical Framework

Andragogy is the art and science of adult learning (Knowles, 1980). Most principal preparation programs today are aligned to the principals of pedagogy, the art and science of teaching children (Davis & Leon, 2011). Malcolm Knowles provided a set of assumptions to differentiate adult learning from children’s learning. Those assumptions included the adult learning concepts of self concept, experience, readiness to learn, orientation to learning, and motivation to learn. Davis & Leon (2011), suggests that these assumptions, with the understanding of how adults learn, should be incorporated into the process of preparing school principals. The theory of andragogy
was applicable to this study because the research focused on the professional learning principals are providing to assistant principals, adults. This professional learning should incorporate the need for adult learners to know why they are learning a skill or concept, the need to have responsibility for their learning, to reference their own experiences, to learn in real-world contexts, and an understanding of internal motivation (Davis & Leon, 2011).

Significance of the Study

The information gained from this study is organized to be of assistance to school leaders. Under the leader evaluation instrument in the state of Georgia, Leaders Keys Evaluation System (LKES), and in many states across the United States, principals are expected to show expertise in developing the leadership capacities of other staff members (Georgia Department of Education, 2014; Multiple Education Websites, 2015). Because of the existence of LKES instrument and the expectation that it includes, school principals and assistant principals in Georgia made up the target sample for the study. The results of this study provide principals across the country with a framework for carrying out the expectations related to developing the leadership capacities of assistant principals.

Additionally, new principals will be better prepared or “ready” for the position (Alvoid & Black, 2014). It might not be possible to simulate the actual school principal experience for those who have never served as the leader of a school building. It is possible, however, to provide those aspiring school leaders with an experience that incorporates the understanding of how adults best learn.
The researcher also aims to improve the retention rate of principals in high-poverty, high-minority, low-performing schools (Burkhauser et al., 2012; Mitgang, 2012). The aforementioned schools have a high rate of vacancies in the principal position because of the constant turnover and lack of success of previous administrators (Burkhauser et al., 2012). As a result, student achievement and teacher retention suffers (Burkhauser et al., 2012). Burkhauser et al. (2012) found that the tenure of an unsuccessful principal can have negative effects that linger after the leader has been replaced. It is expected that improved principal preparation will improve principal retention (Osabutey-Aguedje, 2015). This study sought to contribute to that improvement effort by exploring a possible link between adult learning theory and leadership development. Through the alignment of the principles of andragogy with effective practices used by school principals in developing the leadership capacity of their assistant principals, it is expected that school leaders will have an additional framework of leadership development to access in the pursuit of improved experiences for potential school principals.

Procedures

The researcher used a mixed-methods approach to assess school principals’ perspectives of the extent to which they apply theories of andragogy to the professional development of assistant principals in their schools. Participants consisted of principals and assistant principals in a selected Regional Educational Service Agency area (RESA) in the state of Georgia. The RESA is comprised of 16 regional educational service agencies strategically located in service districts throughout the state of Georgia (Georgia
Data for the quantitative strand of the study was collected using a modified version of the Instructional Perspectives Inventory by John Henschke (1989). This instrument was designed as an assessment instrument indicating self-reported beliefs, feelings, and behaviors of adult educators in practice. The instrument was modified for use with school principals and measured their reported perceptions of the extent to which they use andragogical practices with their assistant principals. To further modify the instrument to allow for mixed interpretation, open-ended questions were added to the survey. This convergent parallel design is employed when the researcher wishes to conduct both methods concurrently but to analyze the data separately (J. Creswell & Clark, 2011). To allow for sequential triangulation of the data, six principal respondents were interviewed to gain insight into the leadership capacity development practices of principals who employ strategies highly aligned to the principles of andragogy. While Creswell (2003), describes triangulation as a “means for seeking convergence across qualitative and quantitative methods” (p. 15), sequential triangulation is employed when the results of one strand are essential to planning the following strand (Johnson, Onwuegbuzie, & Turner, 2007). As a result of sequential triangulation, the interviews extended the research design from simply a convergent-parallel one to a sequential-explanatory design.

A stratified sample was used and participants were contacted through their school email address. The survey was set up through Survey Monkey and the survey window was open for 60 days. Descriptive statistics were used to describe the practices used by school principals in developing their assistant principals. A correlation was explored to
see if there is a relationship between the current practices of school principals and the principles of the theory of adult learning. Thematic content analysis was applied to the open-ended questions of the survey and to the interview questions to ultimately discern a list of best practices of principal preparation based on andragogy.

Limitations

There are approximately 250 school-level administrators in the selected RESA area. This number includes principals and assistant principals. The number of school leaders with 5+ years of experience is unknown. As a result, it is not known if the sample size related to principal experience was large enough to appropriately represent the population and sufficient for an effective research study.

Delimitations

A delimitation of this study is that only principals and assistant principals in the selected RESA area in Georgia were surveyed. Although school leaders around the world could provide significant insight on this topic, this study has a particular relevance to school leaders in the state of Georgia. Performance Standard 5: Human Resource Management of the Georgia Leader Keys Evaluation System (LKES) includes an expectation for school leaders to demonstrate expertise in the development of leadership capacity among staff (Georgia Department of Education, 2014).

The researcher chose to make the survey available only to principals and assistant principals who are employed in the selected RESA area of Georgia. This prevented the availability of the survey to the entire Georgia school principal population.
Additionally, the researcher chose to include in this study only qualitative data from current school principals with 5+ years of experience. This decision was made to focus on capturing the mentoring experiences during the assistant principal experience of current school leaders who have been able to successfully continue as a school principal through the initial five-year period cited as the milestone at which principal effectiveness is able to adequately materialize (Clark et al., 2009; Fuller & Hollingworth, 2014; Grissom, 2011). Including information from university principal preparation programs and district principal preparation programs could have provided data on the practices and perceptions of additional players in the principal preparation process.

Definition of Terms

Andragogy

Andragogy is “the art and science of helping adults learn” (Knowles, 1980; p. 43).

Pedagogy

Pedagogy is “the art and science of teaching children” (Knowles, 1980; p. 40).

Leadership capacity

Leadership capacity is a combination of skills and knowledge, attitudes and actions taken together, focused on generating results, and able to be applied to new contexts and situations (Elmore, 2007; Fullan, 2008; Huggins, Klar, Hammonds, & Buskey, 2017; Stoll, 2009).

Summary

This study attempted to identify the practices school principals are using to develop the leadership capacities of their assistant principals, and how these practices are
aligned with the theory of adult learning, andragogy. Current assistant principals will likely become the new principals of tomorrow. The difficult job of a school principal will be made easier for a novice principal if they are well-prepared during their assistant principal experience. Most public school educators are well trained in pedagogy but not andragogy. The principles of andragogy, adult learning theory, should be used by current school principals, as they develop their assistant principals and prepare them for school leadership. Information obtained through this mixed-methods study will assist school districts, school principals and assistant principals in improving the principal preparation process. Chapter 2 of this study explores related literature concerning the preparation of school principals and the theory of adult learning.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Chapter two provides a comprehensive review of the relevant literature to establish a theoretical and empirical foundation of the proposed research. Topics include studies on effective principals, new principals, assistant principals, leadership capacity, and the theory of andragogy.

Effective Principals

School principals are consistently cited in the literature as having a significant impact on student achievement, second only to teacher quality and classroom instruction (Krasnoff, 2015; Mendels, 2012; The Wallace Foundation, 2013). While individual teachers impact a relatively small segment of the school population, the practices and decisions of the principal affect all of the students enrolled in that school (Krasnoff, 2015). In recent years researchers have been able to quantify principal impact on student achievement (Krasnoff, 2015; The Wallace Foundation, 2013). These student achievement gains are not only aided by a reduction in out-of-school suspensions and student absences, but also result in higher graduation rates (Krasnoff, 2015). These markers of school success are more heavily impacted by principal practices in low-achieving, high-poverty schools than in higher-achieving schools with more affluent populations (Krasnoff, 2015).
Various researchers have made attempts to give a definition of effective principals. Those attempts have resulted in descriptions of what effective principals do. The research regarding effective principals is clear— they improve student achievement (Krasnoff, 2015; Loveless, 2016; Parylo & Zepeda, 2014; Stronge, Richard, & Catano, 2008; The Wallace Foundation, 2013).

The Wallace Foundation report entitled, “The School Principal as Leaders,” found that the work of effective principals is made up of the following practices:

1. Shaping a vision of academic success for all students.
2. Creating a climate hospitable to education.
3. Cultivating leadership in others.
4. Improving instruction.
5. Managing people, data, and processes to foster school improvement.

(Wallace Foundation, 2013, pg. 6).

Stronge, Richard, and Catano (2008) posited their own list of qualities that reflect effective principal leadership. These practices included:

1. Instructional Leadership.
2. School Climate.
3. Human Resource Administration.
5. Organizational Management.
6. Communication and Community Relations.
7. Professionalism.
8. The Principal’s Role in Student Achievement.

(Stronge, Richard, and Catano, 2008, pg. xiii)

Research from a variety of sources has made it clear that an effective principal is not a leader who excels in just 1 or 2 isolated areas. To be considered effective, principals must be proficient in multiple areas that create a synergistic effect in a school (Krasnoff, 2015; Parylo & Zepeda, 2014; Suber, 2012; The Wallace Foundation, 2013). The work of an effective principal results in a significant improvement of student achievement (Krasnoff, 2015; The Wallace Foundation, 2013).

A positive impact on instruction is mentioned throughout the literature as being a common success of effective principals (Krasnoff, 2015; Mendels, 2012; Parylo & Zepeda, 2014; Stronge et al., 2008; The Wallace Foundation, 2013). Improvements in instruction are made through increasing the quality of the teaching staff, useful feedback to teachers, building effective team teams in grade levels and/or departments, and appropriately allocating school resources to maximize the benefit to student learning (Krasnoff, 2015; Loveless, 2016; Mendels, 2012; The Wallace Foundation, 2013). The quality of instruction is overwhelmingly impacted by the quality of the teaching staff assembled in the school (Krasnoff, 2015; Loveless, 2016). Effective principals have shown to be adept at retaining effective teachers while encouraging less effective teachers to seek employment elsewhere (Krasnoff, 2015; Parylo & Zepeda, 2014).

Because effective principals are known by the level of success they achieve at the schools they lead, it is important to note that school improvement takes time. To reach a level at which the impact of their initiatives starts to bear noticeable fruit, principals need
between 3 and 7 years in their position (Krasnoff, 2015). While the average tenure of a school principal in 2015 was 3.6 years, which is significant for low-achieving, high-poverty schools, research shows that the tenure of effective principals at challenging schools is longer than that of less-effective principals (Krasnoff, 2015).

It is clear from the literature that an effective principal has a tremendously positive impact on the school culture, especially in shaping it to be one of high academic expectations for all students (Krasnoff, 2015; Loveless, 2016). For some leaders, a transformation of the school culture they inherit needs to take place (The Wallace Foundation, 2013). This work goes hand in hand with relationship-building across the school community. Positive relationships with school stakeholders has also been identified as a characteristic of effective principal leadership (Parylo & Zepeda, 2014; Suber, 2012). This culture improvement process leads to the building or strengthening of the school community and ultimately results in increased student achievement (The Wallace Foundation, 2013).

New Principals

With the high turnover in the principal position each school year, many schools begin the year with a leader who is new to the role (Burkhauser et al., 2012; Cray & Weiler, 2011; Doyle & Locke, 2014; Duncan et al., 2011; Jacob, Vidyarthi, & Carroll, 2012). As stated previously, most principals reach this position after several years of teaching and serving as an assistant principal (Gates et al., 2004; Papa Jr., Lankford, & Wyckoff, 2002). While teaching under a principal gives an educator exposure to the role, the assistant principal experience typically provides an up-close view of the job the
principal does. This view, however, does not adequately prepare the aspiring principal for the very distinct change in role and responsibility when one reaches this level of school leadership (Spillane and Lee, 434). The time that aspiring principals spend in the classroom and in the assistant role provides an opportunity to develop and shape their view of education, of leadership, and of their expectations for operating in the position of school principal (Spillane and Lee 437).

Unfortunately for new principals, and due to the nature of the position itself, novice leaders are not being afforded a honeymoon period while they slowly benefit from training and support provided by their school district. With high stakes accountability and the need for school turnarounds all over the country, districts are looking to hire school leaders who can effectively operate in the role on day one (Roza, Celio, Harvey, & Wishon, 2003). In light of these increased expectations for novice leaders, superintendents across the United States have noted that newly hired school principals are not adequately prepared for the school leadership role (Roza et al., 2003).

One indicator of the lack of adequate preparation for the principalship is the shock that new principals report upon experiencing that stark contrast in roles and responsibilities compared to their previous positions (Spillane & Lee, 2014). What can be most shocking, and ultimately frustrating, is the extent to which the multifaceted nature of the principal position limits the opportunities to spend quality time in classrooms and to effectively serve as the instructional leader of the school (Spillane & Lee, 2014). Because of this stark contrast in expectations from the assistant principal to the principal position, many researchers agree that new principals need extensive, focused,
high-quality mentoring and professional learning to successfully make the transition to the new role (Mitgang, 2012). Without effective training and support, new principals will quickly find themselves drowning in the new realities of the positions while also experiencing the isolation of the office that many scholars have noted (Mitgang, 2012).

This fact negatively impacts high-poverty, high-minority schools disproportionately more than more affluent ones. The former are typically saddled with a larger number of students eligible for free/reduced lunch, lower test scores, higher discipline infractions, less parent involvement, and more complex student populations (Roza et al., 2003). These figures make these jobs less attractive to top principal candidates. As a result, these schools are more likely to have first year or early-career principals and the students and teachers are continuously led by less-developed, less-effective principals (Branch et al., 2013).

The school demographics do not provide the only challenge to new principal success. Spillane & Lee (2014) conducted a qualitative study of new principals that revealed some common themes across their experiences. One of the most common observations was related to the shocking reality of the magnitude of greater responsibility that comes with the new position. The new principals quickly found that there was a stark difference between having responsibilities and being ultimately responsible for every single aspect of the school (Spillane & Lee, 2014).

As novice principals reflected on their assistant principal experience in Spillane and Lee’s study (2013), they expressed how they felt they had been doing “the technical job of principal during their AP experience”, but were not quite prepared for what they
faced in their new role. Unfortunately, these leaders had not been provided experience in, or exposure to, certain vital parts of the principal’s responsibility. The aspects of the job most cited by new principals as being relatively unfamiliar to them include dealing with personnel issues, overseeing the school budget(s), and working with appropriate personnel to maintain the school building(s) (Cheung & Walker, 2006; Earley et al., 2011; Nelson, Colina, & Boone, 2008; Spillane & Lee, 2014).

Assistant Principals

The assistant principal position is often seen as an entry-level position into educational administration and a required step on the road to a principal position (Chan, Webb, & Bowen, 2003; Gates et al., 2004; Niewenhuizen & Brooks, 2013; Papa Jr. et al., 2002; Ringel, Gates, Chung, Brown, & Ghosh-Dastidar, 2004). Although some administrators might desire to only serve in the assistant principal role (Marshall & Mitchell, 1991), the majority of educators who seek the position do so with aspirations of leading their own school one day (Marshall, 1991; Lile, 2008; Doyle & Locke, 2014; Lile, 2008; Marshall & Mitchell, 1991). While some may seek a higher income, more power and prestige, or a break from teaching, many pursue positions in educational leadership in an attempt to have a greater impact on children and their educational opportunities (Niewenhuizen & Brooks, 2013).

Over the past few decades, scholars and researchers have failed to study the work of assistant principals as closely as they have examined the principal position (Niewenhuizen & Brooks, 2013). The research that has been done in this area has consistently acknowledged that the assistant principal is vital to the success of the school.
and that he or she performs an indispensible role (Niewenhuizen & Brooks, 2013). The assistant principal role typically consists of multiple responsibilities that include serving as the member of the school leadership team, assisting in the instructional leadership of the school, managing teachers, conducting teacher observations, overseeing disciplinary actions, and overseeing school attendance (Chan et al., 2003; Niewenhuizen & Brooks, 2013; Pounder & Crow, 2005).

Several studies conducted in the early 2000’s found that the overwhelming part of an assistant principal’s day was dedicated to student discipline, leaving little time for instructional leadership or preparation for the principal role (Marshall & Hooley, 2006; Niewenhuizen & Brooks, 2013; Weller & Weller, 2002) conducted a study of assistant principals and found that student discipline was their primary assigned responsibility for 77% of those educators.

Experience in the assistant principal position, even for an extended number of years, does not necessarily provide preparation for the principal role. Although the assistant principal is often designated to serve as the principal in the absence of the leader, the overall experience of this role has not included the training and preparation necessary to equip the assistants to be ready to lead their own school on day one (Chan et al., 2003; Niewenhuizen & Brooks, 2013). Many believe that assistant principals are not adequately prepared for the principalship not only due to lack of training in curriculum, instructional leadership, and teacher supervision but also because of the lack of opportunity to perform many of the responsibilities associated with the principalship (Niewenhuizen & Brooks, 2013). This observation is in light of the fact that researchers...
have stated that assistant principals can be valuable as instructional leaders, if given the time and opportunity (Niewenhuizen & Brooks, 2013).

The lack of training and preparation of principals often leads one to focus on graduate school programs related to educational leadership. Traditionally, university coursework is focused on the role of the principal, providing no specific preparation for the assistant principal position (Marshall & Hooley, 2006; Niewenhuizen & Brooks, 2013). This creates a situation where assistant principals are often three or more years removed from formal professional development programs by the time they earn the opportunity to lead schools of their own. Additionally, the programs that graduate schools offer are typically focused on role performance as opposed to leadership development (Marshall & Hooley, 2006; Niewenhuizen & Brooks, 2013). This paradigm might be adequate for manager development but has proven inadequate for principal training.

Most aspiring principals receive their primary training in the principal role from their experience as an assistant principal (Chan et al., 2003; Niewenhuizen & Brooks, 2013). Even with this exposure to the role and responsibilities of a principal, most assistant principals feel that the exposure-based professional learning opportunities are not adequate preparation for a smooth transition to the top school leader position (Chan et al., 2003). Likewise, the reported primary responsibilities of the assistant principal do not provide the needed level of training. While leadership in the area of student discipline is vital to the school operations, that task alone does not adequately prepare the assistant principal for the multi-faceted role of the school principal (Umphrey, 2007).
Although recent state and national accountability measures have led to the expansion of the assistant principal’s role and responsibilities, studies have concluded that a lack of training in instructional leadership, student scheduling, teacher coaching, and other important areas have resulted in principal candidates being unprepared for the challenging role of the school principal (Bloom & Krovetz, 2009; Lile, 2008). Assistant principals need more than exposure to an effective principal if they are going to be equipped to successfully lead a school on day one of their tenure (Bloom & Krovetz, 2009; Lile, 2008; Niewenhuizen & Brooks, 2013; Ylimaki et al., 2007).

Leadership Capacity

Building the leadership capacity of their staff members has steadily become a standard responsibility of principals across the country (Huggins et al., 2017). Over half of the state-required principal evaluation instruments in the United States now include an expectation that school leaders work to build the leadership capacity of their subordinates (Various state education department websites from all 50 states plus the District of Columbia). This movement is likely a response to a consistent finding across research studies related to the principalship—leadership matters (Bouie, 2013; Ikemoto et al., 2014; Leithwood, Harris, & Hopkins, 2008; Shannon, 2007).

However, effective school leadership does not just happen through evolution, it must be developed. That leadership, which ultimately results in improved student achievement, is made up of skills and competencies that may provide people the ability to successfully move an organization forward (Doyle & Locke, 2014). Doyle and Locke (2014) conducted a case study of four school districts and ultimately found common
skills among leaders of effective schools. Those skills and competencies included problem solving, personnel management, knowledge of curriculum and instruction, and being culturally competent (Doyle & Locke, 2014). These findings were similar to the findings of Leithwood, Day, Sammons, Harris, and Hopkins (2006) who identified the ability to set a vision, to effectively work with people, the ability to reform a school, and the ability to serve as the instructional leader.

Likewise, Huggins, Klar, Hammonds, and Buskey (2017) found through a multisite case study that principals who were effective in developing the leadership capacities of others in their buildings “possessed a strong commitment to developing leadership capacity, that they understood leadership development as a process, and that they tolerated risk” (p.1).

Additionally, Yamiliki et al. (2007) found that successful school leaders were not entirely unique individuals. After studying 13 schools in a study commissioned by the ISSPP, Ylimaki et al. (2007) found that the principals of these schools in the USA, Australia, and England were very similar in the leadership dispositions that they exhibited. A sitting principal who is aware of the impact effective principals have on student achievement will continuously observe their staff members for those who should be encouraged to consider school leadership as a career option (Doyle & Locke, 2014). Unfortunately, however, there are principals who are not equipped with the tools required to develop leadership capacity in others (Huggins et al., 2017).

The aforementioned research findings naturally lead to a discussion of what aspiring school leaders should be taught and what should be the focus of the coaching-
based apprenticeship. Leithwood, Harris, and Hopkins (2008) found that effective school leaders need to be equipped with a leadership toolbox that allows the principal to adapt to unique circumstances and constituencies. The adoption of one way to operate and interact will not equip the leader to be successful (Leithwood et al., 2008). This would seem to counter the tendency to accept simple exposure to a successful principal as an effective training experience. Schools, like leaders themselves, are unique institutions and an attempt to lead a new school in the same manner one watched leadership at another school would likely be less than successful (Leithwood et al., 2008).

Because of the multi-faceted nature of the principal position, aspiring school leaders should also be taught how to go about prioritizing the many responsibilities that are prescribed to them, along with the multitude of initiatives their school might be undertaking during a given school year (Leithwood et al., 2008).

Based on interviews with thirty three principals in three states, Adamowski, Therriault, & Cavanna (2007), found that over 40% of the leaders expressed a desire to receive more training in the following areas:

1. Managing and analyzing data
2. Communicating effectively (externally)
3. Making data-driven decisions
4. Building a community of learners
5. Developing a teacher/staff performance accountability system
6. Building a community of support
7. Evaluating classroom teachers
8. Evaluation curriculum

9. Designing curriculum (p. 23)

When considering the training of educational leaders and the development of leadership capacity, the graduate school is seen as the initial area of education (Dodson, 2015). Unfortunately for the educational leadership programs and aspiring principals, university programs are proving to be less than effective training options for developing school leaders (Templeton, Willis, & Hendricks, 2016). The initial criticism of these programs is related to the lack of alignment between the content it covers and the actual roles and responsibilities of school principals (Schechter, 2011). This lack of alignment makes it difficult for aspiring leaders to be adequately prepared to lead schools and to positively impact student achievement during their first year (Schechter, 2011; Templeton et al., 2016). Although the criticisms of graduate programs have led to changes and updates during the NCLB era, these programs continue to be regarded as less than effective training grounds for future school principals (Leithwood et al., 2008; Schechter, 2011).

Schechter (2011) found that this general negative perception is rooted in today’s demand for principals to be instructional leaders and in recent findings that effective school principals have a positive impact on student achievement. In light of the recent research that quantifies the impact of a school principal on student achievement, Schechter (2011) suggests universities and school districts continue to rethink the traditional way in which school leaders are educated, trained, and certified.
The research on effective school leadership has suggested that in some areas the principals is “the” leader, while in others the principal should simply be “a” leader while also being the architect of leadership capacity building. (Leithwood & Riehl, 2003; Templeton et al., 2016). A successful school leader will understand that they cannot do the work of the school alone. Thus, development of leadership capacity is important for the aspiring principal as well as being a responsibility of the principal and important for those who will work under the aspiring leader during his/her tenure. To reinforce that premise, many extensive qualitative studies have found that the school leaders have an indirect, as well as direct, impact on student achievement and school culture (Leithwood & Riehl, 2003). Therefore, the development of the leadership capacities of assistant principals and other staff members should be viewed not just as preparation of the next generation of principals but also as a key aspect of the school improvement process (Huggins et al., 2017).

When considering the development of leadership capacity in others, one of the principles of andragogy is found throughout the literature. In his book, The Modern Practice of Adult Education (1980), Malcolm Knowles emphasized the important place that a person’s prior experience has in their present position. Leithwood, et al. (2008), argues that the knowledge gained by leaders in previous positions is a valuable resource when facing situations and problems they currently face and will face in the future. This toolbox of relevant experience can be filled by previously encountered challenges or through the knowledge and expertise shared by colleagues (Leithwood, et al, 2008). This supports the premise that multiple opportunities to engage in non-routine leadership-
development opportunities are essential to the growth and preparation of leaders. Leithwood, et al. (2008) stresses the crucial role that authentic opportunities, individually and with others, plays in school leadership development. It is these experiences that allow aspiring principals to not only apply their skills but to also reflect on the impact that different contexts have on leadership decisions.

Theory of Andragogy

Although the term andragogy was introduced into the English lexicon by Alexander Kapp in 1833, the word was not used extensively until the 1920s when Rosenstock-Huessy adopted it as term for teaching German adults during the period of recovery from World War I (J. A. Henschke, 2011). Around 1966, Malcolm Knowles acquired the word andragogy to go along with his extensive work developing a theory of adult learning principles that would be clearly distinguishable from the way children learn, pedagogy (Goddu, 2012; J. A. Henschke, 2011; Knowles, 1980).

While there are numerous theories of adult learning, andragogy as developed by Knowles is the most cited and most well-known (Goddu, 2012). As Knowles worked to develop this theory, he focused on the ways in which the strategies of those successfully instructing adults differed significantly from, but operate parallel to, strategies traditionally connected with pedagogy (Knowles, 1980).
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The study explored the andragogical practices used by school principals in their efforts to develop the leadership capacities of assistant principals. This chapter explains the research protocol the researcher followed to conduct the study. The hypothesis and research questions are included in this chapter, along with a description of the research design, population, sample, participants, instrumentation, data collection, and reporting methods.

Rationale for Research Study

According to (Johnson et al., 2007), mixed methods research combines elements of qualitative and quantitative methods for the purpose of providing breadth and depth of understanding and corroboration. Data were initially collected through the use of a survey that concluded with open-ended questions. Data collection was extended with interviews of six selected school principals. Quantitative data on frequency of principal practices was contextualized through the analysis of qualitative data gleaned from responses to the open-ended questions and interview questions. This chosen research procedure, convergent parallel design, is used when the researcher uses concurrent timing to conduct both the quantitative (survey) and qualitative (open-ended questions) strands during the same phase of the research process (J. Creswell & Clark, 2011). Although the
quantitative and qualitative data were collected at the same time, the data were analyzed independently during the data analysis, but then mixed during the determination of findings (Creswell & Clark, 2011). The research design was extended into a sequential explanatory design when interviews were conducted with selected principals. This approach is followed when the results of one strand informs the planning of the following strand (Johnson et al., 2007).

Research Questions

1. To what extent do the current leadership capacity development strategies of school principals align with the principles of andragogy?

2. What is the relationship between various demographic categories and the alignment of a principal’s leadership capacity development strategies with the principles of andragogy?

3. In what ways do principals use andragogical practices to develop leadership qualities in assistant principals?

Research Design

The study adopted pragmatism as its epistemological perspective. This study was built on a critical review of literature to develop an understanding of the practices of supervising principals and how they might adequately prepare their assistant principals to be successful as beginning principals. According to (Creswell & Clark, 2011) pragmatism is concerned with what works and finding solutions to a problem. It is therefore appropriate that this study looked not only at what practices are being used to most effectively prepare the next generation of school building leaders but also how those
practices align with adult learning theory. These interactions and practices were investigated to make a contribution to the literature regarding principal succession planning and principal preparation.

The type of data needed to answer the research questions required both quantitative and qualitative methods, which led the researcher to take a mixed-methods approach in this study. When the researcher uses both quantitative and qualitative strategies to gather and analyze data, the design is considered mixed-methods (Creswell, 2003). According to Creswell (2003), when using mixed-methods:

The researcher bases the inquiry on the assumption that collecting diverse types of data best provides understanding of a research problem. The study begins with a broad survey in order to generalize results and then, in a second phase, focuses on qualitative, open-ended interviews to collect detailed views from participants (p. 18).

Instrumentation

Data for the quantitative portion of the study was collected using a modified version of John Henschke’s *Instructional Perspectives Inventory* (IPI). This instrument was developed by Henschke to be given to adult educators. Henschke (1994) designed the *Instructional Perspectives Inventory* as an assessment instrument indicating self-reported beliefs, feelings, and behaviors of adult educators in practice. Permission to use a modified version of the instrument in this study was granted on October 27, 2016. The Permission Letter is provided in Appendix D.
The instrument was modified for school principals and assistant principals to measure the extent to which principals use andragogical practices when mentoring assistant principals. On the instrument used by principals, the survey items were prefaced with the phrase, “How frequently do you…” while the instrument used by assistant principals was prefaced with the phrase, “How frequently does your principal….” The survey instruments are provided in Appendices E and F. To further modify the instrument to gather additional information, open-ended questions were added to the survey. This convergent parallel design is employed when the researcher wishes to conduct both methods concurrently and to analyze the data separately (Creswell & Clark, 2011). Additionally, sequential triangulation was achieved by following a sequential explanatory design through interviews conducted with selected principals. This design is achieved when a mixed-methods research project employs a strand that is informed by a previously conducted strand (Johnson et al., 2007).

Population

There are approximately 231,800 school administrators in the United States (Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2014). However, the target population for this study was the pool of thousands of school administrators who work in one of the states where developing the leadership capacity of subordinates is an expectation spelled out in the school administrator evaluation system (Georgia Department of Education, 2014).

Sample

The school principals and assistant principals who are among the approximately 250 school-level leaders in a selected RESA area of Georgia served as the sample for this
study. Stratified purposeful sampling was achieved by the school districts in the selected RESA area sending out the survey to the prospective respondents through their school email addresses. The stratified purposive sampling technique, which fits a mixed-methods approach, is a type of non-probability sampling that is most effective when one needs to study a certain cultural domain with knowledgeable experts within (Tongco, 2007). As the researcher moved into the data collection phase, the breakdown of the school leaders’ population-gender, ethnicity, experience, was included.

Participants

The participants in this study were public school principals and assistant principals in the state of Georgia who are employed in a school in the selected RESA area of Georgia. After acquiring IRB approval from Mercer University, an agreement to send out the survey was requested from each school system in the selected RESA area of Georgia. Upon approval, all participants were contacted through a survey link sent to their school email address. The participants were provided a web consent form before accessing the survey. Before the participants began the survey they were required to read the web consent form and electronically provide their consent to participate and have their data used in the study.

Data Collection

The data for this study were gathered through surveys of school principals and assistant principals in the state of Georgia. Upon IRB approval by Mercer University, the data collection process commenced by entering the modified instrument into Survey Monkey through Mercer University. The IRB approval letter from Mercer University is
provided in Appendix A. To facilitate inviting school leaders to participate in the study, the district office of each approving school system was asked to send the survey link to the school leaders through their school email address. The survey was electronically distributed with a letter of invitation to the sample population. The recruitment documents are included in Appendix C. The survey instrument included the instructional perspectives inventory developed by John Henschke that provided a version modified for principals and assistant principals, respectively. The principals’ version asked principals to self-report their use of andragogical practices in their efforts to develop the leadership capacities of their assistant principal(s). The assistant principals’ version asked APs to report their perceptions of their supervising principal’s use of andragogical practices in leadership development efforts.

From the surveys, the quantitative data collected reflect the extent to which the principles of andragogy are used by school principals during the development of the leadership capacities of assistant principals. Open-ended questions were added to the end of the modified survey to identify actual practices current principals are using in developing the leadership capacities of their assistant principals. Data from these questions provided specific strategies used by principals to prepare assistant principals to be successful school principals themselves. Additionally, interviews were conducted with six selected principal participants, a sample size consistent with qualitative data collection practices (Guest, Bunce, & Johnson, 2006).
Institutional Review Board Approval

Permission to conduct this study was obtained from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at Mercer University, as well as the participating school districts.

Response Rate

Approximately 250 school principals and assistant principals make up the school-leader population of the selected RESA area of Georgia. Of an estimated 250 school leaders, a 40% response rate to the survey was the goal. A high response rate was expected to be achieved because the topic is of high interest to school leaders, the survey is connected to concepts included in the current leadership evaluation instrument, took approximately 10 minutes to complete, and had a simple visual and response layout (Dillman et al., 2009; Radhakrishna & Doamekpor, 2008). In addition, the school systems were asked to send out the survey link two times within the 60 day window that the survey was open. At the end of data collection, an acceptable 20% response rate had been achieved.

Data Analysis

Once an acceptable response rate was achieved after the survey window closed, a summary report was generated and the raw quantitative data were entered into SPSS. A descriptive statistical analysis was run to, among other findings, determine which principals have a higher reported usage of andragogical principles and practices in development of assistant principals. A factor analysis was run to identify unobserved factors that might impact a principal’s MIPI score. Additionally, Pearson correlation coefficient tests were conducted to determine the degree to which the demographic
variables and the total score achieved by the school principals on the modified version of the IPI are linearly related (Green & Salkind, 2013).

The open-ended questions and data from the interviews were analyzed using thematic content analysis. This analytical process starts when the researcher begins to look for patterns of meaning in the data (Braun & Clarke, 2006). In thematic content analysis, the task of the researcher is to identify “a limited number of themes which adequately reflect their textual data” (Howitt & Cramer, 2011). To achieve this level of qualitative data analysis, the responses to the open-ended questions and interview questions were imputed into qualitative software and coded line by line, incorporating a data driven inductive approach that resulted in the creation of code categories as the data is analyzed and interpreted (Boyatzis, 1998; Fereday & Muir-Cochrane, 2006; Hesse-Biber & Leavy, 2011). Categories that are viewed as conceptually linked were integrated and synthesized together into unifying themes. The data were considered saturated when no new codes or themes were identified.

Reporting Results

The results of the survey are first reported through tables that show the findings from a factor analysis. Tables of descriptive statistics are provided to illustrate the makeup of the sample population. This descriptive data identifies gender, experience, highest degree earned, and level of school that the participant is currently employed in. The seven factors of the Modified Instructional Perspectives Inventory (MIPI) are ranked based on the total average score for each factor, along with providing the mean score and standard deviation. Items 3, 5, 11, 13, 18, 20, 25, 27, 32, 34, 36, and 41 were reversed
scored. Additionally, correlation data is shared that shows the extent to which there is a relationship between the total score on the MIPI and the components identified through the factor analysis results. To report the findings of the qualitative strand of this study, responses to the open-ended questions were extracted from the survey results files and a thematic analysis protocol was applied. A narrative was generated that details the specific strategies reported by participating principals and used by those principals who supervise the participating assistant principals. Additionally, the data gleaned from principals who were purposefully selected for interviews, was coded line-by-line and organized into themes. This data is reported to ultimately help prepare assistant principals to be successful school principals themselves.

Summary

This chapter provided a description of the specific research design and methodology utilized in identifying the extent to which current practices used by school principals to develop the leadership capacities of their assistant principals align with principles of andragogy. A mixed-methods approach, with a convergent parallel design, was followed to achieve the aims of this research study. The population identified for the study is school principals and assistant principals in the United States, while the sample is made up of school principals and assistant principals in the state of Georgia. The researcher discussed the methodology in detail so that the most accurate data analysis could be conducted and replication studies might be undertaken in the future. The quantitative strand was conducted using a modified version of the Instructional Perspectives Inventory (MIPI), while the qualitative strand was accomplished by adding
open-ended questions to the end of the MIPI and by conducting interviews with selected school principals. Factor analysis, descriptive statistics, and correlations are provided in Chapter 4 to report the results of the quantitative strand, while tables of specific principal development strategies are provided to report the results of the qualitative strand.
CHAPTER 4
RESULTS

Chapter Four begins with a description of the individuals who participated in the research study through the completion of the Modified Instructional Practices Inventory (MIPI). Following the descriptive statistics is an analysis of the data collected through the MIPI instrument and the relationship of that data with the various demographic groups represented in the sample. The chapter concludes with an analysis of the qualitative findings related to strategies used to develop the leadership capacities of assistant principals.

A mixed-methods approach was used to address the following research questions:

1. To what extent do the current leadership capacity development strategies of school principals align with the principles of andragogy?

2. What is the relationship between various demographic categories and the alignment of a principal’s leadership capacity development strategies with the principles of andragogy?

3. In what ways do principals use andragogical practices to develop leadership qualities in assistant principals?

The data collection was conducted using a convergent parallel design that allowed for the collection of the quantitative and qualitative strands at the same time. In an effort to provide a richer data pool, the collection of the qualitative strand was extended to include
emailed interviews with participants who express an interest in sharing more detailed information on the andragogical strategies used to develop the leadership capacities of assistant principals.

Research Study Participants

The sample used in this study was made up of the principals and assistant principals within the 13 school districts that make up the Northeast Georgia Regional Educational Service Agency (NEGA RESA). During the academic year in which this study was conducted, there were 253 principals and assistant principals in the NEGA RESA. An invitation to participate in the study was sent to the principals and assistant principals in December, 2016 and January, 2017. The survey remained open for 60 days and was closed on January 28, 2017. At that time 49 principals and assistant principals had completed the survey, representing a 20% response rate.

42% (21) of the participants were principals and 58% (26) were assistant principals. 48% of the principals identified as female, 52% as male. In the 2011-2012 school year, the percentage of female principals in U.S. public schools was 52% (Hill et al., 2016). Additionally, 58% of the assistant principals identified as female, 42% as males.

When asked to report their highest degree earned, 5% (1) of principals hold only a bachelor’s degree, 14% (3) a master’s, 29% (6) an educational specialist degree, and 52% (11) of the principal participants have earned a Doctorate. Of the assistant principal participants, none reported holding only a bachelor’s degree. 15% (4) of the respondents hold a master’s degree, 58% (15) hold an educational specialist degree, and 27% (7) have earned a doctorate.
The number of years school leaders reported serving as a classroom teacher prior to promotion was similar for both principal and assistant principal responding groups. 14% (3) of principals served as a teacher for 1-5 years, 81% (17) served for 6-15 years, and only 5% (1) taught for over 15 years. 8% (2) of assistant principals taught for 1-5 years, 88% (23) taught for 6-15 years, and only 4% (1) spent more than 15 years in the classroom.

The school principals who participated in this study had represented a variety of experience levels. 38% (8) of the principals have served as principals for less than 6 years. 52% (11) have between 6 and 15 years experience, while 10% (2) have served as a school principal for over 15 years. The assistant principal participants reported a less varied level of experience at this level of leadership. While 88% (23) of assistant principals have between 6 and 15 years experience, only 8% (2) are in their first 5 years and 4% (1) have served as an assistant principal for over 15 years.

The data from the research study is consistent with the findings of previous researchers that those who move into assistant principal and principal positions overwhelmingly follow a consistent career path (Chan et al., 2003; Gates et al., 2004; Niewenhuizen & Brooks, 2013; Papa Jr. et al., 2002; Ringel et al., 2004). 73% (19) of the assistant principals reported that they were teachers prior to moving into their current position, while 86% (18) of principal respondents were assistant principals prior to serving in their current role.

The principal and assistant principal participants are currently working in a variety of school levels, and in schools with a variety of enrollment sizes. By and large, however,
the participants are either working with one assistant principal or are serving as the sole assistant principal.

Modified Instructional Perspectives Inventory Results

As a result of correspondence with Dr. John Henschke via email and telephone, the Instructional Practices Inventory was modified and approved for use with principals and assistant principals. The modified Instructional Practices Inventory (MIPI) consists of 45 survey items. These items were entered into Survey Monkey and building-level leaders at schools in the Northeast Georgia RESA area were invited to participate in this research study. The results of this survey were used to answer Research Question 1- To what extent do the current leadership capacity development strategies of school principals align with the principles of andragogy?

According to my initial survey results there were 49 principals and assistant principals who agreed to participate in this research study. After I reviewed the actual participant responses, I found that 6 of those school administrators who initially agreed to participate in the study chose not to complete the survey. One of these administrators was an assistant principal and 5 were principals. They each officially received a score of zero on the MIPI scale were excluded from data analysis. The data reported in this chapter reflects the scores of 16 principal participants and 27 assistant principal participants.

The highest possible total score on the MIPI is 225. Principal participant MIPI scores reflect the level at which their leadership development strategies align with the principles of andragogy cite. In this research study, the mean principal MIPI score was 184.54
while ranging from a low score of 156.00 to a highest score of 206.59 (SD = 15.68).

Assistant principal MIPI scores reflect the level at which they reported the leadership development strategies of their current supervising principal aligning with the principles of andragogy. Based on their reporting, the principals that the assistant principal participants currently work under have a mean MIPI score of 172.43, with those scores ranging from 77.00 to 215.00 (SD = 37.86). Matched sets to correlate the MIPI scores of assistant principals and their actual supervising principal were not pursued so as to assure anonymity for the assistant principals.

The findings as presented in Table 1 show that over 100% of the principal participants reported average, above average, or high above average usage of andragogical principles in developing the leadership capacities of their assistant principals. These category levels were derived from Stanton (2005) as she used a bell curve as a reference.

Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>MIPI Total Score</th>
<th>Frequency of Participants</th>
<th>Percentage of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High above average</td>
<td>89-100%</td>
<td>199-225</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>82-88%</td>
<td>185-198</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>66-81%</td>
<td>149-184</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>55-65%</td>
<td>124-148</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Below Average</td>
<td>Below 55%</td>
<td>Below 124</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Table 2, it is shown that assistant principal participants reported that 77% of the current supervising principals they work under have an average or above average usage of the principals of andragogy. 37% of those supervising principals were reported to use andragogical principles at the “High above average” level.

Table 2.

MIPI Scores Reported by Assistant Principal Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>MIPI Total Score</th>
<th>Frequency of Participants</th>
<th>Percentage of Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High above average</td>
<td>89-100%</td>
<td>199-225</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Average</td>
<td>82-88%</td>
<td>185-198</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>66-81%</td>
<td>149-184</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Average</td>
<td>55-65%</td>
<td>124-148</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Below Average</td>
<td>Below 55%</td>
<td>Below 124</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the total MIPI score, Henschke (year) broke the andragogical practices measured by the MIPI into seven andragogical factors. These factors were derived from a factor analysis conducted by Henschke (1989) as he first used the MIPI with a group of adult educators employed by the Chicago City College system who represented a subset of the instructors in his study. Seven factors were recognized from this initial study. A subsequent study with adult educators from the St. Louis Community College System led to the establishment of five factors. These seven initial factors were provided by Henschke to the researcher when approval was granted to use the instrument in this research study and, therefore used in the data analysis (Henschke, personal communication, October 17, 2016). For this study, the factors are presented as Leader
Empathy, Leader Trust, Planning and Delivery, Accommodating Learner, Teacher Insensitivity, Experience-based Learning, and Principal-centered Learning.

The dimensionality of the seven scales for this study was checked by scale reliability analysis. The scores were reversed for items 3, 11, 20, 25, 32, and 34 because they correlated negatively with the rest of the items. The reversals were done by subtracting the observed item ratings from 6. With 43 respondents and 45 items, there were a maximum of 1,935 possible item responses. The respondents omitted twenty of the possible item responses, or about 1%. To compute the total MIPI score, the mean of the items rated by a respondent was multiplied by 45. The coefficient alpha reliability for the sum of the 45 items was .97, which is acceptable and unusually high. Therefore, subsequent analyses were done using the total MIPI score.

The data from this research study indicates that over 100% of school principals report using the principles of andragogy at an average or above average level. However, assistant principals report that only about 77% of their current supervising principals use the principles of andragogy at an average, above average, or high above average level. The methodology for this study did not include an attempt to compare the self-reported MIPI scores of school principals with the scores given to them by the actual assistant principals they supervise. Although this study did not include these matched sets, the aforementioned finding could indicate that intended practices by principals to develop their assistant principals may not be viewed as such.
Correlations

The next step taken in the data analysis process was to explore the relationship between the average MIPI score and the components identified from the factor analysis for which information was sought through an addition to the data collection tool. Correlation coefficients were conducted to measure the relationship between each principal’s MIPI and the demographic categories they represented. The aim was to determine if there is a statistically significant correlation between each demographic variable and the total MIPI score, while also acknowledging that correlation does not mean causation.

Dimensionality of the Predictor Variables

Twenty-two dummy variables were created to represent the levels of the nominal variables to be used as predictors. The dummy variables were analyzed by principal components analysis followed by Varimax rotation. Table 3 shows the results of this analysis.

Table 3.

*Varimax Rotated Principal Components of the Dummy Predictor Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>501-999 Students</th>
<th>AP for 6-15 years</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Short Teaching Tenure</th>
<th>Took Adult Learning Course</th>
<th>Under 500 Students</th>
<th>No A.P. Exp.</th>
<th>Over 1500 Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1001-1500 Students</td>
<td>-.90</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>-.88</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>501-999</td>
<td>6-15 Yrs. - A. P.</td>
<td>1-5 Yrs. as A.P.</td>
<td>Ed.S. Degree</td>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.68</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-15 Yrs. - A. P.</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 Yrs. as A.P.</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.88</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed.S. Degree</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>-.58</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.76</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 years as teacher</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-15 years as teacher</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.89</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not taken Adult learning class</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.97</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has taken adult learning class</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16+ years as teacher</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.30</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-499 Students</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 years as A.P.</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master’s Degree</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1500+ students</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16+ years - A.P.</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The component scores were computed by the Anderson-Rubin method of SPSS to ensure their linear independence. Table 4 shows the correlations of each component with the total MIPI score.

Table 4. Correlations of Predictor Component Scores with MIPI Total Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component Name</th>
<th>Correlation of MIPI with Component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1001-1500 Students</td>
<td>.29*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.P. for 6-15 years</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short Teaching Tenure</td>
<td>-.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Took Adult Learning Course</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 500 Students</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No A.P. Experience</td>
<td>-.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 1500 Students</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* P<= .05

Component “1001-1500 Students” is the only statistically significant predictor of total MIPI score.

To answer the research questions of this study, a qualitative strand was added to the methods that included open-ended questions added to the MIPI as well as targeted interviews of six experienced school principals who each hold doctorate degrees. This qualitative data presented in the remainder of this chapter provides detailed perspectives of leadership development strategies from principals and assistant principals.
Responses to Open-ended Questions Added to the MIPI

Two open-ended questions were added to the end of the MIPI and analyzed using thematic content analysis. For assistant principal participants, the following two questions were presented at the end of the MIPI:

1. What specific leadership-development strategies have been used by your current principal to prepare you for the principal position?
2. Is there any further information you would like to provide the researcher on the topic of principals developing the leadership capacity of assistant principals?

For principal participants, the following two questions were presented at the end of the MIPI:

1. What specific leadership-development strategies have been used by your current principal to prepare you for the principal position?
2. Is there any further information you would like to provide the researcher on the topic of principals developing the leadership capacity of assistant principals?

The responses to the questions for these groups are reported below. Those assistant principals who responded to the first question are identified numerically, while respondents to the second question are identified by a letter. Because the responses were anonymous, it cannot be known if some of the responses for questions 1 and 2 were provided by the same participant. As a result, these responses will be identified separately. The same protocol is followed for principal respondents.
For assistant principals, the common themes that ran throughout their descriptions of specific leadership-development strategies used by their current principal were relationships, communication, and inclusion. AP Respondent 3 identified communication and partnership as the foundation for the relationship with her principal. Respondents 6, 7, 8, and 10 shared that they speak with their respective principals regularly, while AP Respondent 4 noted that his principal keeps him informed by sharing information with him that is obtained from principal meetings.

AP Respondent A stated that the leadership of the school working together is critical for developing leadership capacity. This was reinforced by AP Respondent D who shared that she has worked under three different principals and each worked closely with her to develop her as a leader and that was a beneficial relationship to have as an assistant principal. AP Respondents B and C identified principal understanding of the assistant principal’s developmental needs as a being an important aspect of the mentor-mentee relationship.

Being included in leadership tasks and decision-making was also a dominant theme in assistant principal responses to question 1. AP Respondent 1 described serving on her school’s leadership team, PBIS team, and the problem-solving team while AR Respondents 3, 4, 6, 11, 12, and F reported that they have opportunities to engage in decision-making as it relates to budgets, staffing, and other areas that are largely the sole responsibility of the principal. Additionally, AP Respondents 4, 7, 10, 11 identified opportunities to lead groups, plan for and lead meetings, present material to teachers and parents, and to serve as the principal in his/her absence.
For principal participants, the dominant themes of the strategies they shared included opportunities, communication, and coaching. Principal Respondents 3, 6, 8 each reported that they encourage their assistant principals to attend professional conferences and other professional learning opportunities. Principal Respondents 3 and 6 also shared that they give their assistant principals the opportunity to lead meetings, to present information to stakeholder groups, and to observe leadership in action in different settings.

Communication was frequently mentioned by principal participants as strategies they regularly employ to facilitate the development of the leadership capacity of their assistant principal(s). Principal Respondents 4, 5, 8, 10, 11, and D all highlighted different ways in which they keep communication strong with their assistants. Weekly debriefing sessions, monthly check-ins, targeted discussions, providing honest feedback, and sharing of historical information were some of the strategies identified and principal responses to the open-ended questions added to the MIPI.

Principal Respondents 1, 2, 3, 8, 9, 10, and B each shared ways that they coach their assistant principals through involvement in decision-making, assigning unfamiliar responsibilities, cross-training in all aspects of the school operation, debriefing, and reflection.

**Targeted Principal Interview Questions**

This research study is focused on principal preparation of assistant principals. Following the sequential mixed methods design to provide the richest data possible, an exploratory qualitative research approach that consisted of online asynchronous
interviews and that included two questions were posed to six experienced school principals. Because the group of survey participants were spread throughout the designated state, asynchronous email interviews provided access to the principals and to data whose richness and quality “is considered very similar to that in face-to-face interviews (Meho, 2006; Ratislavová & Ratislav, 2014).

Purposeful sampling was used to identify 6 principals who each hold an earned doctorate degree in educational leadership and have five or more years of principal experience. These criteria allowed the researcher to follow Patton’s position that “information-rich cases are those from which one can learn a great deal about issues of central importance to the purpose of the research” (p. 169). The two interview questions were aligned to the research questions and focused on principals’ perception of their responsibility to prepare assistant principals for the principalship and on the most important areas of principal responsibility that aspiring principals should be exposed to.

Table 5. Targeted Interview Participant Descriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th># of Years taught in P-12</th>
<th># of years served as an Assistant Principal</th>
<th># of years served as a Principal</th>
<th>Level of school currently leading</th>
<th># of students in school</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appling</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coile</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davidson</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dunham</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woods</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>High School</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The responses to the interview questions were entered into NVivo and the tools of the program were used to conduct line by line coding. As a result of this analysis, several themes were identified:

Theme One: Inherent Responsibility

Four of the six principals interviewed expressed a belief in their *inherent responsibility* to develop their assistant principals to be effective principals. Principal Coile stated that “the principal has a direct responsibility in developing his or her AP to become principals.” Principal Appling echoed this sentiment by saying “I am *inherently responsible* to develop my assistant principal to be a principal.” Principal Dunham referenced his role as the instructional leader of the building and stated that he “…has an *inherent responsibility* to develop successful assistant principals.” Principal Woods joined Dunham highlighting the instructional leadership role and declared, “…as a principal, one is the instructional leader in the building, not just for students but for the adults. She went on to say, “I believe it is the principal’s *responsibility* to train APs to be future principals.”

Principal Davidson was careful to note that she believed, “it is important for principals to develop their APs to be principals,” but did not use the term “responsibility.” Principal Franklin, however, expressed a different perspective on principals as principal developers and her thoughts contributed heavily to the following theme.

The reservation that the two latter principals expressed appeared to be related to principal abilities as much as assistant principal potential. Their perspectives also
provided an element of doubt to the assumption that all principals can serve as principal developers. According to Principal Franklin, “it takes a skilled principal to know how to identify effective leadership skills that are suited for the role of the principal.” This statement lent credence to the argument for formal development of principal developers. Principal Davidson, an elementary school principal, added that, “the most qualified principal is one who has served as an assistant principal, so it is a natural career progression.” This statement affirmed the researcher’s decision to focus on assistant principals in the quest to better prepare school principals.

Theme Two: Assistant Principal Role as a Goal

While considering their role in the development of future principals, several of the principals pointed out that not all assistant principals desire to be a principal or have the requisite skills necessary to be successful in that role. Even though Principal Davidson had described the journey from assistant principal to principal as “a natural career progress,” Principal Franklin pointed out that “being an excellent assistant principal is an honorable goal.” Despite the aforementioned quote from Principal Davidson, she did go on to assert that “some people have really great skills as APs and maybe would not want the added responsibility and stress that comes with the principal job, and I think that is okay.”

Principal Franklin, an administrator from a large high school with several years of teaching experience, referenced lack of ability as well as a possible lack of desire for the role when she stated, “I have seen some of the best APs make the most ineffective principals.” This belief was clearly based on her experience with a number of assistant
principals who represented a variety of ability levels. Principal Franklin shared that she had “seen APs forced into principal positions that they did not seek, want, or were ready to assume.”

Along these same lines, both Principals Davidson and Franklin acknowledged that some assistant principals might have a misinformed view of their potential or their preparation. Principal Franklin shared that she has, “…seen situations where APs thought they wanted to be principals and in fact they thought they already had the necessary skills. In reality they were not ready and were not realistic about their strengths and weaknesses.” Principal Davidson added that, “as an AP, I did think I was like a co-principal, until I became a principal and realized everything I didn’t have to do.”

Even without the stated goal of preparing the AP for the principalship, the principals interviewed for this study felt it was still necessary to develop their APs to be successful in their current, and possibly future, position. Principal Dunham, who leads a large high school with 1300 students, stated that, “even if an assistant principal does not aspire to be a principal, it is important to me that they understand each and every aspect of running a school building.” Principal Franklin went on to add that, “if the principal sees leadership qualities in an AP that are suited for the principalship, then it would be important to encourage and support the professional growth necessary for the AP to become an effective principal.” Those areas of explicit preparation for all assistant principals, according to Principal Dunham, would include, “instruction, attendance, discipline, testing, understanding the organization, planning, and creating a climate that maximizes student growth.” This focused training protocol would benefit the principal as much as
the assistant or aspiring principal. According to Principal Coile, “the principal would better serve the position with an assistant principal working simultaneously on the same tasks, led by the same vision, and purposed by the needs of the students.”

Theme Three: Development Strategies

As it relates to assistant principal training and development, four of the principals referenced their place in the process to some extent. Principal Woods reinforced her previously stated acknowledgement of her importance to the development of future principals when she asked the rhetorical question, “How else will they learn the job and be prepared for the next step in their journey?” Principal Dunham stated that he is “a teacher first,” and that he is “responsible for giving my assistant principals all of the knowledge that I have.” Principal Appling described herself as a “role model and coach” for assistant principals while Principal Coile shared that she believes she should “model those practices and job embedded duties and tasks for [assistant principals].”

For Principals Davidson and Coile, both from elementary schools, the importance of a coach-apprentice relationship was strongly stressed. They both referenced the need for regular meetings between principal and assistant principal that would include debriefing, planning, identifying leadership opportunities, providing feedback, and support. Principal Davidson shared that she has “worked for principals who provided me with many opportunities and feedback to help me in my current position as a principal.” Principal Coile added that this type of formal and purposeful arrangement communicated a “commitment to the professional development of assistant principals.”
While Davidson shared that when she was an assistant principal, her principal “constantly communicated to others (teachers, parents, and stakeholders) that she was like a co-principal,” Principal Coile noted that “differences [do] exist between the AP position and a principalship.” Principal Dunham stated that he wanted his assistant principals to be “very knowledgeable [and] to build capacity within them.” Principal Davidson seemed to agree with her colleagues when she shared that, “If an AP has a desire to eventually be a principal, the principal should share responsibilities that will be needed in that role.” Principal Coile, however, recounted from her experience that this is not as simple as it seems. According to her, “principals typically hold onto those items, not to covet them and keep them away from their APs, but time and available opportunities prevent them from sharing with their APs.”

Beyond what takes place between the principal and the assistant principal, Principal Appling referenced the professional learning opportunities principals receive once they reach that position. She went on to express the belief that the “entire development process for assistant principals should not be the responsibility of the current principal,” but each school district would benefit from having a “leadership training program.”

Principal Appling, who leads a small elementary school, was the only principal participant to refer to a part of leadership development she called, “the experience of being the bottom line.” As principals are very quick to realize, “the buck stops with you,” in all matters that are school-related. This includes student achievement, staff hiring, staff conduct, staff retention, student safety, instructional scheduling, athletics,
and many other areas of responsibility. This experience is almost impossible to simulate. An opportunity to lead a summer school site might provide the assistant principal with the closest replication of the principal experience.

Theme Four: Budget

The principal participants in this phase of the research study were asked about the most important areas of principal responsibility that aspiring principals should be exposed to but typically are not. Five of the six principals highlighted budget and finance as a crucial area of development. These five principals represented small elementary schools and large high schools, indicating that the financial responsibility is present and paramount at all levels of educational leadership. Principals Appling, Coile, Dunham, Franklin, and Woods, all principals representing different levels and vastly different school sizes, stressed the need to understand the budgeting process and how school funding works. Principals Appling and Franklin both specifically highlighted the differences in “federal, state, and local” funds as a critical area of understanding. While Principal Appling identified “audits” as a specific aspect to learn, Principal Franklin also shared that being able to “create and manage a budget” is an essential principal skill to develop. According to Principal Dunham, these skills and understanding of school finance are vital to “maximizing the funds” that a school has.

Theme Five: Personnel

Another important area of principal development highlighted by five of the principal participants was personnel. This area of responsibility encompasses not only hiring and firing, but also evaluating, mediating, and several other aspects in between.
While Principals Coile and Woods identified “staffing allocations” and “state funding of teachers” as important items to focus on, Principals Davidson and Woods highlighted “leading the entire hiring process” as a necessary development area for aspiring principals. Additionally, Principals Davidson and Franklin focused some of their comments on the evaluation of staff and the ability to utilize the “PDP” (professional development plan) and termination process as vital to principal success. According to Principal Franklin, principals should “specifically know how to make a complaint to the professional standards commission, how to effectively put a staff member on a PDP, and know how to terminate an employee.”

Beyond the formal processes of hiring, evaluating, and firing, several of the principals identified the daily responsibility to staff that Principal Appling referred to as, “personnel issues.” Principal Davidson listed the following as parts of that responsibility: “facilitating conflicts among staff; monitoring teachers’ work; addressing deficiencies; addressing issues related to custodians, cafeteria staff, and subs; providing ongoing feedback and building morale.” According to Davidson, “There are so many specific little decisions that have to be made daily regarding staff- I had no idea as an AP.”

Theme Six: Leading School Improvement Team

Another area identified as important to the development of aspiring principals is the responsibility of leading school improvement. Principal Coile remarked that so many “central office messages and initiatives,” must be communicated by the principal and implemented by the school leadership team. Principal Davidson described the
importance of the role that the principal plays in this process when she stated that, “A well-functioning leadership team comes down to the skills of the principal.” For Principal Franklin, this responsibility in the area of school leadership requires “honest and open communication.” Principal Davidson’s thoughts are closely aligned to Franklin’s. Davidson shared that a principal has to, “define roles, communicate expectations, and train leaders in the skills they will need to lead and represent their teams.” She continued to say that the principal is responsible for making sure that the work of the school improvement leadership team, “is important to improving the school, which means having clear agendas in advance, having data and evidence ready to discuss, and being willing to listen to everyone’s ideas.”

Theme Seven: School Culture through Relationships and Communication

Another major theme that was referenced by four of the principals was related to improving school culture, building relationships, and communicating effectively. Principal Davidson shared that school culture is something she thinks about a lot. And although “everyone in a school plays a part in the school culture,” she believes it is ultimately the responsibility of the principal.

One area identified as having an impact on school culture is relationship building. Principals are expected to have positive and effective relationships with students, parents, teachers, staff members, district staff, and a variety of other stakeholder groups. Principal Dunham stated that a major part of his job is “building relationships.” He noted that this is key for a beginning principal because, “If people believe that you have their
best interest at heart, they will help a new principal with accomplishing the goals set in place to produce student, teacher, and parent growth.”

While it is obvious that a principal must build strong relationships with those they interact with daily, it was noted by several principals that relationships outside of the school building are just as important. Principal Woods shared that part of her work was maintaining good relationships with the public. Principal Davidson stated that “a certain amount of positive public relations,” is a responsibility she carries. Principal Dunham reinforced this perception when he remarked that, “Allowing all stakeholders an opportunity to understand how much you care about them will help with the rough patches.”

It should be evident that a large part of that understanding from stakeholders comes through effective communication. Principals Davidson and Franklin both specifically identified communication as vital to principal success. Principal Franklin shared her belief that the principal must have effective communication with “many stakeholders” and among these are “students, staff, parents, community, central office staff, and peers.” Principal Davidson reinforced that expectation and noted that a principal must have “a willingness to be transparent…” Principal Franklin’s statements seem to concur with Franklin’s while also providing a very detailed stipulation. According to her, “The principal needs to know how much to say, how much to believe, what words to use, what method of communication to use, and how to check to see if that communication was effective.”
Along these same lines, Principal Dunham expressed his belief that new principals must grow to “understand the political climate of being a principal.” Those politics can exist and play out both inside the school building and outside. According to Dunham, it is important that a principal “walk in with a clear vision and mission, and they must adhere to their core beliefs when dealing with their internal and external publics.”

Mixed Results

The quantitative data collected through the MIPI survey indicated that 100% of school principals are using the principles of andragogy at average or above average level. When these results were mixed with the qualitative data and interpreted together, it was clear that the leadership-development strategies shared by the six principals interviewed are strongly aligned to the six assumptions underlying andragogy as identified by Malcolm Knowles. Those assumptions included Need to Know, Self-concept, Prior Experience, Readiness to Learn, Learning Orientation, and Motivation to Learn. These data appear to confirm the self-reported rate level at which school principals are using the principles of andragogy in their work with assistant principals. This alignment was further strengthened by its consistency with the qualitative data gleaned from the open-ended questions added to the MIPI and the related themes that have been highlighted earlier in this chapter.

Summary

In this chapter, descriptive statistics related to the research study participants were provided along with an analysis of the relationships between principals’ MIPI scores and
the various demographic groups represented. Additionally, qualitative data gleaned from the open-ended questions and the exploratory interview questions were analyzed, organized into themes, and reported. Across the seven themes identified within the targeted interviews of the qualitative strand, it is clear that there is no difference between the perceptions of the principals of small elementary schools and large high schools as it relates to the development of the leadership capacities of assistant principals. In Chapter five the conclusions drawn by the researcher, implications of the findings, and the suggestions for future research are presented.
CHAPTER 5
SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This research study explored the alignment of the leadership capacity development strategies of principals with the principles of andragogy. A mixed-methods approach was taken to answer the following research questions:

1. To what extent do the current leadership capacity development strategies of school principals align with the principles of andragogy?
2. What is the relationship between various demographic categories and the alignment of a principal’s leadership capacity development strategies with the principles of andragogy?
3. In what ways do principals use andragogical practices to develop leadership qualities in assistant principals?

During an assistant principal’s tenure, their supervising principal typically serves as a mentor, either formally or informally. To learn how much alignment might exist between principal leadership development practices and the theory of andragogy, a mixed-methods approach was pursued in this research study. By pursuing both quantitative and qualitative data, I was able to not only determine the level of alignment with andragogy but to also identify actual practices used by school leaders to prepare the next generation of principals.
Chapter Two provided a relatively comprehensive literature review that focused on prior research related to effective principals, assistant principals, new principals, leadership capacity, principal retention, and andragogy. This review of literature established the importance of effective school leadership, the impact that strong principal leadership has on student achievement, and the need for improved school leadership development. This literature also led to the development of the conceptual framework for Educational Leader Development that is provided below.

Figure 1. McDaniel’s Stages of Educational Leader Development

Chapter 3 detailed the methodology that was followed in pursuit of answers to the three research questions. In this chapter the population and sample were identified and the research design was described. In Chapter 4 the results of this mixed-methods...
research study were detailed. The modified Instructional Practices Inventory (MIPI) was used to measure the alignment of principal leadership development practices with the principles of andragogy. Relationships between a principal’s MIPI score and their gender, highest degree earned, number of years teaching, number of years as a principal, and level of school employed at were quantified were also measured. Additionally, qualitative data was gathered through the addition of open-ended questions to the MIPI as well as explorative interviews with six experienced school principals. In this chapter an effort was made to summarize the study and major results, discuss the findings, describe my conclusions, and to make recommendations for future research in the area of school leader development.

Discussion

The main goal in conducting this research study was to determine if the principles of andragogy might be the missing piece in the ongoing effort to effectively prepare school principals for an increasingly difficult position. This goal was couched in three research questions.

Research Question #1- To what extent do the current leadership capacity development strategies of school principals align with the principles of andragogy?

The answer to this question would come from the MIPI scores of school principals. The scores of school principals who participated in the study indicated that 100% of school principals use andragogical practices on an average of above average level. The scores also indicated that none of the participants use the practices on a high-above average level. The assistant principals who participated in the study reported that 77% of
their supervising principals use the principles of andragogy at an average, above average, or high-above average level.

Research Question #2- What is the relationship between various demographic categories and the alignment of a principal’s leadership capacity development strategies with the principles of andragogy?

This question was expanded to include several demographic categories represented by the principal participants. Those categories included gender, highest degree earned, number of years teaching, number of years as a principal, and level of school employed.

Malcolm Knowles identified six assumptions about the needs of adult learning: (1) need to know, (2) self-concept, (3) prior experience, (4) readiness to learn, (5) learning orientation, and (6) motivation to learn (Nisbet, Ed, & Tindall, 2009). These assumptions provided the impetus to find an answer to the third research question.

Research Question #3-In what ways do principals use andragogical-related practices to develop leadership capacity in assistant principals?

The qualitative data in this mixed methods study was collected to answer this final research question. This data was achieved through the addition of open-ended questions to the MIPI as well as through exploratory interviews with six experienced school principals who each hold earned doctorate degrees. It was clear through the analysis of the data from the exploratory interviews that there is no difference between the perceptions of principals of small elementary schools and large high schools as it relates to the leadership development of assistant principals.
Regular communication between the principal and the assistant principal was identified by principals and assistant principals as the most important practice or strategy in developing the leadership capacity of aspiring principals. The coach-coachee relationship is built upon the concepts of communication and mutual trust. Because the average principal scored in the “Average” or above range for the factor of Leader Trust on the MIPI, it is assumed that this would not be difficult for school principals to embrace. In practice, this strategy is accomplished through regular meetings (both formal and informal) between the principal and the assistant principal, consistent information sharing, honest feedback sessions, and targeted discussions.

Providing the assistant principals with a variety of leadership opportunities is another development strategy that aligns closely with the principles of andragogy. When aspiring principals are given tasks that require planning, responsibility, presentation, and communication, they are able to increase their knowledge, skills, and confidence while under the mentorship of an experienced principal. In comparison to the student teaching experience, those leaders being mentored will, through leadership opportunities, move from merely assistant principals to aspiring principals.

Coaching is a vital part of the principal development process and is at the heart of this research study. While graduate programs in educational leadership provide a pathway to certification, it is the coaching-based apprenticeship that will ensure that aspiring principals learn the practical side of the principal position while also having someone there to provide feedback and guidance along the way. The nature of the education field does not lend itself well to quality internship experiences for aspiring educational leaders.
Most educators who are on their way to an assistant principal position are employed as teachers. They are not easily able to commit weeks or months to a focused internship as in student teaching or comparison experiences in other fields. This fact makes the coaching-based apprenticeship that takes place during the assistant principal tenure the perfect avenue for developing the leadership capacities of the next generation of school leaders.

Based on the qualitative data collected, it is believed that the process of developing the leadership capacities of assistant principals, the coaching-based apprenticeship, would be greatly enhanced by a focused training protocol. Throughout the responses to the open-ended questions and the principal interviews it became clear that there are certain areas of principal leadership that assistant principals should be exposed to during their apprenticeship experience. These aspects of the job include budgets, personnel, the school improvement process, cultivating relationships, and navigating politics. Principals would be provided with terms, scenarios, discussion topics, related articles. This would ensure that the process of principal preparation during the assistant principal experience is purposeful and planned, not just happenstance.

Being involved in the decision-making at the school leadership level not only gives the assistant principal credibility with the staff but also allows the leader to have a view into the important points of consideration that inform and impact the decision-making process at the principal level. Decisions related to the budget, personnel issues, scheduling, teaching assignments, and resource allocation are rarely black and white situations. Value judgments, historical information, vetting of proposals, and effective
messaging are some of the considerations that must be brought to bear when making decisions that will impact multiple stakeholders, departments, budgets, schedules and/or parts of the school facility.

Leadership matters. Words matter. Messaging matters. It makes a difference when assistant principals are sometimes referred to “one of our principals.” This sends the message to teachers, students, and families that the assistant principal holds a position of leadership that is worthy of respect and acknowledgement. This strategy, in turn, communicates to the assistant principal that their position comes with a tremendous amount of responsibility and expectation.

As the messaging related to a team of principals is communicated to school stakeholders, one of the ways in which assistant principals can affirm that position of leadership is to co-lead the School Improvement Leadership Team (SILT). As school focus areas are identified, initiatives crafted, resources secured, and effectiveness is evaluated during the year-long school improvement process, an engaged assistant principal helping to lead this team of school leaders is an invaluable asset to the school principal. That benefit is not limited to the principal but benefits the school as a whole, as well as the development process of the assistant principal.

The strategies detailed in this section have been cross-referenced with descriptions of the six principles of andragogy (Ota, DiCarlo, Burts, Laird, & Gioe, 2006). In the table below, the leadership-capacity development strategies gleaned from the study’s qualitative data are listed and the andragogical practices they align with are noted.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Andragogy Factors and Development Strategies Alignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andragogy → Strategies ↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need to Know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in Decision-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focused training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protocol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affirming of role to others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-leader of SILT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusions

The researcher concluded that while school principals are using andragogical practices in their efforts to develop the leadership capacities of the assistant principals...
working with them, there is still work to be done in this area. The data does not indicate that principals who have previously taken a course in adult learning theory use andragogy-related practices at a significantly higher rate.

Four of the six experienced principals who were interviewed for this research study affirmed that they believe developing their assistant principals to be effective principals is an inherent responsibility of their current position. Based on their experiences as both principals and assistant principals, these school leaders provided extensive information and recommendations as it relates to principal leadership development. These strategies largely aligned with the five assumptions that make up the theory of andragogy (Ota et al., 2006).

Limitations

Although limitations to the study were briefly referenced in Chapter 3, at this point in the reporting, there are two limitations to this study that are important to acknowledge. The most significant was the small sample size. Although the RESA area selected for this study included approximately 90 principals and 135 assistant principals, the final participant totals for those who completed the survey were 16 principals and 27 assistant principals. As a result of this small sample size, the findings in this study cannot be generalized to the larger population of school principals.

A second limitation of the study was the method of interviews for the six experienced school principals. There is ample research affirming asynchronous email interviews as a valid qualitative research method (Meho, 2006; Ratislavová & Ratislav, 2014). The researcher does acknowledge, however, that the ability to pose follow-up and
clarifying questions to the participants in a face-to-face interview might have been
advantageous in obtaining a richer level of data. The locations of the participants
throughout the state of Georgia unfortunately made this method logistically difficult.

Recommendations for Future Research

The findings of this study led the researcher to recommend several avenues for
future research. It is primarily recommended that a future study in this area be conducted
with a larger sample size that would allow the findings to be generalized to the larger
population of school principals and assistant principals. A future study would also
greatly benefit from the use of matched sets where principal MIPI data could be
compared to the MIPI data of the actual assistant principals they work with. This would
allow the researcher to explore the difference in understandings and perceptions between
school leaders in the same building regarding the use of andragogical-related strategies in
leadership development.

It is further recommended that a qualitative study be carried out that includes
face-to-face interviews with school principals at a variety of experience levels, building
levels, and educational backgrounds. This would allow follow-up questions and
opportunities to clarify statements made by the participants. From this approach, it is
expected that a more comprehensive set of leadership capacity-development strategies
could be produced.
Recommendations for Practice

The following are recommendations for practice as it relates to the development of the leadership capacity of assistant principals. These recommendations are a result of the findings generated from this research study.

1. Addition of andragogy/adult learning theory to the program of study of graduate-level school leadership programs. The focus should be more on the practical application of these principles and less on the theory surrounding them.

2. Provide sessions at conferences for current school leaders on the principles of andragogy and adult learning theory. Obviously there is a population of principals who have not been exposed to adult learning theory in their graduate-level school leadership programs. These school leaders are attending professional conferences across the nation each year and it would be beneficial to them if sessions on the practical application of andragogy to leadership capacity development be a regular offering.

3. States and/or school districts should make the development of assistant principals a stated responsibility and area of evaluation for school principals. Because this is most effectively accomplished by an experienced principal, it could be implemented as a tiered responsibility that takes effect after a principal’s 3rd or 5th year of experience in the role.

4. Once a principal reaches that tiered level of responsibility that deems them as developer of principals, states and/or school districts should consider developing a protocol for school principals to follow as they work to develop the leadership
capacities of their assistant principals. The aspects of the principal role that are deemed to be crucial to new principal success budgets, personnel, the school improvement process, cultivating relationships, navigating politics, etc. could be organized into modules that school leaders could follow as they work with their assistant principals.

5. States and/or school districts should consider creating a “Mentor” designation that school principals can earn once they completed a certain level of training and have also successfully completed a development protocol with an assistant principal.

6. Assistant principals who have successfully completed the state-designated or district-designated training protocol could be designated as a “principal-track” leader. This would provide motivation to the aspiring leader, a specific goal to work towards during their assistant principal experience, and a designation that distinguishes them from peer leaders when a district is looking to fill a principal vacancy.

Summary

Chapter 5 included a discussion of the results of the descriptive and qualitative data analysis and the findings determined by the researcher. Using the Modified Instructional Practices Inventory (MIPI), the researcher was able to conclude that a majority of current principals are using strategies related to andragogy in their efforts to develop the leadership capacities of their assistant principals. Analysis of the qualitative data allowed the researcher to generate a list of leadership capacity development
strategies used by principals that are closely aligned with the assumptions upon which the theory of andragogy is built. The researcher provided suggestions for future research that included the need for a study with a large sample size as well as face to face interviews with school principals. Implications for practice were also shared to provide useful suggestions for university programs and school leaders looking to improve in the area of aspiring principal development.
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MODIFIED INSTRUCTIONAL PERSPECTIVES INVENTORY - PRINCIPALS
MODIFIED INSTRUCTIONAL PERSPECTIVES INVENTORY

©John A. Henschke

Revised for Principals

Listed below are 45 statements reflecting beliefs, feelings, and behaviors beginning or seasoned principals teaching assistant principals as adult learners may or may not possess at a given moment. Please indicate how frequently each statement typically applies to you as you work with these assistant principals as adult learners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How frequently do you:</th>
<th>Almost Never</th>
<th>Not Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Almost Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Use a variety of preparation techniques?</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Use buzz groups (assistant principal(s) meet as a group to discuss information from preparation activities)?</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Believe that your primary goal is to provide assistant principal(s) with as much information as possible?</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Feel fully prepared to help develop the leadership capacity of the assistant principal(s)?</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Have difficulty understanding the point-of-view of the assistant principal(s)?

6. Expect and accept the frustration of the assistant principal(s) as they grapple with problems?

7. Purposefully communicate to the assistant principal(s) that each is uniquely important?

8. Express confidence that the assistant principal(s) will develop the skills they need?

9. Search for or create new development techniques?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How frequently do you:</th>
<th>Almost Never</th>
<th>Not Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Almost Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Teach the assistant principal(s) through simulations of real-life settings?</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Teach the assistant principal(s) exactly what and how you had planned?</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Notice and acknowledge to the assistant principal(s) positive changes in them?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Have difficulty getting your point across to the assistant principal(s)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Display a belief that the assistant principal(s) is/are varied in the way they acquire, process, and apply subject matter knowledge?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Really listen to what the assistant principal(s) have to say?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Trust the assistant principal(s) to know what their own goals, dreams, and realities are like?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Encourage the assistant principal(s) to solicit assistance from other learners?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Feel impatient with the progress of the assistant principal(s)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19. Balance your efforts between the content acquisition and motivation of the assistant principal(s)?

20. Attempt to make your presentations clear enough to forestall all questions of the assistant principal(s)?

21. Conduct group discussions?

22. Establish growth objectives for the assistant principal(s)?

23. Use a variety of media in development activities? (Internet, telephone, interactive video, videos, etc.)

24. Use listening teams (the assistant principals grouped together to listen for a specific purpose)?

25. Believe that your development strategies are as refined as they can be?
<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26. Express appreciation to assistant principal(s) who actively participate?</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Experience frustration with assistant principal apathy?</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. Prize the assistant principal’s ability to learn what is needed?</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Feel the assistant principals need to be aware of and communicate their thoughts and feelings?</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. Enable the assistant principal(s) to evaluate their own progress in developing their leadership capacity?</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Hear what the assistant principal(s) indicate their developmental needs to be?</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Have difficulty with the amount of time the assistant principal(s) need to grasp various concepts?</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Promote positive self-esteem in the assistant principal(s)?</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
34. Require the assistant principal(s) to follow the precise learning experiences you provide to them?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How frequently do you:</th>
<th>Almost Never</th>
<th>Not Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Almost Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35. Conduct role plays?</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Get bored with the many questions the assistant principal(s) ask?</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Individualize the pace of learning for each assistant principal?</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Help the assistant principal(s) explore their own abilities?</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Engage the assistant principal(s) in clarifying their own aspirations?</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Ask the assistant principal(s) how they would approach a task?</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Feel irritation at the inattentiveness of the assistant principal(s) in the leader-development setting?</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Integrate leadership development techniques with subject matter content?</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Develop supportive relationships with the assistant principal(s)?</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Experience unconditional positive regard for the assistant principal(s)?</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Respect the dignity and integrity of the assistant principal(s)?</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Circle the letter on each item that best describes you.
APPENDIX F
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ASSISTANT PRINCIPALS
**MODIFIED INSTRUCTIONAL PERSPECTIVES INVENTORY**

©John A. Henschke

Revised for Assistant Principals

Listed below are 45 statements reflecting beliefs, feelings, and behaviors beginning or seasoned principals teaching assistant principals as adult learners may or may not possess at a given moment. Please indicate how frequently each statement typically applies to your current principal as he/she works with assistant principals as adult learners.

Circle the letter on each item that best describes your current principal.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How frequently does your principal:</th>
<th>Almost Never</th>
<th>Not Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Almost Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Use a variety of preparation techniques?</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Use buzz groups (assistant principal(s) meet as a group to discuss information from preparation activities)?</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Display a belief that his/her primary goal is to provide the assistant principal(s) with as much information as possible?</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Display a sense of being fully prepared to develop assistant principal(s)?</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Seem to have difficulty understanding the point-of-view of the assistant principal(s)?

6. Expect and accept the frustration of the assistant principal(s) as they grapple with problems?

7. Purposefully communicate to the assistant principal(s) that each is uniquely important?

8. Express confidence that the assistant principal(s) would develop the skills they need?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How frequently does your principal:</th>
<th>Almost Never</th>
<th>Not Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Almost Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Search for or create new development techniques?</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Teach the assistant principal(s) through simulations of real-life settings?</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. Appear to teach the assistant principal(s) exactly what and how they had planned? A B C D E

12. Notice and acknowledge to the assistant principal(s) positive changes in them? A B C D E

13. Have difficulty getting his/her point across to the assistant principal(s)? A B C D E

14. Display a belief that the assistant principal(s) vary in the way they acquire, process, and apply subject matter knowledge? A B C D E

15. Really listen to what the assistant principal(s) has to say? A B C D E

16. Display trust in the assistant principal(s) to know what their own goals, dreams, and realities are like? A B C D E

17. Encourage the assistant principal(s) to solicit assistance from other learners? A B C D E
18. Seem to be impatient with the progress of the assistant principal(s)?

19. Appear to balance their efforts between the content acquisition and motivation of the assistant principal(s)?

20. Make their presentations clear enough to forestall all questions of the assistant principal(s)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How frequently does your principal:</th>
<th>Almost Never</th>
<th>Not Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Almost Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21. Conduct group discussions?</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Establish growth objectives for the assistant principal(s)?</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Use a variety of media in development activities? (Internet, telephone, interactive video, videos, etc.)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Use listening teams (assistant principals grouped together to listen for a specific purpose)?</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
25. Display a confidence that his/her development strategies are as refined as they can be?  

26. Express appreciation to assistant principal(s) who actively participate?  

27. Experience frustration with assistant principal apathy?  

28. Prize the assistant principal’s ability to learn what is needed?  

29. Feel the assistant principals need to be aware of and communicate their thoughts and feelings?  

30. Enable the assistant principal(s) to evaluate their own progress in developing their leadership capacity?  

31. Hear what the assistant principal(s) indicate their developmental needs to be?
32. Seem to have difficulty with the amount of time the assistant principal(s) need to grasp various concepts?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

33. Promote positive self-esteem in the assistant principal(s)?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How frequently does your principal:</th>
<th>Almost Never</th>
<th>Not Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Usually</th>
<th>Almost Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>34. Require the assistant principal(s) to follow the precise learning experiences provided to them?</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Conduct role plays?</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Seem to get bored with the many questions the assistant principal(s) asks?</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Individualize the pace of learning for each assistant principal?</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Help the assistant principal(s) explore their own abilities?</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Engage the assistant principal(s) in clarifying their own aspirations?</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Ask the assistant principal(s) how they would approach a task?</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Display irritation at the inattentiveness of the assistant principal(s) in the leader-development setting?</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Integrate leader-development techniques with subject matter content?</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Develop supportive relationships with the assistant principal(s)?</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Seem to experience unconditional positive regard for the assistant principal(s)?</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Exhibit respect for the dignity and integrity of the assistant principal(s)?</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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TABLE 7: INITIAL CODES AND THEMES
### Table 7. Initial Codes and Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes</th>
<th>Initial Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inherent Responsibility</td>
<td>• Role model and coach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Inherently responsible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Development process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Responsibility in developing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop APs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ineffective principals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Professional growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Skilled principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Instructional leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I am responsible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Build capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Principal as a Goal</td>
<td>• Long-term AP position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Added responsibility and stress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Think I was like a co-principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Excellent assistant principal is an honorable goal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• APs wanted to be principals and thought they had the skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Understand each aspect of running a school building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Strategies</td>
<td>• Leadership training programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Tasks, vision and needs of the students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Principal models</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Differences between the A.P. position and a principalship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Asking questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Commitment to professional development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Regular conversations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Providing opportunities and feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• A.P. like a co-principal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Opportunities to lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 7. <em>Continued</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Budget**           | • Budget process  
|                      | • Budgeting  
|                      | • Federal, state, and local budgets  
|                      | • The financial aspect  
|                      | • Maximize the funds  
|                      | • Budget – funding  
| **Personnel**        | • Personnel issues  
|                      | • Allocations and FTE funding  
|                      | • Hiring, monitoring, and evaluating staff  
|                      | • Monitoring teachers’ work  
|                      | • Addressing deficiencies  
|                      | • Evaluating staff  
|                      | • Addressing issues related to staff  
|                      | • Developing hiring process  
|                      | • Facilitating conflicts among staff  
|                      | • Providing feedback/building morale  
|                      | • Specific little decisions  
|                      | • Personnel – allotments, hiring, remediation, terminations  
| **Leading School Improvement Team** | • Principal has a direct responsibility in developing AP  
|                      | • Developing a strong school improvement leadership team  
|                      | • Well-functioning leadership team  
|                      | • Define roles, communicate expectations, and train leaders  
| **School Culture through Relationships and Communication** | • Building a positive school culture  
|                      | • Assessing school culture  
|                      | • Positive public relations  
|                      | • Willingness to be transparent and share decision making  
|                      | • Building relationships  
|                      | • Stakeholders  
|                      | • Community – Public Relations  
|                      | • Communication  
|                      | • The politics  
|                      | • Clear vision and mission  |