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This study described the relationship between leadership behavior, parental involvement and student achievement in the areas of reading and mathematics in focus middle schools. A questionnaire designed by Bell South Laboratories was used to elicit teachers' perceptions of their principal's behavior in the areas of discipline, climate, communications, community relations, and instructional leadership. The instrument was field tested by a panel of experts whose feedback was used to improve the instrument. Information relative to parental involvement was secured from Board of Education minutes outlining the number of parents who join the PTA and the number of parents who volunteer in the school.

Analysis of the data was made by using the Pearson (r) to determine if a relationship existed between the...
variables. Table values were used to determine the significance of the Pearson r. The statistical tools were utilized to test the 14 null hypothesis in the study.

The following significant findings of the study are that:

1. There were significant relationships found between the variables of climate and reading and mathematics, community relations and reading and mathematics, communications and reading and mathematics, PTA and reading and mathematics, volunteers and reading and mathematics.

2. The relationships found crossed focus boundaries.

3. There were non-significant relationships found between discipline and reading and instructional leadership and mathematics.

4. The relationships for non-significant relationships cross focus boundaries.

5. The study revealed that focus status was neither an issue in teachers' perceptions of the principal's behavior, nor was it an issue in the variable of parental involvement.
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CHAPTER I
Introduction

Background of the Problem

Research on effective schools over the past five years has defined the effectiveness of schools by the extent to which specific activities occur in the schools. These activities are called correlates of effective schools. One of the correlates of effective schools according to Edmonds (1979) is leadership. Essentially, the extent to which the principal leads staffs in the improvement of student achievement is a major determinant of the school's effectiveness. A more definitive description of leadership behavior for this research project is the extent to which teachers perceive the principal's handling of discipline, school climate, school communications, instruction, and community relations. The principal's leadership behavior has been linked to teachers' job satisfaction (Jang 1987) where the purpose was to determine the interrelationship among public elementary school
principals' leadership behavior, communication behavior and teacher job satisfaction.

Although Edmonds' effective school research does not rely heavily on parental involvement, the research documents that various levels of parental involvement yield different results. Edwards (1987) found that parents of students involved in student learning activities performed better than students whose parents only attended school activities. When parents become interested in student achievement, they will perform those tasks necessary to improve student achievement. The issue of how parents can best be utilized was explored by Brandt (1986) where low income parents were used in a social support system rather than in an academic support system. Brandt reports that low-income parents would have felt inadequate, defensive, and rebellious in an academic support system and that would have created problems. The metropolitan system used in my study measure parental participation by the number of PTA members and the number of parents who volunteer. The researcher determined that 20% of parents joining the PTA is a high percentage. The researcher further determined that 10% is high for
parents who come to school for the purpose of assisting teachers, principals and/or support staff. Any percentage less than 20% is considered low parental participation.

Test data reported from the research department of the State reveal that scores for students attending schools in this metro school system is an average of 6 percentage points less than students who attend schools in the surrounding counties (White 1989). The issue of student performance was even more crucial when the performance of middle school students was reviewed.

In the 1988-89 school year, this metropolitan school district opened with a new superintendent who was committed to the belief that all children can learn. The superintendent determined that in order for that belief to be transformed into practice, reform was needed in the school district. Like most urban schools, the school district was in trouble. Significant improvement was needed and could only be achieved if all or most of the areas were attacked as a system (Goodlad 1983). Of particular interest to this superintendent was the plight of middle schools.
Many studies have been developed which relate to what goes on in schools. Emphasis, according to Goodlad (1983), should be placed on the process used for school improvement. The process used by this new superintendent was to organize schools on the basis of student performance as measured by the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) scores in reading and mathematics - but primarily in reading. The three categories were: local focus, area focus and central focus.

The local focus schools were identified as having a percentage of students who scored above the national norm in the three level schools as follows: elementary, 60%; middle schools, 50%; and high schools, 40%. As local focus schools, they were allowed to operate independent of close supervision from the areas or central offices for as long as they maintained the percentages presented. Area focus schools were those schools where less than the percentage of students in the local focus schools scored at the national norm. The area focus schools were supervised by the area superintendents in the three areas of the school district. The areas are identified as Area I, Area II and Area III. They were not the bottom scoring
schools, rather they were between the high scoring and bottom scoring schools. The bottom scoring schools were called central focus. Seventeen schools were identified as central focus. These schools were to operate under the direct supervision of the superintendent via a special assistant to the superintendent who headed the central focus team. In each category, the principal was free to use his/her particular leadership behavior in improving the overall instructional program. In the central focus schools, the principals were provided a critique sheet of observations made by the central focus team. This sheet reflected current observations, and recommendations for improvements along with mutually agreed upon objectives. Some area superintendents adopted this model for area focus schools; however, some principals in area focus schools reported receiving little or no assistance from the area staffs. Previously observed local focus schools were free to decide their own plan of action but could receive assistance upon request from the area superintendent's staffs or central office staffs.
There is evidence to support this organizational plan (Pugh, 1986) where similar factors of school climate, the principal's own past professional experience, and the principal's capacity to reflect - in action were studied as areas to be improved.

Statement of the Problem

Historically, principals have focused more on management duties often to the neglect of the instructional program (Spillane, 1989). If American urban schools are in trouble as Goodlad reports, one thing that must happen is a shifting to a greater focus on instruction. A major requirement in effecting this change demands attention to and emphasis on leadership behavior; ie behaviors where the building level administrator attends to discipline, school climate, school communications and instruction.

The impact of parental involvement on student achievement is inconclusive. According to the effective school's research of Edmonds, (1979) we must cease blaming parents and society for the plight of young people and teach them. He supports this statement with evidence of effective schools with
little or no parental involvement. Edwards (1987) on the other hand found that student achievement is related to the type of activities in which parents are involved. Clarification on the effect of parental involvement is sought.

The problem was to determine if leadership behavior and parental involvement affect student achievement in the areas of reading and mathematics in local focus, area focus and central focus middle schools of a metropolitan school district.

Significance of the Problem

The reorganization of school districts will not have a significant effect on student achievement if the leadership behavior of the building level administrator does not change. The difficulty that a superintendent encounters with seeing change take place relates to the "level of usage" (Hord et. al., 1987) at the local school level, and the inability to monitor that level of usage. This study will clarify for administrators at all levels in this metropolitan school district, the impact of leadership on student achievement. It will also clarify how the variables of parental involvement
and leadership behavior impact student achievement. Future change agents should find this information useful in reorganizing school systems' methods of operating. The building level administrator as change agent in the local school can use this information as a guide in deciding on the variables which impact student achievement. Administrators at all levels must have clarification on those factors which impact student achievement as measured by standardized test scores.

The Research Question

The following research questions are presented:

1. Is there a relationship between the leadership behavior of the building level administrator and student achievement in reading and mathematics?

2. Is there a relationship between parental involvement and student achievement?

Definition of Terms

Leadership Behavior - The extent to which teachers perceive the principal's handling of
discipline, school climate, school communications and instruction as measured by the questionnaire used in this study. (See Appendix A).

**Parental Involvement** - The number of PTA members and volunteers in the local schools as presented in the board of education minutes September, 1989. (See Appendix B).

**Student Achievement** - Improved reading mathematics scores as measured by the Iowa Test of Basic Skills, Spring 1989.

**Limitations of the Study**

1. The duration of the study was seven months. In consideration of the amount of time needed to effect change, this should be a consideration in the findings.

2. Parental involvement is measured by the number of PTA members and volunteers. No consideration is given to the type of participation in which parents are engaged.

3. This study is limited to one school level - middle schools which is a relatively new concept. Middle schools may experience
difficulty with improved student achievement for matters totally unrelated to the superintendent's reorganization or the principal's willingness to implement directives.

Summary

The superintendent of this metropolitan school district accepted the premise that all children can learn. In the execution of his vision for students in the district, he has directed principals to function as instructional leaders, stating that they must spend at least 50% of their time in the classrooms. Gersten, Carnine and Green (1982) disagreed with this. They stated that the responsibility for instruction is not the total responsibility of the principal. These researchers also refused to agree with the research of Edmonds (1979) that all principals can become instructional leaders. They further state that some administrators do not have the ability to perform as instructional leaders. Middle schools in this district have a curriculum specialist on staff whose primary responsibility is instruction in mathematics and
reading. Teachers, however, realize that this staff member is not the administrator. A principal who is strong in instruction can more quickly gain the respect of teachers regarding the comments made about instruction. Additionally, they (Teachers) display more respect for the position of principal than for any other position in the building. This respect is enhanced when the building level administrator demonstrates an instructional focus. Based on these observations, it appears to be in the best interest of the building level administrator to operate as an instructional leader.

Parental involvement can take many forms. Parents can participate by simply attending school activities, or they may become more involved in the overall instructional program. Coleman (1966) states that parents and the home environment of children is the major determiner of how students will perform in schools. He is convinced that schools do not make a difference. Coleman (1966) believes that schools are not the major determiner of student achievement. If Coleman is correct, the implications are profound. If students in this metropolitan school system can learn,
improved instruction should be implemented as mandated, not by the superintendent, but by the building level administrator.
CHAPTER II

Review of the Literature

This chapter will review selected studies relevant to the variables in the study. The research studies will be reviewed relative to middle school principals' leadership behavior, parental involvement, and assistance and supervision from divisions outside the school building.

Leadership Behavior

Bradley (1987) obtained evidence regarding the perception public school principals held concerning their level of competence in, and the degree of importance of the criteria of instruction management, human relations, political/cultural awareness, leadership and self-understanding of administrative effectiveness and leadership.

The methodology used consisted of distributing 102 survey questionnaires to public school principals. One hundred one of the 102 surveys were returned.
Comparisons were made between subgroups of elementary and secondary, female and male, and older versus younger principals on mean criterion (scale scores) and item response patterns. Although female principals assigned higher ratings, no significant differences were found between elementary and secondary or between older and younger principals in their perceptions of their level of competence in or degree of importance of criteria of administrative effectiveness and leadership. The following conclusions were reached:

(1) whether principals function in an elementary or high school setting or are older or younger appears unrelated to self perceptions regarding level of competence or degree of importance attributed to behaviors reflecting administrative behavior. Principals' perceptions of their leadership behavior is a viable element which was limited from this study.

Hoover (1989) analyzed James Burnes' model of leadership in which he described leaders as transformational or transactional. The transformational leader is described as one who is capable of inspiring subordinates to heights he never intended to achieve. The transitional leader, on the
other hand, is rooted in two way influence: a social exchange in which the leader gives something and gets something in return. This study was designed to determine if the model would emerge in a similar configuration to that found by Bass and others who used army officers and supervisors in business as their subjects. This comparison to business is appropriate in an examination of the role of mid-management.

The conclusions reached in this study were that the same transformational and transitional factors emerged from school populations as has been found in Bass's original research. The exception was factor 1 Charisma. The findings in Hoover's study are closely linked to the research of Sookgamal (1987) who examined the kinds of leadership behavior and teachers responses to those leadership behaviors.

Jang (1987) studied the principal's leadership and communication and teacher job satisfaction in Korea. The purpose of the study was to determine the interrelationship among public elementary school principals' leadership behavior, communication behavior, and teacher job satisfaction.
The procedures involved collection data using the Profile of a School, the Audit of Administrator Communication, and the Teacher Job Satisfaction Inventory, from 555 public elementary school principals.

The following conclusions were presented. (1) The greater the principal's leadership behavior is viewed as being supportive of teachers, facilitative of the work of the school, past goal emphasis, and receptive to teachers' ideas the more likely it is that teachers intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction will be higher; (2) the greater the principal's leadership behavior is viewed as being non-supportive of teachers, more receptive to students' ideas and lower on all other leadership behaviors the more likely it is that the teachers will experience only extrinsic job satisfaction; (3) the greater the principal's emphasis on the informer affective involver and developer factors of communication, the more likely it is that the teachers intrinsic and extrinsic job satisfaction will be higher; (4) the greater the principal's leadership behavior is viewed as being facilitative of the work of the school, having a high goal emphasis,
having greater competence, and having teachers more involved in decision making, the more likely it is that the principal's communication behavior in the affective involver, developer and informer factors will be higher; (5) the greater the principal's leadership behavior is viewed as being nonreceptive to teachers ideas, and providing less teacher involvement in decision making, the more likely it is that the principal's communication behavior in the encourager and affective involver will be lower. The principal's communication behavior is closely linked to the study done by Hoover where he described the transformational leader as one who is capable of inspiring subordinates to heights they never intended to achieve. Communication is the method most leaders use to achieve this goal.

Blanchard, Zigarmi and Zigarmi (1987) discussed the principal as a key to effective schools and the key to the school's ability to react to the future. Leadership is defined as "working with and through people to accomplish a particular organizational goal." The authors state that "whereas some authorities believe one leadership style is better, most research
supports the theory that situational leadership is the most affective." The authors describe situational leadership as (1) supporting, (2) coaching, (3) delegating, and (4) directing. The operative words for supportive behavior are praise, listen and facilitate. The operative words for directing are structure, control, and supervise. The authors state that "ideally there are four leadership styles which include the two extremes plus coaching and delegating." In style 1, the high directive/low supportive behavior is called "Directing." In this style, the leader defines the roles of followers and tells them what, how, when, and where to do various tasks. Style 2 is defined as high supportive/high directive behavior called "Coaching." The leader provides a great deal of direction and leads with ideas but also attempts to hear the followers feelings about decisions as well as their ideas and suggestions about how to solve problems. In style 3, the high supportive/low directive behavior is called "Supporting." Here the day-to-day focus is on control for decision-making shifts from the leader to the follower. Style 4, low supportive/low directive behavior is called
"Delegation." In this style, the leader discusses problems with subordinates until joint agreement is achieved on problem definition, and then decision-making process is delegated totally to the followers.

Sookgamal (1987) studied the teachers' and students' perception of instructional leadership style and its effectiveness. The purpose of this study was to compare the perceptions of instruction regarding leadership styles according to Hersey and Blanchard's leadership theory. The dominant style range (flexibility) and style adaptability (effectiveness) of the instructors were measured.

The following conclusions were drawn: (1) The instructors used the dominant style of selling with the support styles of participating telling and delegating respectively; (2) Both students and instructors perceived the same leadership style range of selling, participating, telling, and delegating of the instructor; (3) The delegating style was seldom used in the classroom instructional of instructional leadership style as perceived by instructors and students in marginally effective; (4) The style range of
instructional leadership as perceived by male
instruction was selling, participating, telling, and
delegating; by female instructors, it was selling,
telling, participating and delegating. No differences
existed in male and female instructors' perceptions of
their style effectiveness. McLaughlin (1986) studied
leadership behaviors related to cultural change in a
middle school. The purpose of the study was to
investigate the cultural context of a school to analyze
how the culture of a school changed under new
leadership and the evaluation of the enculturation
process. This exploratory study was conducted through
the process of interviews, observations and review of
documents.

The conclusions viewed the new leadership as being
responsible for the change in the cultural context of
the school (from one that did not include teachers in
the planning for the school; promoted feelings of staff
isolation; built goals and expectations on a mini-high
school orientation; and administered a secondary school
system of order and discipline mandated by the
principal); to a school culture that developed and
nurtured staff participation on planning, for the
school and their work life, promoted a sense of belonging to a special education organization; established a purpose for the school and means to attain the purpose and involved all staff in the process of rule making and enforcement rooted in the philosophy of the school. This study supports the research of Hoover (1989) where similar results were found relative to teachers' perceptions of leadership behavior.

Carlton (1987) compared principal and teacher's perceptions of the principal's leadership skills by examining ratings of the principal's actual skills. The researcher felt that analysis would lead to the following output (1) an increased awareness of principal's strengths and weaknesses; (2) greater communication between principals and teachers, and (3) hopefully increased productivity on the part of principals and teachers.

The population for this study included a group of twenty-eight principals who participated in the Confederation of Oregon School Administrators Assessment Center and teachers in those principals' schools.
Research questions sought the following information: (1) principals' perception of their own skills; (2) principals' perceptions of the importance of given skills; (3) principals' predictions of teachers' rating of principals' actual skills; (4) teachers' perceptions of principals' skills; (5) teachers' perceptions of importance of given skills; and (6) Assessment Center predictions rating of principals' skills.

The methodology for this study combined survey research with information provided by the COSA Assessment Center. The results of this study suggested that there is a general agreement between principals and teachers regarding principals' leadership skills. The predictions made regarding principals' skills by the Assessment Center accurately reflected teachers' perception of the same principals skills in the field. Principals generally predicted that teachers would rate the importance of skills lower than teachers actually did. It was concluded that since teachers' perceptions of principals' skills are generally accurate, teacher ratings of their principals can play an important role in the total process of principals evaluation. These
conclusions were similarly drawn in the study by Bradley (1987).

**Parental Involvement**

Edwards (1987) studied the relationship of parent involvement, school climate and student achievement by comparing schools from two Midwestern states aimed at determining if (1) certain types of parent involvement affect school climate more strongly than others; and if (2) parent involvement in the form of parent education programs has an effect on gains in student achievement. Partnership and participatory activities were the two parental activities used. Partnership being activities where parents and teachers share in teaching/learning actions; participatory activities are the more traditional conferences and attendance at school activities.

Second, the effects of a parent education program on student achievement were investigated. This program informed parents of minimal essential objectives taught students in reading and mathematics along with suggestions for parents to extend student learning. The conclusions of this study generated recommendations
supporting the need for involving parents in school
programs in ways which involve parents in the teaching
and learning processes of their children. Both Coleman
(1966) and Brandt (1986) support the issue that the
kinds of activities parents involve themselves in
influence student achievement.

Aljabar (1987) investigated the views of parents,
teachers and principals toward public school
corporation homework policy in Indiana by determining
the perceptions of parents, teachers and principals
toward the homework policy. The dependent variables
were: (1) the grade levels that should be included in
homework policies, (2) the subject areas that should be
included in homework policies, and (3) the amount of
homework time that should be required for each subject
in each grade level. The independent variables were:
(1) awareness of participants who responded to the
survey where the homework policy was perceived to be in
place, and (2) unawareness of participants who
responded to the survey where homework policy was not
perceived to be in place.

The conclusions were: (1) concern toward a
homework policy had the attention of the Indiana school
constituents; (2) a larger proportion of participants thought the policy should be included in grades 4-6 than was the case for grades 1-3; (3) a larger proportion of participants thought the policy should include mathematics, language arts and social studies than was the case for science, arts and crafts and health and physical education; (4) participants thought the amount of time devoted to mathematics homework, science homework, language arts homework, and social studies homework should progressively increase from the first grade to the sixth grade; (5) parents who perceived that a homework policy was in place believed more homework time should be devoted to science than teachers or principals believed; (6) principals who perceived that a homework policy was in place thought less homework time should be devoted to arts and crafts than parents or teachers thought.

Rickins (1987) discussed the importance of parents of middle school aged children networking. Networking is perceived as a support system for parents who are experiencing the modern day problems of raising children. Additionally, networking is considered a solution to confusion parents have in both school and
school activities and their attempts to control these for the adolescent child.

The suggestion is presented for parental concerns regarding "ganging up" on kids relative to party hours and activities. Through networking, parents would agree on beginning and ending times for parties and the activities their children would engage in during the parties. This support system for parents could also be utilized for school activities.

With this feeling of insecurity, making contact with other parents through a network is depicted as a method for providing support for parents in a conversational manner.

Whittle (1987) studied principals report of school-community relations in Georgia schools of excellence by assessing elementary principals reports regarding their school-community relations program in nominated schools of excellence. Three hundred thirteen elementary principals constituted the people used in this study. The specific breakdown is as follows: 29 Schools of Excellence, 11 nominated schools, 140 randomly selected non-nominated schools. The School-Community Relations Administrator Measure
(SCRAM) developed originally by Cary and modified by Whittle was used to assess principals reports of their school-community relations program.

Analysis of convariance was used to test for significant difference at the .05 level among the three categories of schools. The findings revealed that the Georgia Schools of Excellence were more likely than others to use school newsletters, the local media, and other types of written communication to relay the schools' story. The principals were likely to provide inservice for the entire school staff and to discuss the importance of a positive relationship to the school's community. These schools also had a greater level of parental involvement. Parents were invited to school events, to work as volunteers, and to participate in the purchase of school equipment.

Recommendations for improving the elementary schools school-community relations program were to increase parental involvement, school and business links, the use of newsletters, the formation of local school advisory committees, and inservice training for the school staff.
Epstein (1987) supports the research of Edwards (1979) on the importance of parents participating in learning activities. Unlike Edwards, Epstein believes that principals should assist parents by informing them of practices which have proven to be effective. Her contention was "that many parents don't know what to do". In some ways she supports Brandt (1986) by stating that not all schools actively encourage and direct parent activities. Epstein expands the meaning of parental involvement to include learning activities with children beyond the school building. She lists five basic types of parental involvement: (1) Basic Obligations of Parents - Discussed the responsibility of parents to provide the basic needs of food, clothing and shelter, and to teach certain cognitive and social skills before children enter school. If parents fail to provide these essentials, schools have a choice of providing the needs, reporting the parents or teaching parents what needs to be done. (2) Basic Obligation of Schools - This essentially keeps parents informed of what goes on in schools. A survey conducted by the author revealed that approximately 60% of the parents reported never having a conference with a teacher. (3)
Parent Involvement at School - One type of school activity is volunteering to assist with academic or related activities. This would include checking papers, teaching mini courses, career activities, etc. Because most mothers work, her survey revealed that only 4% of parents are available to provide this kind of assistance. Other types of in-school activities are parent audiences at performances and workshops. (4)

Parents Involvement in Learning Activities at Home - This section identifies the kind of activities parents are more likely to assist their children with to be reading or reading related activities. In a study conducted to determine the effect of parent involvement activities, it was found that while students whose parents assisted them at home made greater gains in reading, there were no similar patterns in math. Assistance from parents is correlated with age and grade level. Parents assist first graders. The older children are, the less assistance they receive at home from parents. (5)

Parent Involvement in Governance and Advocacy - These are described as participating as decision makers in PTA and or Union advocacy type organizations.
Jenkins (1981) presents a critical analysis of the relationship parents have with schools. She is especially critical of urban schools which she feels systematically exclude the urban poor. This is done by negative reporting to parents of students' academic and behavioral performance. Parents of these children learn quickly that school is the place to get criticized and they stay away. Teachers then say that the parents are not interested in their children's education. (Jenkins, 1987, p. 21) also discusses parents lack of decision making opportunities by quoting Dale Mann who states, "The public has generally been asked to support what has been decided and not to help decide what is supported". Jenkins feels that the urban school principal in particular should take more initiative in involving parents in decision making activities, shifting the power base from traditional beaocractic sources to a coalition of parents students and community. Jenkins (1987) suggests the following model:

Level I. Entry - interest parents in the life of the school. Once interest is obtained, the principal must assess the level at which they can
participate. Level 2 - Getting Involved - getting parents to serve as hosts at school functions is one way. Level 3 - Curriculum Participation - parents take part in workshops to learn more about the curriculum. Level 4 - Self Assertion - emphasis of the workshops shifts to techniques of self-assertion. Level 5 - Decision Making - Because decision making skills need to be developed over time, the author suggests beginning with charette.

She describes a charette as a group consisting of administrators, parents, students, teachers and paraprofessionals. At the training stage, problems are selected which are free from emotions. Steps in the strategy to be used are "(1) perceiving the problem, (2) clarifying the problem, (3) developing an activity or program which addresses the problem, (4) identifying difficulties which might impede solutions, (5) developing and acting on strategies, (6) determine resources needed, (7) setting up a system of accountability, and (8) evaluating the results."

Brandt (1986) published a conversation with James Comer on Improving Achievement of Minority Children in
which Comer discussed how to get parents involved in school activities by creating a governance and management group. The group consists of the principal, parents selected by parents, teachers selected by teachers, and a mental health or support team person. Comer states involving parents improves student achievement because when the social climate is addressed and the quality of relations are improved, distrust is reduced and energies are freed to concentrate more on academic programs and to plan and manage the school. Comer is more explicit in the kind of activities, parents especially parents of urban poor children are most effective with. He states that if we limit their participation to academic support, we will scare them away. They can, however, be very effective with social support areas. In these areas, they felt they were doing something that was worthwhile and useful. He discusses the importance of schools modifying what they have always done - even when what was done did not work. This idea was also expressed by Ron Edmonds (1979) who identified effective schools with little or no parental involvement.
Outside Evaluation

Pugh (1986) conducted a study on a topology of instructional leadership practices based on the study of central office school improvement initiative and the responses of two junior high school principals in low achieving settings by investigating and providing an understanding of the responses of the two junior high school principals to a central office school improvement initiative known as Replicating Success Project (RSP). The project initiated at two low performing junior high school, sought among other goals to develop the instructional leadership practices of principals. Each principal was interviewed and requested to respond to both quantitative and qualitative data gathered over a nine month period. The action research interview process utilized events based on observations within the settings and survey responses of the school staffs to determine the instructional leadership practices of the principals. The study suggests that the development and performance of instructional leadership practices by principals in low achieving school settings correlate with a number of factors which include: (1) the environment (school
climate); (2) the principals own past professional experiences and professional staff development; (3) the issue of empowerment, i.e., diverse leadership roles among all staff, as well as genuine participatory decision making; and (4) the principals' capacity to reflect-in action. The implications of the study suggest support for central office school improvement initiatives as a means of changing practices which contribute to the low achieving status of schools. This point supports the use of a central focus team working to improve student achievement in central focus schools. The study also suggests that action research methodology may be an effective process for researchers and practitioner to share in reflections-in-actions, and in developing an understanding of educational problems leading to identification and analysis of proposed solutions. The data suggests that the principals responded to the central office initiative by (1) utilizing it as "a vehicle" to initiate school improvement efforts; and (2) inculcating it as "a mechanism" to accelerate positive changes in the learning environment.
Although Pugh's study used a case study methodology, he was interested in improving the instructional leadership in Junior High (Middle Schools). The examination of similar variables as those examined in this research project.

Murphy (1985) reports that districts with excellent student achievement have superintendents who are personally involved in supervision and evaluation of principals. This article states that while teacher evaluation and supervision have tightened over the years, the supervision and evaluation of principals have become loose. The supervision and evaluation of principals were examined in effective school districts in California. The major interests in the study were as follows: (1) to search for characteristics or factors related to district effectiveness, (2) to examine the leadership activities of superintendents, and (3) to determine the way district offices attempt to coordinate the work activities of principals. The supervision of principals in effective districts tended to focus on the following areas: A. Review Activities. (1) review of curriculum and instruction, (2) facilities review, (3) perception checking; B. Culture
building. (1) communication, (2) team building, (3) problem resolution, (4) knowledge building, (5) role modeling and, (6) direct supervision.

The evaluation procedure consisted of: (1) a formal conference at the beginning of the year to set specific objectives and performance criteria, (2) a variety of ways to monitor progress, and (3) an end of the year evaluation. The conclusions reached in the study were as follows: (1) the overall pattern of supervision and evaluation differs from that found in many other districts in that procedures are clear and evaluation criteria well defined, (2) there is evidence that evaluation is used to link school and district offices, (3) supervision and evaluation provide a strong base for the development of other linkage functions such as goal setting and linkage functions, (4) supervision and evaluation focused on instruction and curriculum rather than peripheral activities found to be the focus in less effective districts, (5) the superintendents are actively involved in the supervision and evaluation process in 11 of the effective districts and functions as the primary supervisor in 10 of those 11. They are highly visible
leaders on school campuses and intensely interested in curriculum and instructional matters.

Pajak and Glickman (1989) conducted a comparative case study of three districts in Georgia to discover dimensions of school improvement at the district level. The districts were chosen because of demonstrated improvement in student achievement on Georgia Criterion-Referenced Tests (GCRT) 4th and 8th grades sustained for three consecutive years. The following were identified as practices to be examined. (1) The sequence and influence of events, (2) commonalities, if any, across all three districts, and (3) factors particular to each system.

Interviews which lasted approximately one hour were conducted using 30 individuals in each districts. The superintendent, central office staff, principals, lead teachers, and teachers of reading and mathematics in elementary and middle schools made up the 30 individuals interviewed. The schools districts were all small with 280, 130 and 150 teachers in the north, east and west districts respectively. Two districts were predominantly white, one district had a balanced population of Black and White students.
In each of the districts the superintendent and central office supervisors were key figures in stimulating and facilitating efforts to maintain and improve the quality of instruction.

The conclusion reached was that the primary initiators and implementers of change varied from system to system. In the eastern district, the prime agents for working with teachers on schoolwide student achievement were the inschool supervisors; in Northview the prime change agents were the central office staff and at Westview the prime change agents were representative teachers at various grade levels, and schools who served as schoolwide committees coordinated by the central office supervisory staff. Contrary to the effective school research, data for this study show that the principal was most often secondary to central office supervisors.

Summary

The research generally supports the importance of leadership behavior as a variable in educational research. The perceptions teachers, students and others have of an administrators' behavior and the effectiveness of those leaders are the most widely
researched. However, the vast majority of that research was conducted in elementary schools, leaving a minimal of research in the middle school.

The research relative to parental involvement examines both the quantity and quality of parental involvement in the school and parental opinions relative to school programs. There is a need for more research regarding the kind of activities in which parents participate. The research presented suggests this may be a factor which has been generally neglected and could make a difference in the quality of instruction students receive.

Research relative to involvement of superintendents and central staff members generally support the theory that the more these persons are directly involved in school activities in the school, the more likely change is to occur in those schools.
CHAPTER III

Theoretical Framework

Test data from the State's Department of Education (White 1989) show that students attending schools in this urban school district score an average of 6 percentage points less on standardized tests than do students who attend schools in surrounding counties. This factor served as a focus for improving instruction in the metropolitan school district. If schools do not make a difference independent of background as reported by Coleman, those responsible for educating the poor in urban schools could feel comfortable in a sense of helplessness, and simply blame the home and society for the plight of students. If, on the other hand, there is some credibility in the effective school research done by Edmonds and others, school personnel have a responsibility to examine other variables which might contribute to improved student achievement.

The purpose of this study was to examine the effect of leadership behavior and parental involvement on student achievement in the areas of reading and
mathematics in three central focus, three area focus and three local focus middle schools.

The effectiveness of leadership behavior is well documented in the research examined during this research project. Although some researchers such as Gersten (1982) report that principals do not necessarily have to serve as instructional leaders, other effective school researchers report improved student achievement when the principal is able to assume this role. Gersten's major argument is that some principals do not have the ability to serve as instructional leaders. School systems have a responsibility to hire principals who can perform this role and to assist those principals who cannot.

Assistance to principals who had demonstrated that they were unable to improve student achievement was exactly what was done in the metropolitan school district when schools were organized into three categories, local focus, area focus and central focus.

In a study by Edwards (1987), it was concluded that involving parents in school teaching activities had more effect on student achievement than did parents who only attended school activities such as PTA.
meetings. Blanchard, Zizarami and Zizarmi (1987) discussed the importance of the building level administrator's use of situational leadership. In this regard, it is noted that one leadership behavior is no more effective than another. It is also noteworthy to restate the research of Edmonds (1979) where some students achieved with little or no parental involvement.

Projected Relationship of the Variables

It is expected that an effective school would have effective leadership where the principal communicates and demonstrates an interest in and knowledge of the instructional program. It is further expected that in effective schools parents would have an interest in the school and would display that interest by their presence either at PTA meetings and other activities or by volunteering in other school or school related activities. Given these conditions, it can be further expected that the outcome will be high student achievement.

These variables are selected because of their relationship to Edward's comparison of the relationship
of parental involvement, school climate, and student achievement. The assertion that parents who perform specific duties make a difference in student achievement is supported by research. The research done by Van Der Burg further substantiates the comparison of the variables by the comparison he makes of administrator and parent perspective. It was expected that the administrators' emphasis on instruction would entice parents to involve themselves in the schools' program thus creating a school climate where emphasis was placed on school communication, discipline, and instruction. The outcome of such an atmosphere would surely be improved student achievement as measured by standardized test scores.

The assumption made was that if principals could be made aware of teachers' perceptions of their leadership behavior and the impact this behavior has on student achievement, there should be some effort made to effect change. The levels of change as identified by Hord et al. (1988) in the concerned-based Adoption Model deserves some consideration especially as the researcher examines the extent to which the items on
the central focus agenda are addressed by principals of central focus middle schools.

When an atmosphere exists where building level administrators concentrate on instruction and parents are involved in the school's activities, it is assumed that students will achieve. However, one must remember that these variables can be in place in schools where students do not achieve, and some of them could not be in place in schools where students do achieve.

**Conceptual Support for the Interlinkages of the Variables**

It is assumed that the examination of specific variables, namely, principals' leadership behavior and parental involvement should have an effect on student achievement in central and area focus middle schools as measured by reading and mathematics ITBS scores. These variables are selected because of their relationship to Van Der Burg (1987) views of what works in an effective school when parents and teachers voice their perception of the principals' leadership behavior.

The validity of these variables are further supported by Edwards' (1987) research of the
relationships of parental involvement, school climate and student achievement. If the researcher can identify the most effective leadership behavior entering high student achievement, that leader will serve as a model for other leaders experiencing low test scores.

The relationships are presented in the diagram on the following page. In the diagram, student achievement serves as the core or center for all action which the variables of leadership behavior and parental involvement affect. The diagram further demonstrates how the dependent variables of leadership behavior affects parental involvement. The research of Van Der Burg (1987) supports the interlinkages of the variables in his views of what works in an effective school when parents and teachers voice their perception of the principal's leadership behavior. Parents of middle school aged children are likely to perceive discipline and school climate as important variables. This grows out of a natural concern that middle school aged children have relating to a fear of their new environment which is different from the safe and known
Figure A
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environment of their elementary schools. Teachers, on the other hand, are more likely to judge the principal's leadership behavior by all of the above mentioned variables plus school communication, instructional leadership and school community relations.

The hypotheses for this study are presented:

1. There is no significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of the principal's leadership behavior in the area of discipline and reading achievement of students in central focus, area focus and local focus schools.

2. There is no significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of the principal's leadership behavior in the area of school climate and reading achievement of students in central focus, area focus and local focus schools.

3. There is no significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of the principal's
leadership behavior in the area of school communication and reading achievement of students in central focus, area focus and local focus schools.

4. There is no significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of the principal's leadership behavior in the area of instructional leadership and reading achievement of students in central focus, area focus and local focus schools.

5. There is no significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of the principal's behavior in the area of school/community relations and the reading achievement of students in central focus, area focus and local focus schools.

6. There is no significant relationship between the number of PTA members in a school and reading achievement of students in central focus, area focus and local focus schools.
7. There is no significant relationship between the number of parents who volunteer in a school and reading achievement of students in central focus, area focus and local focus schools.

8. There is no significant relationship between the teachers' perceptions of the principal's leadership behavior in the area of discipline and mathematics achievement of students in central focus, area focus and local focus schools.

9. There is no significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of the principal's leadership behavior in the area of school climate and mathematics achievement of students in central focus, area focus and local focus schools.

10. There is no significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of the principal's leadership behavior in the area of school communication and mathematics achievement of students in central focus, area focus and local focus schools.
11. There is no significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of the principal's leadership behavior in the area of instructional leadership and mathematics achievement of students in central focus, area focus and local focus schools.

12. There is no significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of principal's leadership behavior in the area of community relations and mathematics achievement of students in central focus, area focus and local focus schools.

13. There is no significant relationship between the number of parents who join the PTA and mathematics achievement of students in central focus, area focus and local focus schools.

14. There is no significant relationship between the number of parents who volunteer and mathematics achievement of students in central focus, area focus and local focus schools.
Summary

Some basic assumptions were made relative to the interlinkages of the variables; namely that the principals' behavioral emphasis on discipline, school climate, school communication, instruction, and community relations should lead to improved student achievement.

It was also noted that parents of middle school-aged children have a special interest in the overall climate of the school. This consideration was based on the fact that the adolescent child has a natural fear of the middle school; since he/she has just left the safe and known environment of the elementary school. Parents are, therefore, likely to be very concerned about the principal's behavior relative to the variables studied. Teachers are likely to be concerned with the variables of school climate, school discipline, school communication, instruction and community relations. A diagram was presented which depicts the interlinkages of these variables and how they impact on student achievement.
CHAPTER IV
Research Design

The Design of the Study

The design of the study was descriptive. The study described the relationship between leadership, and the parental involvement and student achievement in the areas of reading and mathematics. To investigate the null hypotheses, the subjects were administered a questionnaire (Appendix A) which solicits responses on the variables of leadership behavior. The questionnaire, more specifically, examines teachers' perceptions of leadership behavior as that behavior relates to discipline, school climate, school communication, school community relations and instruction. The second variable of parental involvement was examined by reviewing Board minutes which report the number of PTA members and volunteers in each of the nine selected schools. Twenty percent was established as a high percent of PTA membership. Anything below twenty percent is a low rate of
membership. Although research (Epstein 1988) established 4% as an acceptable rate for volunteering, this percentage was raised to ten percent for this project.

Population

The subjects selected for the study were three hundred middle school teachers assigned to the nine randomly selected middle schools. These schools represented three from each of the three categories of local focus, area focus and central focus. The local focus schools were the highest scoring middle schools in the system. The area focus schools had achieved the middle range of scores and the central focus schools had the lowest scores of all middle schools in the system. The central focus schools, falling under the supervision of the superintendent via a special assistant to the superintendent, received consistent assistance and supervision from the central focus team. The assistance received by the area focus schools varied from area to area. Principals assigned to the three randomly selected area focus schools were
interviewed relative to the assistance they received during the research year. (Appendix D). The local focus schools received no consistent supervision or assistance either from the area office staff or the central offices. However, these schools were free to request assistance from either of the aforementioned staffs. All schools were visited by the superintendent at least once. During his visits to each of the schools, he gave suggestions where the need for improvement was indicated.

Schools assigned as central focus were provided assistance and supervision from the central focus team. The team basically began by visiting the school, observing the overall level of operation and reporting verbally to the principal. By the month of October, members of the teaching team had performed an assessment of each of the seventeen central focus schools and provided the principals of these schools with a written document stating the assessment. The assessment given to principals included similar categories of those presented in this research project; namely school discipline, school communication, school climate and instruction. Although there were
recommendations, principals were free to address the items on the assessment as they chose. During the remaining months of the school year, the central focus team members continued to visit the schools and to provide feedback to the principals. The principals were always left free to use the suggestions made as they chose. Schools assigned to area focus schools received assistance at the discretion of the various area superintendents. The assistance, therefore varied. The principals participating in this study were contacted and the specific assistance they received from either the area or central office staffs are documented. (See Appendix D) Local focus schools were allowed to operate without close supervision. The principals of these schools were contacted to respond to the assistance they received during the 1988-89 school year. (See Appendix D).

The team began by visiting the school observing the overall operation and reporting verbally to the principal. By the month of October, members of the team had performed an assessment of each of the seventeen central focus schools and provided the principal with appropriate feedback.
Instrument

A questionnaire was administered to teachers assigned to the nine middle schools randomly selected for the study. The questionnaire was developed by Bell South Laboratories for principals attending leadership workshops in the southeastern United States. The instrument was validated by a group of middle school principals in the metropolitan school district involved in this study. A researcher was hired to perform a face validity and item analysis of the instrument. All suggestions made by the researcher were incorporated into the final instrument. Based on those suggestions the last twenty-two items were omitted from the questionnaire. Additionally, questions five through ten were also omitted for the purpose of meeting the specific needs of this study. Questions one through four of the instrument tested teachers' perceptions of the principal's behavior in discipline; five through eight tested teachers' perceptions of school climate; nine through thirteen tested school communication. Questions twenty-five through twenty-nine tested teachers' perceptions of community relations and questions fourteen through nineteen tested teachers'
perceptions of the principal's behavior in the area of instructional leadership.

A total of two hundred fifty-seven questionnaires were returned. Specifically, the numbers participating in the focus schools were: Central focus - 62; Area focus - 127 and Local focus - 68.

The overall percentage of return was 87%.

Data Analysis

The pearson r was administered for the purpose of determining the relationship between the variables. The relationship between the dependent variable of reading achievement to the independent variables of discipline, school climate, school communications, instructions, school community relations, PTA membership and the number of volunteers were calculated using the pearson r. Similar calculations were performed on mathematics achievement and the independent variables of leadership behavior and parental involvement. The results of these calculations will serve to prove whether or not the independent variables are predictors of student achievement.
Summary

A presentation was made of the research design, treatment, measure and statistical tool. The three hundred subjects used in this study were subdivided by assignments to central focus, area focus and local focus schools. A more detailed analysis is made in Chapter V of the statistical data.
CHAPTER V
Analysis of Results

The primary purpose of this research was to determine the effect of the building level administrator's leadership behavior and parental involvement on student achievement in the areas of reading and mathematics in central focus, area focus, and local focus middle schools of a metropolitan school system. In order to analyze the results of the study fourteen research questions were developed.

The research questions are presented:

1. Is there a relationship between teachers' perception of the principal's behavior in the area of discipline and reading achievement in local focus, area focus and central focus schools?

2. Is there a relationship between teachers' perceptions of the principal's behavior in the area of school climate and reading achievement in local focus, area focus and central focus schools?
3. Is there a relationship between teachers' perception of the principal's behavior in the area of school communications and reading achievement in local focus, area focus and central focus schools?

4. Is there a relationship between teachers' perception of the principal's behavior in the area of school community relations and reading achievement in local focus, area focus and central focus schools?

5. Is there a relationship between teachers' perception of the principal's behavior in the area of instruction and reading achievement in local focus, area focus and central focus schools?

6. Is there a relationship between the number of PTA members in a school and reading achievement in local focus, area focus and central focus schools?
7. Is there a relationship between the number of parents who volunteer and reading achievement in local focus, area focus and central focus schools?

8. Is there a relationship between teachers' perception of the principal's behavior in the area of discipline and mathematics achievement in local focus, area focus and central focus schools?

9. Is there a relationship between teachers' perceptions of the principal's behavior in the area of school climate and mathematics achievement in local focus, area focus and central focus schools?

10. Is there a relationship between teachers' perception of the principal's behavior in the area of school communications and mathematics achievement of local focus, area focus and central focus schools?
11. Is there a relationship between teachers' perception of the principal's behavior in the area of community relations and mathematics achievement in local focus, area focus and central focus schools?

12. Is there a relationship between teachers' perceptions of the principal's behavior in the area of instruction and mathematics achievement in local focus, area focus and central focus schools?

13. Is there a relationship between the number of PTA members in a school and mathematics achievement in local focus, area focus, and central focus schools?

14. Is there a relationship between the number of parents who volunteer and mathematics achievement in local focus, area focus and central focus schools?
Findings

Hypothesis one was designed to determine the relationship between teachers' perceptions of the principal's behavior in the area of discipline and student achievement in reading. The research hypotheses is presented.

Ho 1: There is no significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of the principal's behavior in the area of discipline and reading achievement in local focus, area focus and central focus schools.

A crucial point in the analysis of the data was setting .05 as the level of significance. The researcher computed the pearson product moment (r) in order to determine if a relationship existed between the variables.
For the purpose of analyzing the results, a rating of 5 indicated satisfaction with the principal's behavior in the areas of the questionnaire. The range of scores was 5 for highly satisfied to 2 for highly dissatisfied. The closer the respondents' scores came to 5, the more satisfied with the principal's behavior in the areas of leadership presented. The results of this analysis is reported in Table 1.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>( \bar{x} )</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>Table Value .05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LF</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions one through four on the questionnaire were designed to elicit teachers' reaction to their perceptions of the principal's behavior relative to discipline. There were two hundred fifty-seven respondents to the four questions on the questionnaire: 68 local focus, 127 area focus and 62 central focus.
The mean (x) scores of 55; 37 and 28 were achieved. These mean scores are the percentage of students who scored at or above the national norm (50%).

As indicated in Table 1, the Pearson r of .18 local focus; .03 area focus, and .02 central focus proved the relationship between reading achievement and teachers' perceptions of the principal's behavior to be non significant in central focus and area focus and local focus schools. In order to accept the null hypothesis, the Pearson r needed to be less than .240 (Local Focus), .174 (Area Focus), .250 (Central Focus). Therefore, null hypothesis 1 is accepted. There is not a significant relationship between teachers' perception of the principal's behavior in the area of discipline and reading achievement in local focus, area focus and central focus schools.

Hypothesis two sought to answer the research question: Is there a relationship between teachers' perceptions of the principal's behavior in the area of school climate and reading achievement of students in local focus, area focus and central focus schools? The research hypothesis is stated as follows:
Ho 2: There is no significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of the principal's behavior in the area of school climate and reading achievement of students in local focus, area focus and central focus schools.

Questions five through eight were designed to elicit teachers' responses to their perception of the principal's behavior relative to school climate. In an effort to answer this hypothesis, Pearson r was calculated.

Setting $p = 0.05$ as the level of significance, the researcher applied the Pearson correlation ($r$) statistical technique to determine if there was a relationship between the variables.

The number of subjects responding to this question was two hundred fifty-seven, 68 in local focus, 127 in area focus and 62 in central focus schools.

As indicated in table 2, $r$'s of .30 (Local focus) .27 (Area focus) and .71 (Central focus) proved to be significant at the .05 level of significance. In order
to accept the null hypothesis, the table value needs to be less than .250 (Local focus); .240 (Area focus) and .174 (Central focus) schools. The null hypothesis is, therefore, rejected.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Climate/Reading</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>( \bar{x} )</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>Table Value .05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LF</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis three sought to answer the research question: Is there a relationship between teacher's perceptions of the principal's behavior in the area of school communications and reading achievement? The research hypothesis is stated as follows:

Ho 3: There is no significant relationship between the teachers' perceptions of the principal's behavior in the area of school communication and students achievement in
Questions fourteen through nineteen were designed to elicit teachers' perceptions of the principal's behavior relative to instructional leadership. In order to answer this hypothesis, Pearson r was calculated.

Setting $p = .05$ as the level of significance, the researcher applied the Pearson correlation ($r$) statistical technique to determine if there was a relationship between the variables.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>$\bar{x}$</th>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>Table Value .05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LF</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions nine through thirteen were designed to elicit teachers' perceptions of the principal's
behavior in the area of school communication. Two
hundred fifty-six teachers; 68 local focus, 126 area
focus and 62 central focus responded to questions nine
through thirteen.

As indicated in Table 3, r's of .82, .93 and .18
are all significant relationships at the .05 level of
significance. In order to reject the null hypothesis,
the table value needs to be less than the table values
of .250 (Local focus); 240 (Central focus) and .174
(Central focus). The null hypothesis is rejected.

Hypothesis four sought to answer the research
question: Is there a relationship between teachers'
perceptions of the principal's behavior in the area of
community relations and reading achievement? The
research hypothesis is stated as follows:

Ho 4: There is no significant relationship
between the teachers' perceptions of the
principal's behavior in the area of community
relations and reading achievement in local focus,
area focus and central focus schools.
Questions twenty-five through twenty-nine were designed to elicit teachers' responses to their perception of the principal's behavior relative to community relations. In order to answer this hypothesis, Pearson $r$ was calculated.

Setting $p = 0.05$ as the level of significance, the researcher applied the Pearson correlation ($r$) statistical technique to determine if there was a relationship between the variables.

**Table 4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Relations/Reading</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>$\bar{x}$</th>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>Table Value $\text{.05}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LF</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Questions twenty-five through twenty-nine were designed to determine teachers' perceptions of the principal's behavior in the area of community relations. There were two hundred fifty-four teachers-
67 local focus, 126 area focus and 61 central focus who responded to these four questions.

As indicated in Table 4, an r of .61 (local and area focus) and .76 (central focus) are high positive relationships at the .05 level of significance. In order to reject the null hypothesis, r must be less than .250 (Local focus); .240 (Area focus) and .174 (Central focus) at the .05 level of significance. The null hypothesis is, therefore, rejected. There is a significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of the principal's behavior in the area of community relations and reading achievement.

Hypothesis five sought to answer the research question: Is there a relationship between teachers' perceptions of the principal's behavior in the area of instructional leadership and reading achievement? The research hypothesis is stated as follows:

Ho 5: There is no significant relationship between the teachers' perceptions of the principal's behavior in the area of instructional leadership and reading
achievement in local focus, area focus and central focus schools.

Questions fourteen through nineteen were designed to elicit teachers' responses to their perception of the principal's behavior relative to instructional leadership. In order to answer this hypothesis, Pearson r was calculated.

Setting \( p = .05 \) as the level of significance, the researcher applied the Pearson correlation (r) statistical technique to determine if there was a relationship between the variables.

Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>( \bar{X} )</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>Table Value .05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LF</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Two hundred fifty-seven teachers (68 Local Focus, 127 Area Focus, 62 Central Focus) responded to the four questions on the questionnaire that were designed to answer this research question.

As indicated in Table 5, r's of .50 Local focus; .30 Area focus and .32 Central Focus were obtained after computing the Pearson Correlation at the .05 level of significance. In order to reject the null hypothesis, r needs to be less than the table values of .250 (Local focus); .240 (Area Focus) and .174 (Central focus). The null hypothesis is rejected. There is a significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of the principal's behavior in the area of instructional leadership and reading achievement in local focus, area focus and central focus schools.

Hypothesis six sought to answer the research question: Is there a relationship between the number of PTA members and the reading achievement of students? The research hypothesis is stated as follows:

Ho 6: There is no significant relationship between the number of PTA members and the reading achievement of students in local
focus, area focus and central focus schools.

Board of Education minutes were used to secure the number of PTA members in each of the middle schools used in this study.

In order to answer this hypothesis, Pearson $r$ was calculated. Setting $p = .05$ as the level of significance. The researcher applied the Pearson correlation ($r$) statistical technique to determine if there was a relationship between the variables.

Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>Membership</th>
<th>$\bar{x}$</th>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>Table Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LF</td>
<td>2424</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>1199</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>2417</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>2219</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF</td>
<td>1829</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.065</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As stated in Chapter Four, the number of PTA members were secured from the Board minutes. Consideration must be given to the percentage of parents participating in PTA activities as compared to the total number of students enrolled in the nine schools. Twenty percent or better of the total number of parents having children enrolled in the nine schools is considered high participation. Any number less than 20% is considered low participation. The expectations of this research question was that high participation in the PTA would relate positively to high reading achievement. The following total of students were enrolled in the nine selected middle schools. Local focus - 2,424; Area focus - 2,417 and central focus - 1,829. Twenty percent of those student bodies are Local focus - 484; Area focus - 483 and central focus 365. The actual number of memberships in the nine selected schools is Local Focus - 1,199, Area Focus - 2,219 and Central Focus - 765, which is better than 50% of the student population in the nine schools PTA membership can therefore be considered high in these selected schools.
As indicated in Table 6, r's of .12 (Local Focus), .23 (Area Focus) and .96 (Central Focus) were achieved at the .05 level of significance. In order to reject the null hypothesis r needs to be less than the table value of .041 (Local focus), .032 (Area Focus) and .065 (Central Focus) at the .05 level of significance. The null hypothesis is rejected. There are significant relationships between PTA membership and reading achievement of students in local focus, area focus and central focus schools.

Hypothesis seven sought to answer the research question: Is there a relationship between the number of volunteers in a school and reading achievement in local focus, area focus and central focus schools? The research hypothesis is stated as follows:

Ho 7: There is no significant relationship between the number of volunteers in a school and reading achievement of students.

Board of Education minutes for September, 1989 were used to secure the number of Volunteers in each of the middle schools used in this study.
In order to answer this hypothesis, Pearson r was calculated. Setting $p = 0.05$ as the level of significance, the researcher applied the Pearson correlation (r) statistical technique to determine if there was a relationship between the variables.

Table 7

Relationship Between the Number of Parents Who Volunteer and Reading Achievement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volunteers/Reading</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>Membership</th>
<th>$\bar{x}$</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>Table Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LF</td>
<td>2424</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>1199</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>2417</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>2219</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF</td>
<td>1829</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.065</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of volunteers in the nine middle schools were secured from the September, 1989 Board minutes. A percentage of 20% and above was assigned as a high percentage rate for PTA membership. Consideration was given to the fact that most parents work, and to the fact that the highest percentage of adults volunteering, was far less than 20% participation. Based on these factors and the research of (Epstein, 1987) 4% was set as a high percentage rate for volunteers. Four percent of the students enrolled
in the nine schools represented as follows: Local Focus - 97, Area Focus 96, Central Focus 73. The actual number of volunteers in the nine schools was as follows: Local Focus - 454; Area Focus - 102; Central Focus - 110 which is better than 4%. It can, therefore, be stated that the rate of volunteerism in the school was high.

As indicated in Table 7 $r = .41$ (Local focus); .38 (Area focus) and .23 (Central focus). In order to reject the null hypothesis $r$ must be less than the table values of .042 (Local focus); .031 (Area focus), and .065 (Central focus). The null hypothesis is rejected. There is a relationship between the number of parents who volunteer and reading achievement.

Hypothesis eight sought to answer the research question: Is there a relationship between teachers' perceptions of the principal's behavior in the area of discipline and mathematics achievement? The research hypothesis is stated as follows:

Ho 8: There is no significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of the
discipline and mathematics achievement in local focus, area focus and central focus schools.

Questions one through four were designed to elicit teachers' perception of the principal's behavior relative to discipline. In order to answer this hypothesis, Pearson r was calculated.

Setting p = .05 as the level of significance, the researcher applied the Pearson correlation (r) statistical technique to determine if there was a relationship between the variables.

Questions one through four were designed to secure teachers' perceptions of the principal's behavior in the area of discipline. There were 257 teachers who responded to the four questions in this area of the questionnaire. Specifically, 68 local focus teachers; 127 area focus teachers and 62 central focus teachers responded.
Table 8

Relationship Between Teachers' Perceptions of the Principal's Behavior in the Area of Discipline and Mathematics Achievement in Local Focus, Area Focus, and Central Focus Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>( \bar{x} )</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>Table Value .05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LF</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated in Table 8, the Pearson r's of .28 (Local focus); .32 (Area focus) and .18 (Central focus) were found at the .05 level of significance. In order to reject the null hypothesis, r would need to be less than the table values of .250 (Local focus); .240 (Area Focus) and .174 (Central focus). The null hypothesis is rejected. There is a significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of principal's behavior in the area of discipline and mathematics in local focus, area focus and central focus schools.

Hypothesis nine sought to answer the research question: Is there a relationship between teachers' perceptions of the principal's behavior in the area of
school climate and mathematics achievement of students? The research hypothesis is stated as follows:

Ho 9: There is no significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of the principal's behavior in the area of school climate and mathematics achievement.

Questions five through eight were designed to elicit teachers' responses to their perception of the principal's behavior relative to school climate. In order to answer this hypothesis, Pearson r was calculated.

Setting $p = .05$ as the level of significance, the researcher applied the Pearson correlation ($r$) statistical technique to determine if there was a relationship between the variables.

The number of subjects responding to this question was two hundred fifty-seven; specifically, 68 (Local focus); 127 (Area Focus) and 62 (Central Focus) teachers.

As indicated in Table 9, r's of .28 (Local focus); .36 (Area focus) and .19 (Central focus) proved to be
significant at the .05 level of significance. In order to reject the null hypothesis, \( r \) needs to be less than the table values of .250 (Local focus); .240 (Area focus) and .174 (Central focus). The null hypothesis is, therefore, rejected. There is a relationship between teachers' perceptions of the principal's behavior in the area of school climate and mathematics achievement in local focus, area focus, and central focus schools.

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Climate/Mathematics</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>( N )</th>
<th>( \bar{x} )</th>
<th>( r )</th>
<th>Table Value .05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AF</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CF</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis ten sought to answer the research question: Is there a relationship between the teachers' perceptions of the principal's behavior in the area of school communications and mathematics.
achievement? The research hypothesis is stated as follows:

**Ho 10:** There is no significant relationship between the teachers' perceptions of the principal's behavior in the area of school communication and mathematics achievement.

Questions nine through thirteen were designed to elicit teachers' responses to their perception of the principal's behavior relative to school communication. In order to answer this hypothesis, Pearson r was calculated.

Setting $p = 0.05$ as the level of significance, the researcher applied the Pearson correlation (r) statistical technique to determine if there was a relationship between the variables.

Questions nine through thirteen were designed to elicit teachers' perceptions of the principal's behavior in the area of school communication. Two hundred fifty-six teachers responded to questions nine through thirteen, specifically, 68 (Local focus teachers), 127 (Area focus teachers) and 62 (Central focus teachers).
Table 10

Relationship Between Teachers' Perception of the Principal's Behavior in the Area of School Communication and Mathematics Achievement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>Table Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LF</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated in Table 10, r's of .84 (Local focus); .26 (Area focus) and .19 (Central focus) are significant at the .05 level of significance. In order to reject the null hypothesis, r needs to be less than the table values of .250 (Local focus); .240 (Area focus) and .174 (Central focus). The null hypothesis is, therefore, rejected. There is a significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of the principal's behavior in the area of school communications and mathematics achievement in local focus, area focus and central focus schools.

Hypothesis eleven sought to answer the research question: Is there a relationship between the teachers' perceptions of the principal's behavior in
the area of community relations and mathematics achievement? The research hypothesis is stated as follows:

Ho 11: There is no significant relationship between the teachers' perceptions of the principal's behavior in the area of community relations and mathematics achievement.

Questions twenty-five through twenty-nine were designed to elicit teachers' responses to their perceptions of the principal's behavior relative to community relations. In order to answer this hypothesis, Pearson r was calculated.

Setting $p = .05$ as the level of significance, the researcher applied the Pearson correlation ($r$) statistical technique to determine if there was a relationship between the variables. There were two hundred fifty-four teachers who responded to these five questions.

As indicated in Table 11, $r$'s of .84 (Local focus); .26 (Area focus) and .22 (Central focus) are presented. In order to reject the null hypothesis, $r$
Table 11

Relationship Between Teachers' Perceptions of the Principal's Behavior in the Area of Community Relations and Mathematics Achievement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>$\bar{x}$</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>Table Value</th>
<th>.05</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LF</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

must be less than the table values of .250 (Locus focus); .240 (Area focus) and .174 (Central focus) at the .05 level of significance. The null hypothesis is rejected. There is a relationship between teachers' perceptions of the principal's behavior in the area of community relations and mathematics achievement in local focus, area focus and central focus schools.

Hypothesis twelve sought to answer the research question: Is there a relationship between teachers' perceptions of the principal's behavior in the area of instructional leadership and mathematics achievement? The research hypothesis is stated as follows:
Ho 12: There is no significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of the principal's behavior in the area of instructional leadership and mathematics achievement of students.

Questions fourteen through nineteen were designed to elicit teachers perceptions of the principal's behavior relative to instructional leadership. In order to answer this hypothesis, pearson r was calculated.

Setting $p = .05$ as the level of significance, the researcher applied the pearson correlation ($r$) statistical technique to determine if there was a relationship between the variables.

Table 12
Relationship Between Teachers' Perceptions of the Principal's Behavior in the Area of Instructional Leadership and Mathematics Achievement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Leadership/Mathematics</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>$\bar{x}$</th>
<th>$r$</th>
<th>Table Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LF</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.174</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions fourteen through nineteen were designed to secure teachers' perceptions of the principal's behavior in the area of instructional leadership. Two hundred fifty-seven teachers responded to the four questions on the questionnaire that were designed to answer this research question, specifically, 68 (Local focus); 127 (Area focus) and 62 (Central focus) teachers.

As indicated in Table 12, r's of .06 (Local focus); .0 (Area focus) and .16 (Central focus) were obtained after computing the Pearson Correlation at the .05 level of significance. In order to reject the null hypothesis, r needs to be less than the table values of .250 (Local focus); .240 (Area focus) and .174 (Central focus) at the .05 level of significance. The null hypothesis is accepted. There is not a significant relationship between teachers' perceptions of the principal's behavior in the area of instructional leadership and mathematics achievement in focus schools.

Hypothesis thirteen sought to answer the research question: Is there a relationship between the number of PTA members and mathematics achievement in local
focus, area focus and central focus schools? The research hypothesis is stated as follows:

Ho 13: There is no significant relationship between the number of PTA members and mathematics achievement.

Board of Education minutes were used to secure the number of PTA members in each of the middle schools used in this study.

In order to answer this hypothesis, Pearson r was calculated. Setting $p = .05$ as the level of significance, the researcher applied the Pearson correlation ($r$) statistical technique to determine if there was a relationship between the variables.

Table 13

Relationship Between the Number of PTA Members and Mathematics Achievement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>Membership</th>
<th>$\bar{x}$</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>Table Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LF</td>
<td>2424</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>1199</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>2417</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>2219</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF</td>
<td>1829</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.065</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As stated in Chapter Four, the number of PTA members was secured from the board minutes. Consideration must be given to the percentage of parents participating in PTA activities as compared to the total number of students enrolled in the nine schools. Twenty percent or better of the total number of parents having children enrolled in the nine schools is considered high participation. Any number less than 20% is considered low participation. The expectation of this research question was that high participation in the PTA would relate positively to high mathematics achievement. There were a total of 6,618 students enrolled in the nine selected middle schools; Specifically 2,424 (Local focus students); 2,417 (Area focus students) and 1,829 (Central focus students). Twenty percent of the student body in the various focus schools is presented. PTA membership can, therefore, be considered high in these selected schools.

As indicated in Table 13, r's of .42 (Local focus); .37 (Area focus) and .21 (Central focus) at the .05 level of significance are considered significant. In order to reject the null hypothesis r needs to be less than the table values of .042 (Local focus); .031
(Area focus) and .065 (Central focus) at the .05 level of significance. The null hypothesis is rejected. There is a significant relationship between PTA membership and mathematics achievement in local focus, area focus and central focus schools.

Hypothesis fourteen sought to answer the research question: Is there a relationship between volunteers in a school and mathematics achievement of students? The research hypothesis is stated as follows:

Ho 14: There is no significant relationship between the number of volunteers in a school and mathematics achievement in local focus, area focus and central focus schools.

Board of Education minutes for September, 1989 were used to secure the number of volunteers in each of the middle schools used in this study. In order to answer this hypothesis, Pearson r was calculated. Setting p = .05 as the level of significance. The researcher applied the pearson
correlation \((r)\) statistical technique to determine if there was a relationship between the variables.

Table 14

Relationship Between the Number of Parents Who Volunteer and Mathematics Achievement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Volunteers/Mathematics</th>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>Membership</th>
<th>(\bar{x})</th>
<th>(r)</th>
<th>Table Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>2424</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>1199</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AF</td>
<td>2417</td>
<td>463</td>
<td>2219</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CF</td>
<td>1829</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.065</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number of volunteers in the nine middle schools was secured from the September, 1989 Board minutes. Whereas, a percentage of 20 and above was assigned as a high percentage rate for PTA membership, consideration was given to the fact that most parents work. Additionally, schools that had the highest percentage of adults volunteering, had far less than 20%. Based on these factors, and the research of Epstein (1988) a 4% or better value was set as a high percentage rate for volunteers. Four percent in the various local schools is presented - Local focus (184); Area Focus (96) and Central Focus (73). The actual number of volunteers in the focus schools is
presented. Local focus (184); Area focus (102); Central focus (110) which is better than 4%. It can, therefore, be stated that the rate of volunteerism in the schools was high. As indicated in Table 15, r was calculated in the various focus schools as .14 (Local focus); 3 (Area focus) and .15 (Central focus). In order to reject the null hypothesis, r needs to be less than the table values of .042 (Local focus); .031 (Area focus) and .065 (Central focus). The null hypothesis is rejected. There is a relationship between the number of parents who volunteer in the schools and student achievement in mathematics in local focus, area focus, and central focus schools.

Seven independent variables were studied to determine their relationship to two dependent variables.

As indicated in Table 15, there were thirty-one significant relationships and seven relationships which were found not to be significant in local focus, area focus and central focus schools.
Summary of Significant and Non Significant Relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Significant Relationships</th>
<th>Non-Significant Relationships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Focus Schools</td>
<td>All Focus Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variables</td>
<td>Variables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discp/Math</td>
<td>Reading/Discipline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm/ Read and Math.</td>
<td>Instructional/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comm/Rel/Read/Math</td>
<td>Leadership/Math</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership/Read</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTA/Read./Math</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers/Read/</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

This chapter described the statistical relationship between the variables of teachers' perceptions of leadership behavior, parental involvement and student achievement in the areas of reading and mathematics. Fourteen tables were presented to show the relationships among the variables. Table 15 summarized the significant and non significant relationships discovered.
CHAPTER VI

Summary of Findings, Conclusions, Implications and Recommendations

Summary

The problem in this study was to determine the relationship between leadership behavior and student achievement in local focus, area focus and central focus schools.

This study described the relationship between several variables, mainly leadership, in the areas of discipline, school climate, school communications, school community relations, instructional leadership, PTA membership and volunteerism on student achievement in the areas of reading and mathematics in nine middle schools labeled local focus, area focus and central focus.

The literature substantiates the reasonableness of this study. Bradley (1987) reported on principals' seeking to ascertain their effectiveness by using a questionnaire. Unlike this research project, Bradley's study dealt with self-appraisals, a likely step omitted
from this study. Educators and members of boards of education throughout the world search for the ingredients, or variables, that create an atmosphere conducive to the achievement of boys and girls who attend their schools. It seemed appropriate to look at those variables and to examine teachers' perceptions of the principal's behavior in the handling of those variables. Interestingly, the one variable which unions and teacher organizations constantly report teachers' dissatisfaction with is discipline. Teachers report satisfaction with principals' behavior in discipline in this study.

Coleman found that schools are not the major determiner of a child's success in school. According to him, the type of home a child comes from is the major determiner of his success in school.

One issue which seems to support Coleman in this research is the fact that a positive correlation was found between student achievement in reading and mathematics and the number of parents who volunteer in the schools. This statistic would have been more revealing had we taken the opportunity to examine school-by-school results. Although the highest scoring
schools had the highest number of volunteers in their schools, they ranked low in the number of PTA members. This supports the research of Edwards (1987) which determined that the kind of activities in which parents participate determined student success in schools. Volunteering in the schools is more akin to participating in the instructional program than is attending PTA meetings. The research done by Brandt (1986) reported that parents of poor urban students are intimidated by academic factors and should be provided the opportunity to participate in more social aspects of the school. If parents of students who are not doing well in school do not participate, the question naturally arises as to whether students perform better because their parents participate, or do parents participate because their children do well?

Findings

Teachers were satisfied with the principals' behavior in the area of discipline, school climate, school communications, school community relations, and instruction. PTA memberships and volunteerism were both high. These represent all of the independent variables addressed in this study.
As reported in Table 15, there were significant relationships between 11 of the 14 hypotheses presented. In most instances the significant correlations were in pairs relative to the dependent variables of reading and mathematics. There were 3 non-significant relationships. Most of those were also in pairs relative to the dependent variables of reading and mathematics. The only variable which was split was discipline relative to the dependent variables of reading and mathematics. Discipline and reading did not have significant relationships.

The highest relationship between the variables was in PTA and Reading in Central focus schools (.96). The lowest relationship was Discipline and Reading in Central focus schools (.0). Schools which had a high number of volunteers did not have the highest number of PTA memberships. These schools did, however, have the highest test scores among the middle schools studied.

The study revealed that focus status was neither an issue in teachers' perceptions of principals' behaviors, nor was it an issue in the variable of parental involvement. The consistent acceptance and rejection of the null hypotheses across focus level
indicates that focus status was not an issue in teachers' perceptions of principals' behavior in handling the variables. This close range of mean scores was consistent with each of the variables.

Conclusions

The following conclusions are drawn based on the review of the literature and the analysis of data.

(1) Focus status did not appear to be a factor in examining the relationship between the variables. It did not matter if a school was area focus, central focus or local focus, teachers were generally satisfied with the principal's behavior in the areas of discipline, school climate, community relations, instructional leadership and communications.

(2) Focus status did not appear to be a factor in examining the relationship between the variables of student achievement and PTA membership. There were high and low membership numbers in all focus level schools.

(3) Teachers reported satisfaction with discipline. These were not select teachers, their ratings
indicating satisfaction with the principal's behavior in this area is likely indicative of a larger portion of teachers in this metropolitan school district.

(4) Strategies to get parents to join the PTA do not appear to have much impact on student achievement as would be indicated by the amount of effort put into this activity. Principals might better use those efforts in making parents feel comfortable about volunteering by designing programs in which they can participate.

(5) Although, the results relative to the relationships were significant, most were low. This fact might serve as a means for improving student achievement.

Implications

Based on the findings and conclusions, the following implications are drawn:

(1) The relationship between the variables can be raised by attending to the independent variables.

(2) Student achievement can be improved by strengthening the variables in this study.
(3) Teachers seem confused about the issues they should present to union and professional organizations' representatives, or

(4) Teachers may not have felt free to express their true opinions out of a concern that principals would read the questionnaire.

(5) Being labeled an area focus, local focus or central focus school does not effect teachers' perceptions of the principal's behavior in certain leadership activities.

Recommendations

(1) Principals should place more emphasis on involving parents in school activities. Towards this end, efforts should be made to ascertain parents needs. This can be done by administering a needs assessment to determine what they perceive their needs to be. Additionally, the principal should have available to parents, opportunities for involvement in social as well as academic activities.

(2) Opportunities, in the format of a forum, should be afforded teachers in order to provide activities
to express their concerns. Additionally, principals should communicate an openness which says teachers can express their honest opinions.

(3) Principals should give attention to strengthening the leadership areas of discipline, school climate, school community relations, school communications and instructional leadership in an effort to raise the level of relationship between these variables.

(4) This study should be replicated and include a self-assessment by principals. This is the method used by the Bell South People who developed the instrument used in this study. It is interesting to note how the perceptions of teachers are sometimes different from those of the principal. Often those differences are in favor of the principal.

(5) This study should be replicated with different leadership behaviors presented. Items such as showing favoritism or perhaps some open-ended questions which allow teachers to voice their concern relative to the lack of student achievement in their schools should be explored.
(6) This study should be replicated asking students' opinions of the principals' behavior in the crucial areas of leadership.

(7) Efforts should be made by principals. Channel these efforts to get parents to join the PTA in order to get parents more involved in other ways which are designed to improve student achievement.

(8) Principals should administer a needs assessment to parents to ascertain what they consider their needs to be. Design activities around parents strengths, not their weaknesses.

(9) Principals should build the trust of both parents and teachers in order to get both to express their concerns relative to school operations.

(10) Results of this study should be made available to principals in order for them to make necessary adjustments to their overall school program.
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APPENDIXES
APPENDIX A

INSTRUCTIONS—As you complete this questionnaire, please note that each item is preceded by the question, "How satisfied are you with the way your principal..." Your response choices are as follows: NO INFORMATION, HIGHLY DISSATISFIED, DISSATISFIED, NEITHER SATISFIED nor DISSATISFIED, SATISFIED, HIGHLY SATISFIED, NEITHER SATISFIED nor DISSATISFIED.

Rating Scale: NI HD D S HS NS
1 2 3 4 5 6

For each item check ( ) one point on the rating scale.

PRINCIPAL SCHOOL ENVIRONMENT

Discipline
1. Encourages teachers in ways to improve student behavior.
2. Encourages parents in ways to improve student behavior.
3. Encourages students to display appropriate behavior.
4. Is actively involved in discipline and control of students.

Climate
5. Avoids unnecessary classroom interruption.
6. Supports an environment that is conducive to collaboration.
7. Provides a stable and secure work environment.
8. Encourages attractive and organized class room.

School Communication

9. Asks for staff members' ideas on improving teaching and learning.

10. Helps others feel free to express their opinions.

11. Genuinely listens to others' ideas.

12. Responds to co-worker's suggestions in a timely manner.

13. Seeks information from staff about his or her performance.

**MULTIFACETED BEHAVIORS OF PRINCIPAL**

14. Is personally committed to the teaching and learning process.

15. Effectively facilitates the teaching/learning process.

16. Encourages staff development experiences in addition for formal academic programs.

17. Participates with staff if personal and professional development.

18. Leads by example.
19. Makes sure that the school's objectives are clearly understood.

20. Encourages students to make decisions in a timely manner.

Community Relations Promotor

21. Keeps parents and the community informed about the school and its programs.

22. Encourages and listens to ideas from parents and community members.

23. Works with dissenting individuals or groups within the community to reach understanding.
### Appendix B

**VOLUNTEER SERVICES SEMESTER REPORT**

**SECOND SEMESTER - 1988-89**

**AREA I**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>VOLUNTEERS</th>
<th>VOLUNTEER HOURS CONTRIBUTED</th>
<th>NUMBER OF STUDENTS SERVED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ELEMENTARY continued...</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS:</strong></td>
<td>1,619</td>
<td>13,214½</td>
<td>15,203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MIDDLE SCHOOLS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bunche</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sylvan</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS:</strong></td>
<td>159</td>
<td>856</td>
<td>3,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HIGH SCHOOLS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>1,270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglass</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>1,725</td>
<td>1,916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harper</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>1,209</td>
<td>1,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muys</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>1,290</td>
<td>1,527</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**VOLUNTEER SERVICES SEMESTER REPORT**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>VOLUNTEERS</th>
<th>VOLUNTEER HOURS CONTRIBUTED</th>
<th>NUMBER OF STUDENTS SERVED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MIDDLE SCHOOLS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coan</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Atlanta</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS:</strong></td>
<td><strong>156</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,099</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,879</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HIGH SCHOOLS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carver</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crim</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulton</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>1,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southside</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>1,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown Learning Center</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Volunteer Services Semester Report
### Second Semester - 1988-89

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>VOLUNTEERS</th>
<th>VOLUNTEER HOURS CONTRIBUTED</th>
<th>NUMBER OF STUDENTS SERVED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Middle Continued...</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>1,095</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walden</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>987</td>
<td>1,311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS:</strong></td>
<td><strong>587</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,287</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,651</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Schools</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archer</td>
<td>648</td>
<td>15,287</td>
<td>3,758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grady</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>2,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Fulton</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northside</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>282</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>1,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Fulton</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>1,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTALS:</strong></td>
<td><strong>908</strong></td>
<td><strong>17,193</strong></td>
<td><strong>8,916</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Area Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,242</strong></td>
<td><strong>31,227</strong></td>
<td><strong>23,818</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

VOLUNTEER SERVICES SECOND SEMESTER REPORT
1988-1989

The following data were tabulated from the information received on Volunteer Report Forms for the second semester of the 1988-89 school year. Services of volunteers were utilized by a total of 113 schools. A total of 9,171 volunteers were involved in rendering services to 71,638 students.

The volunteers contributed a grand total of 82,767 hours. If these services had been purchased at the minimum wage ($3.35 per hour), the cost would have been $277,269.45.

The students and staff of the Atlanta Public School System are indeed grateful to those individuals, organizations, businesses, institutions, and groups who have made contributions and provided services.
APPENDIX D

QUESTIONS FOR LOCAL FOCUS AND AREA FOCUS PRINCIPALS

1. What assistance did you get from the area staff?

2. Was your school audited during the 1988-89 school year by the area staff?

3. Did the area staff provide feedback after the audit?