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ABSTRACT

This research investigated the level of involvement, both actual and desired, of Iowa elementary principals in their schools' reading programs. The purpose was to determine if there existed a difference between what Iowa elementary principals actually did and what they desired to do in their involvement with specific reading-related tasks. This study sought to answer the following questions:

1. Do Iowa elementary principals view their actual knowledge of reading as different from a desired level of knowledge about reading?
2. Do Iowa elementary principals view their actual level of interaction with teachers as different from a desired level of principal-teacher interaction?
3. Do Iowa elementary principals view their actual level of planning and participation in reading inservice as different from a desired level of such inservice involvement?
4. How recently have Iowa elementary principals undertaken professional development in reading?
5. To what extent are reading specialists available to assist principals with reading questions and concerns?

The population for this study consisted of 750 Iowa elementary principals employed during the 1987 spring semester in Iowa. A random sample of 500 Iowa elementary principals received questionnaires.

The questionnaire, constructed in two parts, had 13 statements that dealt with specific reading-related tasks that the literature supported as being reasonable activities of elementary principals involved in their schools' reading programs. Information gathered by
the questionnaire was examined and summarized using both descriptive and inferential statistics.

Statistical analyses indicated a significant difference between Iowa elementary principals' actual and desired levels of involvement in their schools' reading programs. They want to improve their knowledge of reading and reading instruction. They desire to share ideas about reading with the teaching staff more often than they currently are able to share. Iowa elementary principals have a slightly higher level of actual involvement in reading inservice participation than in the other areas.

Based on the data several recommendations were made. Iowa elementary principals should continue to increase their knowledge of reading and reading instruction and interact with their teaching staffs in discussing reading and participating in reading inservices.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A student's success in reading has a bearing on his/her success in educational experiences. Hunter (1975) stated that in educational accomplishment reading maintains the position of the most critical indicator of success. Given the importance of reading, one should consider the numerous factors contributing to a school's successful reading program. In addition to appropriate materials and effective instruction, strong leadership is a necessary component in determining the success of an elementary school's reading program.

Recent professional publications discuss the leadership roles provided by elementary school principals, especially regarding the school's reading program. Hoffman and Rutherford (1984) noted:

If there is a single factor which approaches the status of 'necessary' condition in effective programs, it is the force of an instructional leader. That leader, it appears, will either be the principal with considerable expertise in reading or the principal working closely with a reading specialist. (p. 88)

Such interest in the principal's role in guiding the school's reading program is not strictly a current phenomenon. More than two decades ago several authors indicated the need for elementary principals to actively lead their schools' reading curricula (Austin & Morrison, 1963; Karbal, 1965; McHugh, 1967). Lobdell (1965) discussed important principles in a reading program; among them was quality leadership. He asserted that:

The primary leadership task in reading, as in every other aspect of the school program, is ours—the administrators. We have to show by our active support and our understanding that we are deeply, vitally concerned. (p. 16)
Elementary principals seem to be expected to provide knowledgeable leadership for the schools' reading programs. Several research studies have been conducted to determine whether knowledgeable leadership had been provided. Panchyshyn (1971) randomly surveyed 100 Iowa elementary principals and 400 of their primary-grade faculty members. He found principals to be as knowledgeable as primary grade-teachers about reading. He concluded that Iowa elementary principals were providing knowledgeable leadership to their schools' reading programs. A similar study was done in Nevada by Gehring (1977). He surveyed a random sample of elementary principals, focusing on their knowledge of reading and their leadership activities. He concluded that the principals provided knowledgeable leadership in their schools' reading programs and that a positive relationship existed between administrators' knowledge of reading and students' achievements in reading.

A major study supporting the importance of a principal being a knowledgeable leader was carried out by the New York State Office of Education (1974) on two inner-city schools. These schools were matched by socio-economic factors. One was a high-achieving school and one was low-achieving. This study indicated that the major differences between the two schools were factors that were under school control; the most notable finding was that the behavior of the principals was most influential. The principals of the high-achieving school provided knowledgeable leadership for the school's reading program. They supported and provided time for planning the reading program.
In spite of such research showing principals to be knowledgeable leaders of reading programs, classroom practitioners voice opinions regarding their principals' inability to provide timely, worthwhile assistance with questions relating to their schools' reading programs. Aldridge (1973) surveyed a representative population of elementary principals and elementary teachers throughout the Springfield, Missouri school district. From the data collected he concluded that classroom teachers did not consider their administrators to be the best source of support in reading instruction concerns. Only three percent of the teacher respondents listed principals as the best source of help for reading-related matters. A study by Zinski (1975) investigated the nature of the administrative involvement of principals in an elementary school's reading program. One hundred seventy elementary school principals from a large Wisconsin Cooperative Educational Agency responded to a survey about their involvement in their schools' reading programs. Zinski found that most principals were not involved in specific facets of their schools' reading programs and that they generally did not want to be involved in those areas. He concluded that if elementary school principals were to create a balanced schoolwide reading program that would lead to maturity in reading, they needed to be involved to a greater extent than they indicated.

The literature supports the idea that a successful school reading program is guided by a knowledgeable principal who has some degree of involvement in the reading program. Strong, instructional leadership has certain observable characteristics. The principal can do specific
things that illustrate knowledgeable leadership. Some studies (McNinch & Richmond, 1977; McNinch & Richmond, 1981; Mottley & McNinch, 1984) have sought to define specific principal actions that are crucial to providing knowledgeable leadership in a school's reading program. McNinch and Richmond (1977) developed a survey of 14 "DO- SHOULD" comparisons based on those principal actions deemed important by experts in the field of reading. Nearly 150 elementary school teachers responded to the survey. The authors concluded that survey respondents believed that principals should be more directly involved in the reading program. The survey respondents did not minimize the need for any of the specific actions included in the survey.

Mottley and McNinch (1984) determined that specific actions by elementary principals in five categories were important for providing knowledgeable leadership in the schools' reading programs. They formed their 50 statements of action based upon "a review of current literature and a position statement from the International Reading Association" (p. 81). The authors used five categories related to reading: (a) working with teachers, (b) working with students, (c) creating a building atmosphere, (d) providing policy leadership, and (e) building community support. From these categories they designed a questionnaire and randomly surveyed 200 elementary school principals in Georgia. Half the population responded to their actual (Does) performance and half responded to their ideal (Should) behaviors in directing the school reading program. The authors concluded that principals in the study felt very closely involved with most facets of
the reading programs under their direction. The principals confirmed that "many of the role responsibilities suggested by the literature are, in fact, executed at the building level by elementary principals. Principals . . . characterized their involvement by choosing labels of frequently and always to describe their performances" (p. 84).

A study by Manning and Manning (1981) of 204 elementary school principals from 18 states found strong agreement among principals regarding specific tasks for an elementary principal's involvement in the school's reading program. The purpose of the Mannings' study was to "gather data about principals' role perceptions related to the reading program" (p. 131). Among the authors' conclusions were that elementary school principals believed that they should:

1. Help teachers plan meaningful inservice activities in reading.

2. Participate with the teachers in reading inservice activities.

3. Give support to teachers in the reading program by doing such things as assisting with assessment and helping locate, evaluate, and select reading materials.

4. Be knowledgeable of what should be happening in an excellent reading program. (p. 133)

The literature provides a basis for accepting the notion that there are concrete actions a principal can undertake in guiding a reading program. However, there is lack of concurrence as to whether principals actually provide the desired leadership. Because there is no recent information on the actual involvement of Iowa elementary school principals in their schools' reading programs, this study could provide current information on how elementary principals in Iowa are involved in their schools' reading programs.
Statement of the Problem

The problem to be considered in this study is whether Iowa elementary principals perceive a difference between their actual involvement in performing specific reading-related tasks and their desired levels of involvement for these tasks. Gersten, Carnine, and Green (1982) concluded that principals need not carry out all the instructional support functions necessary for an elementary school, but instead, additional personnel should perform these activities. This is good news for principals already loaded with numerous administrative demands. Unfortunately, the fact remains, at least in Iowa, that decreasing financial support for specialized reading personnel demands that a building principal be prepared and willing to assume the leadership role necessary in guiding the schools' reading program.

The purpose of this study was to survey Iowa elementary principals regarding their level of involvement, both actual and desired, in specific reading-related tasks. Categories under consideration included: the principal's personal knowledge of and preparation for guiding a reading program, the principal-teacher interaction regarding reading matters, and the principal's support of and participation in reading inservice.

More specifically, this study was designed to answer the following questions:

1. Do Iowa elementary principals view their actual knowledge of reading as different from a desired level of knowledge about reading?
2. Do Iowa elementary principals view their actual level of interaction with teachers as different from a desired level of principal-teacher interaction?

3. Do Iowa elementary principals view their actual level of planning and participation in reading inservice as different from a desired level of such inservice involvement?

4. How recently have Iowa elementary principals undertaken professional development in reading?

5. To what extent are reading specialists available to assist principals with reading questions and concerns?

For this study the elementary principal will be defined as an Iowa administrator serving in elementary schools which include K-5, K-6, K-8, or a combination of grades five and below. Middle schools or intermediate schools serving, for example grades 6-8, are not included. The methodology, including random selection process and survey instrument, will be discussed in Chapter III. Some limitations of this study lie in the fact that the sampled population is solely from Iowa. Thus, it would be misleading to attempt to generalize conclusions. Also, the survey instrument relies on self-assessment which may prevent respondents from being as objective as possible.

Learning about the current level of involvement of Iowa elementary principals in their schools' reading programs and noting if principals feel they are operating at a desired level could provide information of considerable worth. Knowing the present status could influence principals' preparation for guiding reading programs, create awareness of possible changes to improve an existing structure, or
solidify certain practices in regard to guiding a school's reading program.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Principal's Importance

Numerous professional publications and research studies have cited the importance of the principal to the school's reading program. Barnard and Hetzel (1976) commented that: "The key to the improvement of reading rests with the principal. By the very nature of the position, the principal is responsible for providing the impetus to improve the school reading program" (p. 386). They believed that the human factor is the critical variable in a successful school reading program, and that the principal's actions can be the basis for building an effective program.

Nelson (1983) researched the question: Do principals make a difference in the reading achievement of students? He selected eight studies done during the 1970s that represented valid and extensive research to determine the impact of school principals on student reading achievement. In all eight studies principal leadership behavior was positively associated with reading achievement. Nelson deliberately chose to review studies in which "the research was conducted in schools categorized as 'effective' based on the operational definition of reading achievement" (p. 1). From his synthesis of the eight studies, Nelson concluded: "If the instructional programs at a given school are to be successful, it is imperative that the principal be an active participant . . . and provide teachers with meaningful information about the reading curriculum" (pp. 11, 12). Hoffman and Rutherford (1984) also
reviewed some major studies of reading program effectiveness at the elementary school level. All of the schools studied had effective reading programs, and in each situation there was a component of strong, knowledgeable leadership. The researchers commented on the importance of the principal to the school's reading program. They concluded that "Administrative behavior had a significant impact on school effectiveness. An improving school had a principal who assumed the role of instructional leader" (p. 85).

A report from Philadelphia schools by Kean, Summers, Raivetz, and Farber (1979) noted the principal's influence in the school's reading program. These researchers, over a three-year period, studied fourth grade classes of Philadelphia public schools by using questionnaires and making on-site visits. The researchers found that in those elementary schools having the highest reading achievement scores, the principals were former reading professionals with experience necessary to provide active leadership for their schools' reading programs. The most successful schools in their study were administered by individuals who were committed to reading and the reading program.

A noted reading authority, Durkin (1974), after studying reading instruction in numerous classrooms, concluded that "school-wide excellence in reading instruction exists only when a principal has a very special concern for reading" (p. 9).

In his book The Principal's Guide to Improving Reading Instruction, Hillerich (1983) stressed the importance of the principal in providing leadership to a school's reading program. While he did not advocate that the principal be a reading expert, he recommended
that "the principal must be a model and must know enough about the
teaching of reading to assess its effectiveness, to set priorities, to
ask the right questions, and to know where to turn for answers"
(p. x).

The literature supports the belief that an effective elementary
reading program is guided by an instructional leader with experience,
commitment, and concern. Specific characteristics or behavioral
elements that comprise these noteworthy descriptors must be
considered.

Principal's Knowledge of Reading

Baumann (1984) reviewed literature on school effectiveness and
drew several implications for the improvement of reading instruction
in an elementary school. He found that strong instructional
leadership was typically manifested by certain characteristics. One
such characteristic in an elementary school principal was considerable
personal knowledge of reading instruction.

McHugh (1967) illustrated the importance of a knowledge base from
which to make meaningful suggestions and effective leadership
decisions regarding the reading program. In a study of California
school districts, he found that upgrading the ability of the principal
to provide knowledgeable supervision of the reading program had a
positive effect on student achievement. He commented on what he had
observed among principals in regard to their knowledge bases:

In far too many situations, the principal is poorly trained for
the emerging school curriculum that is rapidly developing. He
has the title of 'instructional leader' but neither the skills
nor breadth and depth of background in each curriculum area
... for example, in reading. He considers supervision of
primary grade reading programs either too sensitive or too delicate. (p. 23)

McHugh was careful to point out that the principal's plight was not of his/her own making, and that when provided with knowledge about reading instruction, a principal was more involved, especially in primary reading instruction.

Rauch (1974) also made a strong statement about the importance of an administrator's personal knowledge about reading. He said, "An administrator who knows about the reading process can mean the difference between success or failure of a school's reading program" (p. 297). He recognized the many roles a reading leader is expected to fulfill and felt that one of the primary responsibilities was to be currently informed of the research and literature on reading practices. This personal knowledge made a crucial difference in the decision making for the good of the total reading program.

In their discussion of the importance of the principal's personal knowledge of the reading process, Otto and Erickson (1973) indicated that as long as the principal was responsible for the building's reading program, there had to be knowledge for guiding the program. They stated that "the principal must have more than a superficial knowledge of the skills to be taught, the sequence from level to level, the methods of diagnosis, and the total program effectiveness" (p. 19). They believed that any administrator who found weaknesses in his/her personal knowledge base had to take steps necessary to improve deficiencies.
Shepherd (1966) echoed other authors in his belief that an administrator must acquire knowledge about reading and how it is taught and then use this knowledge as the basis for sound leadership of the reading program. Shepherd suggested specific areas of knowledge about which principals should be informed. Some of them included: "various approaches to classroom management, fundamental mechanics of basal readers, a systematic development of skills, techniques of diagnosis, best children's books, and leading methods of effecting corrective reading instruction" (p. 28).

It would almost seem that elementary principals face an overwhelming task in acquiring a level of knowledge of the reading process that various authors indicate as minimally necessary for effective leadership. However, Greene (1966) noted that teachers did not expect their principals to be able to do things better than themselves, but rather to have the knowledge to judge properly and to appreciate effective, well-taught reading lessons. He concluded that the principal needed sufficient knowledge and background from which to offer practical aid where needed.

After reviewing many research studies, Harris (1976) determined that "the principal should be well-informed about reading instruction" (p. 49). He found, however, that many elementary principals had little or no formal instruction in reading methodology and little or no personal experience in teaching reading. Thus, principals needed to improve their levels of knowledge and understanding about reading processes.
Laffey (1980) called the principal the "key change agent" and stressed the need for a knowledge base from which to make decisions about the school's reading program. In his summary of research he concluded:

Among other things, the principal needs to establish reading as a priority in the academic curriculum; to act as the key change agent in adopting new programs (insuring adequate resources and materials, providing inservice training, and judiciously supporting experimentation); to act as a constructive evaluator; and to present the reading program in a favorable light to the community at large. (p. 634)

**Principal's Interaction With Teachers**

A second characteristic of effective reading leadership is the interaction between a principal and the building teachers as shown through classroom observations and staff exchanges. In a study by DeGuire (1981) teachers from ten schools were surveyed with a 40-item questionnaire to determine their perceptions about the principal's role in the school's reading program. One conclusion drawn related to the principal's interaction with teachers. The teachers felt that the amount of time the principal observed in the classroom was nearly as important as the principal's knowledge of reading. Further, it was concluded that, ideally, the principal should create regular opportunities for staff discussions about the strengths and weaknesses of the reading program and problematic areas.

In Nelson's (1983) review of studies of effective schools, he found that interaction between principals and teachers with regard to classroom activities seemed to be a foundation for academic success. In effective schools principals had specific plans for dealing with reading problems and communicated these plans to the staff. The
teachers reported receiving professional and supervisory help from their principals through classroom visits, staffings, and clear two-way communications.

Harris (1976) summarized important functions of the principal regarding the elementary school's reading program. One was purposeful interaction with teachers. An example cited was that the principal should be sensitive to difficulties, especially for newer, inexperienced teachers, in teaching reading. Additionally, the principal was urged to stimulate teacher interest in reading improvement through open communications and staff meetings.

In the Philadelphia Report Kean, Summers, Raivetz, and Farber (1979) looked at practices in fourth grade classrooms that made a difference in students' reading achievement. The authors found that the more principals were involved in direct observation in the classrooms, the better the pupils performed on reading tests.

Similar conclusions were drawn by Scofield (1979). She stated that one element making a difference in having a strong reading program was the principal acting as a supervisor in the classroom. When interacting with the teachers through classroom visits, the principal needed to look for specific aspects, such as the use of skill sheets, diagnostic procedures, or management components so that particular strengths and weaknesses within an observed reading lesson could be openly, pointedly discussed by the teacher and principal at a later conference.

Both Baumann (1984) and Berger and Bean (1975) stressed the importance of principal-teacher interaction through classroom
observation. Strong instructional leadership was manifested in part by ongoing observations and evaluations. A significant element of the observation process included follow-up meetings with the teacher to provide feedback.

In their study of schools with excellent reading programs, Manning and Manning (1981) found a high percentage of agreement among principals regarding the importance of principal-teacher interaction. They reported:

Ninety percent of the principals said they assist teachers with the diagnosis of students' reading difficulties, and 96% reported that they review reading achievement data with teachers, noting strengths and needs as revealed by those data. The same number of principals (90%) stated that they help teachers locate, evaluate, and select appropriate reading materials. (p. 132)

This high degree of interaction serves to foster a healthy atmosphere and positive morale within the school.

A study by Mottley and McNinch (1984) found that in the area of "working with teachers," principals felt only somewhat involved. The researchers examined principals' perceptions of various involvement areas in their schools' reading programs. They found that generally "principals perceive themselves as active leadership agents . . ." (p. 84), but a notable exception to principals' positive perceptions of involvement was in the category that delineated principal-teacher interaction.

Though some administrators may be only somewhat involved, encouragement of good reading teaching practices through principal-teacher interaction is an important function of the building administrator. Sherwood (1977) commented that:
A brief commendation from a knowledgeable administrator can rejuvenate a tired teacher whose enthusiasm is beginning to wane. On the other hand, an authoritarian or excessively critical principal can damage the reading program by lowering the teachers' self-confidence. (p. 2)

Another proponent of positive administrator-teacher interaction, Avery (1972) wrote about the obligations of a principal in providing leadership to the reading program. He addressed the importance for a principal to be both alert and responsive to the basic needs of faculty members. To illustrate the power of classroom observation as one manner of developing interaction, Avery commented:

Few educational researchers have been able to measure the effect of the principal's attitude on reading instruction as accurately as the first grade teacher who stated matter-of-factly that, 'Every time my principal walks into the classroom, the temperature drops thirty degrees.' (p. 13)

Inasmuch as negative interactions fail to foster open two-way communications between a principal and teacher, absence of classroom visits and supervisory observations does not necessarily improve principal-teacher interaction. A teacher's fear of the building principal visiting the classroom at an inopportune moment might eventually revert to hope that the administrator would indeed visit and offer help for unsolved, recurring problems with the reading program. In any case, the principal's absence solves nothing.

**Principal's Involvement in Inservice**

One might wonder how principals already in charge of a building can improve their levels of knowledge. Obviously, attending college courses, reading professional publications, observing master teachers, and participating in conferences can foster growth of a knowledge base. Another important source of knowledge is inservice education.
In fact guidance of and participation in reading in-service sessions is a third characteristic of effective reading leadership that is discussed in the literature.

In referring to the importance of reading in-service, McHugh (1967) stated:

If improved school practice in reading is to be achieved, the principal . . . is the chief agent . . . to bring about change. Therefore, it follows that the principal as well as the teacher needs additional skill to improve reading instruction through participation in continuous reading in-service. (p. 25)

McHugh studied a California reading in-service program that required principals and first grade teachers from the same buildings to attend in-service sessions simultaneously. Principals initially felt skeptical and resistant, but after several sessions both teachers and principals felt they had been provided more skill and knowledge. Principals believed that they had acquired a background from which to provide help in primary reading instruction.

Many other authors have discussed the importance of principals taking an active role in reading in-service sessions. Avery (1967) advised that one way an administrator could establish the role of an instructional leader was to implement an ongoing in-service program in conjunction with the reading curriculum. Both teachers and administrators would participate in order to keep abreast of current issues, trends, and research in reading. Likewise, Hahn (1967) advised principals to participate in reading in-service sessions. He felt one way to avoid inconsequential in-service was by having administrators lead the way in devising, implementing, and attending reading in-service. Moss (1985) was careful to point out that the
principal's role exceeds scheduling an occasional inservice activity. In her view the building administrator needed to commit time and effort to the reading program through staff development and through personal participation in exemplary language-learning activities.

In their study of schools having excellent reading programs, Manning and Manning (1981) asked principals, "What should a principal do to improve a school's reading program?" One hundred percent of the respondents reported that principals should participate with their staff members in inservice reading activities. Most of the principals (97%) believed they should provide the leadership necessary to help teachers plan meaningful inservice reading activities. It was not sufficient for a principal to merely introduce an inservice speaker and then politely be excused to the office to cope with administrative demands.

If, as the literature suggests, principals are supposed to provide leadership to the reading inservice sessions, one could ask just how these building administrators are supposed to acquire the needed skills. Cox (1978) noted that because the effectiveness of the reading program depends largely on the leadership capabilities of the principal, inservice training was needed for principals in reading processes, reading programs, and supervisory strategies.

St. John and Runkel (1977) stressed the need for principals to participate in inservice training. In their overview of the current situation, they perceived administrators as sitting in on various inservice offerings "when the spirit moved them or their feet got tired" (p. 66). Even the successful completion of the best
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administrative preparation program does not assure that school principals will have the needed competencies and skills for effective instructional leadership during on-the-job demands. St. John and Runkel strongly stated that:

> All administrators need to be committed to continuing study programs and self-renewing activities if they hope to maintain professional competence and superior performance. All educational personnel, regardless of position, age, and level of competence, can benefit from some form of effective inservice training. (p. 67)

It is perhaps the case that administrators need reading inservice from knowledgeable reading personnel before they can assume the roles of guiding their building staffs in meaningful reading inservices.

Logan and Erickson (1979) presented evidence regarding principals' participation in reading inservice sessions. They surveyed 204 elementary teachers about their inservice programs. Among the responses they sought were teachers' ratings of both quantity and quality of principal involvement in inservice programs. On a scale of one to five, the largest percentage of ratings, on both quantity and quality, fell at the lowest point. Most teachers rated the quantity of principals' participation as "very limited" and the quality as "not helpful." Obviously, in the teachers' opinions, the principals were not obtaining the inservice experience deemed desirable.

Otto and Erickson (1973), Rauch (1974), and Sanacore (1974) all offered specific suggestions for principals in determining the content, scope and sequence, and evaluation of reading inservice sessions at the building level. Building administrators must initiate
action to improve the reading programs and utilize their authority to provide substitutes, released time, and appropriate materials for reading inservices.

An observation by Miller (1977) stressed the need for administrators to lead by example in diligently improving skills through participation in appropriate inservice sessions. He made the point that:

> Usually, it is those at the top who make decisions about who needs inservice experiences and what the nature and content of those experiences should be . . . Everyone must improve his/her skills . . . for the ultimate in effectiveness and efficiency. (p. 31)

The literature on reading inservice conveys a distinct message: effective reading programs have instructional leaders knowledgeable about reading and committed to initiating, guiding, and, most importantly, participating in reading inservices designed to meet the needs of individual buildings.

**Principal's Assistance From Specialists**

The literature supports the idea that an elementary principal, in order to have an effective reading program in the school, must be an instructional leader. Knowledge about reading and reading instruction, a positive interaction with staff members through classroom visitation and clear two-way communication, and commitment to meaningful reading inservice for both him/herself and teachers are characteristics of such an instructional leader. There are, however, dissenting opinions about the need for principals to be the ultimate instructional leaders in their schools. Gersten et al. (1982) felt that "the current theme of 'principal as instructional leader'---and
all its nostalgic yearning . . ." (p. 49) was perhaps out of line with what could actually happen. In their study of urban schools they found other factors guiding instruction. They commented:

We believe that those components of effective leadership, which we label instructional support functions, need not all be carried out by the building principal. Realistically, most schools will need more than one person to adequately carry out all of these activities anyway. (p. 49)

Another article indicating that it is not always necessary for site administrators to be actively involved in instructional leadership discussed a federally funded Follow Through program. Meyer, Gersten, and Gutkin (1983) detailed how a compensatory education program thrived in an inner-city school for 13 years with seven different principals whose attitudes toward the program varied from outright hostility to indifference. In situations where the building principal had not been an active instructional leader, the job was handled by carefully trained supervisors and staff consultants.

The assertion of some authorities that consultants can assume roles of instructional leaders should be considered with caution. McHugh (1967) pointed out that consultants, because of their excellent skills and experience, are natural sources of information for principals experiencing difficulties in the reading program. However, there is a cautionary note:

Consultants, for the most part, are spread too thin—too many schools, too many teachers, too many subjects to supervise. Unfortunately, in many states consultant services are so poor that a supervisor has little impact on instruction within a school. (p. 24)
The key consideration here is the time factor. For the principal to rely solely on a reading consultant to guide the school's reading program leaves the program adrift.

Mentioning the consultant in a school's reading program is not done so that an extensive investigation can be undertaken in this study. For the purpose of this study there is merely an interest in the extent of availability of services from extraneous reading support personnel. Principals with sincere concern for their schools' reading programs and who have daily access to reading specialists may provide different types of responses than similarly concerned principals whose buildings are visited monthly or less frequently by reading specialists.

The fact that principals want to be involved with the schools' reading programs is evidenced in recent studies (Manning & Manning, 1981; McNinch & Richmond, 1981; Mottley & McNinch, 1984). Principals perceive themselves as closely involved with some aspects of their programs and want to substantially increase their involvement and assume even more direct action. Mottley and McNinch (1984) after surveying elementary principals, found that "principals see their instructional roles as that of a secondary support, leaving supervision of teachers to department chairpersons and reading specialists" (p. 84). Undoubtedly, this is a comfortable position for those principals who feel inadequate to knowledgeably confront and solve problems in the reading program. It goes without saying, however, that if consultant/specialist services are fragmented and not
available exactly when needed, the reading program suffers from want of a leader.

Conclusion

It would seem from the review of literature that an effective school reading program must have a strong instructional leader. Some of the components of this instructional force include personal knowledge about reading instruction and the reading process, interaction with teachers through classroom visitation, staff discussions, and two-way communications about reading and specific reading problems, and a commitment to the development of and participation in appropriate reading inservice training. Although some authors feel this leadership could be accomplished by carefully prepared supervisors and/or consultants, the prevailing attitude among researchers and authorities is that the role of instructional leader can and should be held by the elementary principal.

Perhaps it would seem that an elementary principal is called on to function in too many roles. He/she must tend to both administrative and supervisory tasks and must answer to parents, superintendents, salesmen, school board members, custodians, bus drivers, and numerous others. In Iowa it is not too unusual for the elementary principal to also serve as the superintendent. Nor is it at all unusual for an elementary principal to be in charge of more than one attendance center. How, among the myriad of responsibilities, does an elementary principal become an instructional leader of the school's reading program?
The literature offers specific characteristics that can be acquired to bolster personal knowledge and expertise. It further illustrates several cases where the principal does fulfill the role of instructional leader. Additionally, the idea is supported that principals want to be instructional leaders. In spite of the desire, many principals find themselves bogged down in administration.

A recent report from a commission of the Southern Regional Education Board has indicated that principals need to be better educated for the role of instructional leaders in their schools (Jaschik, 1986). While this commission's conclusions may not be generalized to Iowa principals, the report's suggestions about the need for principals to be instructional leaders reinforce the research pertinent to leadership of reading programs in particular.

By surveying Iowa elementary principals to gain their perceptions of their involvement in their schools' reading programs, the investigator acquired an overall sense of whether or not reading leadership was evidenced. Useful information was also provided by an analysis of the principals' perceptions about their levels of actual and desired levels of involvement. The methodology of the investigation is described in the next chapter.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This research investigated the level of involvement, both actual and desired, of Iowa elementary principals in their schools' reading programs. The purpose was to determine if there existed a difference between what Iowa elementary principals actually did and what they desired to do in their involvement with specific reading-related tasks.

This study sought to answer the following questions:

1. Do Iowa elementary principals view their actual knowledge of reading as different from a desired level of knowledge about reading?

2. Do Iowa elementary principals view their actual level of interaction with teachers as different from a desired level of principal-teacher interaction?

3. Do Iowa elementary principals view their actual level of planning and participation in reading inservice as different from a desired level of such inservice involvement?

4. How recently have Iowa elementary principals undertaken professional development in reading?

5. To what extent are reading specialists available to assist principals with reading questions and concerns?

The Sample

The population for this study consisted of Iowa elementary principals who were employed during the 1987 spring semester in Iowa. There are 926 elementary schools in Iowa, but the number of principals is fewer. Numerous individuals are responsible for more than one
building site. There are also individuals serving, not only as an elementary principal, but also in another capacity, often that of superintendent. Each individual was listed only once thus avoiding name duplication.

The sample was randomly selected from among the total Iowa elementary principal population. An alphabetized list of Iowa school districts, generated by the Iowa Department of Education, provided 926 names of Iowa elementary schools and their principals. A total population of 750 was obtained by omitting duplicated names of those individuals assigned to more than one building. A sample of 500 elementary principals was obtained from the population by selecting every other name on the list. After going through the list once, the same procedure was used again until the random sample of 500 selected participants was reached.

**Instrumentation**

The data for the study were collected through the use of a questionnaire. Literature dealing with questionnaire construction was consulted and a preliminary form was prepared (Borg & Gall, 1983). The questionnaire was refined through consultation with a panel of specialists. The specialists represented the areas of statistics and research, elementary administration, reading instruction, and literature and composition. A copy of the survey instrument is included in Appendix A.

The questionnaire was constructed in two parts. In the first section 13 statements dealt with specific reading-related tasks which the literature supported as being reasonable activities of elementary
principals involved in a school's reading program. Five statements pertained to the elementary principal's knowledge of reading, five statements pertained to the interaction between the teachers and the elementary principal, and three statements pertained to the elementary principal's planning of and participation in reading inservice. For the first section respondents assessed their actual level of involvement as well as their desired level of involvement for specific reading-related tasks. Additionally, each respondent gave a reason for a difference between the actual and desired levels of involvement if a difference existed.

Written instructions preceding the 13 reading-task statements directed respondents to indicate their level of involvement using an evaluative Likert scale from "Never," "Seldom," "Occasionally," to "Regularly." Numbers one through four were arbitrarily assigned to the scale and a quantitative index of the evaluation measure was generated.

The second section of the questionnaire requested demographic data: (a) sex and age of the respondent, (b) highest degree held and major area of concentration, (c) recency of course work in reading, (d) recency of attendance at a reading-related professional meeting, (e) teaching and administrative positions held, (f) number of years as an administrator, (g) current position, (h) district size, (i) availability of and provisions for reading specialists, (j) teachers' attendance at professional meetings dealing with reading.
Use of the Instrument

The cover letter and questionnaire were initially given to 20 elementary school principals. This sample was representative of the total population. All of the questionnaires were returned with no unanswered items or significant written comments. It was assumed, therefore, that the instructions were understood and that the intent of the questionnaire was clear. No changes were made in the questionnaire format or content.

In April of 1987 the questionnaire, a cover letter, and a stamped, self-addressed envelope were mailed to 500 Iowa elementary principals. After four weeks 295, or 59%, of the 500 questionnaires had been returned. In order to have statistical significance at the 95% confidence level, a total of 244 responses was needed. Thus, because the number of returns provided more than the required number, no follow-up was conducted.

The information gathered by the questionnaire was examined and summarized using both descriptive and inferential statistics. Along with reporting the data, observations and summaries were included with each statement of reading-related activity. Statistical measures used in the analysis of the data included frequencies, percentages, the mean, median, mode, and range. Additionally, relationships between statement responses and demographic information were analyzed. These statistical measures included the chi-square test of independence, the t-test of correlated means, the analysis of variance, and the Pearson correlation coefficient. Statistically significant values were reported in the findings.


Limitations

One methodological limitation of the study was collection of data by a questionnaire. A disadvantage of the questionnaire is the possibility of misinterpretation by respondents. Questionnaires often elicit a lower completion rate than other instruments.

Further it cannot be assumed that nonresponse was randomly distributed throughout the sample. No information existed about the involvement and characteristics of the approximately 40% who did not respond to the questionnaire.

While the questionnaire guaranteed confidentiality, it did rely on self-perceptions. Thus, another limitation related to the fact that individuals might not have been totally objective in their responses. There are many individuals, regardless of anonymity, who do not want to admit negative factors about themselves.

Finally, a limitation existed in the fact that the questionnaire was answered only by Iowa elementary principals. Therefore, the results of this study were generalizable only to this state and not representative of other geographical areas.
CHAPTER IV
ANALYSIS OF DATA

This research investigated the level of involvement in reading-related tasks, both actual and desired, of Iowa elementary school principals. Also, when a difference existed between what the respondent actually did and what the respondent desired to do, an opportunity was available to give reasons for the difference. A review of literature provided the basis for 13 statements about reading-related tasks that were considered reasonable activities of elementary principals involved in their schools' reading program.

The investigator, with the assistance of specialists in the field, developed a questionnaire that was mailed to 500 randomly-selected Iowa elementary principals. The questionnaire, divided into two sections, elicited responses about the levels of involvement in the reading program and demographic details of the respondents. Based on the returned data, conclusions were drawn about the level of involvement of Iowa elementary school principals in their schools' reading programs.

Demographic Description

A demographic description of the Iowa elementary school principals who participated in this study is presented in Table 1. The information includes sex, age, highest degree held, major area of concentration, number of years in education and as a school administrator, and district size. The data are presented by number and percentage of response; mean, median, range, and mode are included where applicable.
Table 1

Demographic Characteristics of the Iowa Elementary School Principals Participating In the Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>89.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 292</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 35 years</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45 years</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46-55 years</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>38.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 or older</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 285</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Degree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>69.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist's</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ed.D.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 295</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major Area of Concentration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Administration</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>79.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and Instruction</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance and Counseling</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 264</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
Variable | Number | Percentage
--- | --- | ---
**Total Years of Educational Experience**
Under 10 years | 27 | 9.2
11-20 years | 94 | 32.1
21-30 years | 120 | 41.0
31-40 years | 48 | 16.3
41 or more | 4 | 1.4

\(N = 293\)
Mean = 22.60 Median = 23.21 Mode = 24

**Total Years of Administrative Experience**
Under 10 years | 98 | 33.4
11-20 years | 120 | 41.0
21-30 years | 64 | 21.8
31 or more | 11 | 3.8

\(N = 293\)
Mean = 14.73 Median = 14.88 Mode = 15

**Size of School District**
999 students or fewer | 145 | 49.5
1000 students or more | 148 | 50.5

\(N = 293\)

Note. Ns may vary from 264 to 295 due to omissions in entry data.

Among the 292 respondents, 10.3% were female and 89.7% were male. This percentage of female response is slightly higher than the total 9% female population among Iowa elementary principals as stated by the Iowa Department of Education. Ages of the 285 principals responding ranged from 28 years to 64 years of age with the mean age at 46.86 years and the median at 47.71 years. The majority (69.8%) of respondents held a master's degree as their highest degree, and
one-fourth (25.4%) had attained a specialist's degree; a small number (4.8%) held doctorate degrees.

Respondents indicated not only their highest degree obtained, but also their major area of concentration. A large majority (79.1%) of the 264 respondents listed in some descriptive manner the area of Educational Administration. The next largest category was Elementary Education with 17 (6.4%) respondents. The numbers and percentages for the seven other areas of concentration are small (see Table 1).

The respondents' years of educational experience ranged from a minimum of three years to a maximum of 45 years; the mean was 22.60 years and the median was 23.21 years. A similar range occurred in the respondents' number of years as a school administrator. The minimum was one year and the maximum number of years as a school administrator was 36; the mean was 14.73 and the median was 14.88 years.

Regarding district size the respondents were almost evenly divided. The number of respondents serving districts of 999 students or fewer was 145 or 49.5%, and 148 respondents or 50.5% served districts which have 1,000 or more students enrolled.

In addition to the demographic statistics presented thus far, respondents also indicated their teaching and administrative experiences and their current position. These multiple-response answers are shown in Table 2. Among the 289 respondents who indicated their teaching experiences, there were a total of 636 responses. About half or 49.5% indicated primary or middle grade teaching. Two hundred seventy-six or 43.4% of the responses indicated teaching experience at the junior high and/or secondary level(s). There were
45 of the 289 responding principals (15.6%) who indicated that they had taught a reading course.

Table 2

Teaching and Administrative Experience, Past and Current, of Iowa Elementary School Principals Participating In the Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>(Multiple Response Answers)</th>
<th>% of Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching Experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Grades</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Grades</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Grades (7-9)</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary (10-12)</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taught Reading Course</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N = 289</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Administrative Experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Principal</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>57.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior High/Intermediate Principal</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Principal</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Consultant</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N = 290</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Position</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal of One School</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>57.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal of Two or More Schools</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal and Superintendent</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N = 294</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Ns may vary from 289 to 294 due to omissions in entry data.
The respondents' administrative experiences were concentrated with more than half of the 489 responses (57.2%) at the elementary level. There were 147 or 30.1% of the responses indicating junior high and/or secondary administrative experience. Fifty-six (11.5%) of the total responses indicated experience as a superintendent, and only six (1.2%) had served as a reading consultant.

While over half (57.7%) of the responses indicated responsibility for only one building site, the remainder (42.3%) of the responses indicated assignment to multiple administrative duties. Numerous individuals (18.2%) served at least two buildings, others (15.0%) were both an elementary principal and the district's superintendent, and yet others (9.1%) listed among their responsibilities teaching duties, counseling duties, or curriculum directing assignments. Appendix B contains specific responses reported by responding principals.

The overall demographic characteristics presented a typical respondent who was male, about 47 years old, involved in education for over 20 years, 14 of which had been as an administrator, and who held a master's degree in Educational Administration. Additionally, the typical respondent had teaching experience at the elementary level, had previous experience as an elementary administrator, and was currently responsible for one building site.

Analyses of Statements of Involvement

Knowing a demographic profile of the respondents is instructive in examining responses to individual items relating to reading program involvement. The questionnaire contained 13 statements of reasonable reading-related activities which elementary principals could perform.
Each respondent rated the actual level of involvement as "Never," "Seldom," "Occasionally," or "Regularly." Further, each respondent rated the desired level of involvement with the same descriptors. When a difference existed between the actual level and the desired level, respondents were to check reasons for the difference between the two conditions.

By assigning numerical values of 1, 2, 3, and 4 to the four levels of involvement, it was possible to compute the mean response for both the actual level of involvement and the desired level of involvement. A t-test of correlated means comparing the actual to the desired levels of involvement was performed for each of the 13 statements in the questionnaire.

Statement number one asked respondents to rate the extent to which they "Read current professional periodicals specifically dealing with reading." Table 3 shows the number and percentage of responses for both the actual and desired involvement levels. A majority (55.9%) of the respondents indicated they occasionally read reading-related periodicals, and 62 or 21.0% regularly read such material. At the desired level of involvement 275 or 93.2% indicated a desire to read professional periodicals dealing with reading either occasionally or regularly. The majority (65.1%) wanted to do so on a regular basis. For the first statement the mean response for the principals' actual involvement was 2.92; the desired level mean response was 3.66. The difference in means was statistically significant ($t = 19.80; p = .000$).
Table 3
Read Current Professional Periodicals Specifically Dealing With Reading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Actual Involvement</th>
<th>Desired Involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>55.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 shows the responses 183 principals gave to explain why there was a difference between the actual and desired levels of involvement. Among the 243 responses more than half (60.1%) indicated a lack of time to read current professional periodicals dealing specifically with reading. There were 50 or 20.5% of the responses which indicated that principals read other professional publications instead, and 42 or 17.3% responses showed reliance on others to keep principals informed of reading trends and information.

Statement number two of the questionnaire asked respondents to indicate to what extent they "Share with teachers current ideas and materials pertinent to reading instruction." The number and percentage of responses for both actual and desired levels of involvement are in Table 5. Over half (58.7%) of the respondents
indicated that they occasionally share reading-related instructional ideas with the teaching staff; a smaller number (21.0%) of respondents indicated that they actually do so on a regular basis. A large majority (89.9%) of the respondents indicated at the desired level of involvement they would like to share such ideas either occasionally or regularly. For this statement the mean response at the actual level was 2.95, while the mean response for the desired level was 3.55. The difference in mean scores was statistically significant (t = 15.82; p = .000).

Table 4
Reasons For Not Being Able To Achieve Desired Level of Involvement For Statement Number One

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons (Multiple Response Answers)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of time to do so.</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>60.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read other professional publications instead.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone else keeps me informed of current reading trends.</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other varied reasons.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 shows the reasons for 145 respondents not being able to achieve the desired level of involvement. Among the 169 responses 49.7% indicated a lack of time to share ideas; 30.8% of the responses showed that someone else shares current ideas with the
staff. Some of the varied, written responses included a "lack of expertise," "no system for information dissemination," and that "other administrative duties come first." The latter comment would coincide with a response to lack of time.

Table 5
Share With Teachers Current Ideas and Materials Pertinent To Reading Instruction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Actual Involvement</th>
<th>Desired Involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>58.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statement number three of the questionnaire asked principals to indicate the extent to which they "conduct in-class demonstrations of reading instruction." As shown in Table 7, of the total responses 254 or 86.1% indicated that they never or seldom conducted reading-instruction demonstrations. Only five individuals did so on a regular basis. Among the responses at the desired level of involvement there were 42 respondents or 14.2% who indicated they never desired to conduct in-class reading-instruction demonstrations and 65 or 22.0% of the respondents who seldom desired to do so. Less than half of the
respondents (46.8%) indicated that this activity was one they desired to do on an occasional basis. For the third statement the mean response at the actual level was 1.61, and the mean response at the desired level was 2.56. The difference in mean scores was statistically significant ($t = 20.61; p = .000$).

Table 6
Reasons For Not Being Able To Achieve Desired Level of Involvement For Statement Number Two

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons (Multiple Response Answers)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of time to do so.</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>49.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have no information to share.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone else shares current ideas with staff.</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other varied reasons.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reasons for not being able to achieve the desired level of involvement are shown in Table 8. More than one-third (35.5%) of the responses noted a lack of time to conduct in-class demonstrations of reading instruction, and a slightly larger percentage (36.4%) indicated principals felt unprepared to do this. Among the written responses six principals explained the presence of reading professionals who were called on to conduct reading-instruction demonstrations. One respondent wrote, "I see a need to do this at
times when an evaluation demonstrates the need"; another individual wrote, "I am an administrator, not a reading specialist."

Table 7

**Conduct In-Class Demonstrations of Reading Instruction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Actual Involvement</th>
<th>Desired Involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>50.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8

**Reasons For Not Being Able To Achieve Desired Level of Involvement For Statement Number Three**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons (Multiple Response Answers)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of time to do so.</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel unprepared to do this.</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone else takes care of this.</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other varied reasons.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The fourth statement in the questionnaire asked respondents to indicate to what extent they "Communicate with the school media person about current juvenile literature." Table 9 shows the total responses. At the actual level of involvement, 119 or 40.3% of the respondents indicated they never or seldom communicate with the media person about children's literature; 133 individuals or 45.1% indicated that they occasionally visit about juvenile literature with the media person. At the desired level of involvement there were 55 or 18.6% of the respondents who never or seldom wanted such interaction, whereas a majority (72.9%) of the respondents wanted such communication on an occasional or regular basis. For this statement the mean response for the actual level of involvement was 2.56; the mean response for the desired level of involvement was 2.99. The difference in mean scores was statistically significant ($t = 10.65; p = .000$).

Table 9

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Actual Involvement</th>
<th>Desired Involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>45.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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In Table 10 there is shown the distribution of reasons given by 86 respondents for principals not being able to achieve the desired level of involvement. As with other reading-related tasks, lack of time was noted in over half (57.1%) of the 91 responses. The reason given in more than one-fourth (28.6%) of the responses is simply that there is no media person in the building. Among the written responses some principals indicated the presence of a "library aide on staff" or a "district media specialist" who may attend to the school's needs as scheduling permits.

Table 10

Reasons For Not Being Able To Achieve Desired Level of Involvement For Statement Number Four

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons (Multiple Response Answers)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of time to do so.</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is no media person.</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other varied reasons.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents' levels of involvement as they "Assist teachers in interpreting pupils' reading test data" are reported in Table 11. More than three-fourths (78.6%) of the principals indicated that they occasionally or regularly help in this regard. Among the 295 respondents only 59 or 20.0% never or seldom assisted with
interpreting reading test data. At the desired level of involvement 241 or 81.7% of the respondents desired to do this reading-related task on an occasional or regular basis. For the fifth questionnaire statement the mean response for the actual level of involvement was 3.13; the desired level of involvement mean response was 3.40. The difference in mean scores was statistically significant ($t = 7.94; p = .000$).

Table 11

**Assist Teachers In Interpreting Pupils' Reading Test Data**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Actual Involvement</th>
<th>Desired Involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12 shows the reasons for not being able to achieve the desired level of involvement. Of the 77 responses given by 57 responding principals, 30 or 39.0% indicated a lack of time, 22 or 28.6% indicated a lack of expertise in interpreting pupils' reading test data, and 23 or 29.8% showed that someone else monitors test data. One respondent wrote, "All experienced teachers are able to do
this themselves." Many principals might feel that the teaching staffs are interpreting pupils' reading test data to a sufficient degree without administrative assistance.

Table 12

Reasons For Not Being Able To Achieve Desired Level of Involvement For Statement Number Five

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons (Multiple Response Answers)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of time to do so.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack expertise in this area.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone else monitors test data.</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other varied reasons.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statement six of the questionnaire asked principals to indicate the extent that they "Discuss with teachers the importance of reading in their school." Table 13 summarizes their levels of involvement. Among the 295 respondents only one individual never discussed the topic and only one never desired such discussions. There were 87 or 29.5% who did so on an occasional basis and 188 or 63.7% who regularly had such discussions. At the desired level of involvement 56 or 19.0% of the respondents wanted to have such discussions on an occasional basis, and the majority, 206 or 69.8% desired this interaction on a regular basis. For this statement, the mean response for the actual
level of involvement was 3.56, and the desired level mean response was 3.75. The difference in means was statistically significant ($t = 6.52; p = .000$).

Table 13

Discuss With Teachers the Importance of Reading In Our School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Actual Involvement</th>
<th>Desired Involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>29.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>63.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14 shows that only 42 of the 295 respondents noted a reason for not being able to achieve the desired level of involvement. Half of the responses indicated a lack of time for such discussions, but 13 responses (27.1%) noted feeling unprepared to have such discussions with teachers about the importance of reading.

Questionnaire statement number seven asked principals to indicate the extent that they "Conduct observations during reading classes." Their responses are shown in Table 15.
Table 14

Reasons For Not Being Able To Achieve Desired Level of Involvement For Statement Number Six

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons (Multiple Response Answers)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of time to do so.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel unprepared to do this.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone else stresses the importance of reading.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other varied reasons.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15

Conduct Observations During Reading Classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Actual Involvement</th>
<th></th>
<th>Desired Involvement</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>64.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Of the 295 respondents 280 or 94.9% indicated that they occasionally or regularly conduct observations during reading classes. The largest group is those who do so on a regular basis, 167 or 56.6%. At the desired level of involvement there were 189 or 64.1% of the respondents who indicated that they desired to conduct such observations on a regular basis. For statement number seven the mean response for the principals' actual level of involvement was 3.51; the mean response for their desired level of involvement was 3.70. The difference in mean scores was statistically significant ($t = 7.05; p = .000$).

Table 16 shows the reasons 49 principals reported for not being able to achieve their desired level of involvement. Of the 52 responses a large majority (84.6%) indicated a lack of time while six responses (11.6%) indicated a lack of preparation to conduct observations during reading classes.

Table 16

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of time to do so.</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>84.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feel unprepared to do this.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone else observes reading lessons.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other varied reasons.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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On the questionnaire statement number eight asked principals to mark the extent that they "Describe to others the reading program used in the school." Table 17 delineates the responses. Among the 295 respondents 105 or 35.6% never or seldom described their reading program to others. One hundred thirty-three or 45.1% did so occasionally, and 52 or 17.6% respondents regularly described their reading program to others. At the desired level of involvement there were 43 or 14.6% of the respondents who never or seldom wanted to discuss the reading program with others, but nearly three-fourths (74.9%) felt that they wanted to do so on an occasional or regular basis. The mean response at the actual level for statement number eight was 2.74; the mean response at the desired level was 3.02. The difference in mean scores was statistically significant \( t = 8.31; \ p = .000 \).

Table 17

Describe To Others the Reading Program Used In My School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Actual Involvement</th>
<th>Desired Involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>45.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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There were 76 responses provided by 70 principals indicating reasons for not being able to achieve the desired level of involvement. These are shown in Table 18. For this statement "lack of time to do so" was not considered to be as important a condition for difference between actual and desired levels as was the condition, "lack of opportunity to do so." Forty-six or 60.5% of the responses indicated no opportunity to discuss the school's reading program, and 18 or 23.7% of the responses indicated that someone else described for others the school's reading program. One respondent wrote, "Others don't often ask about it or show interest in the school's reading program."

Table 18
Reasons For Not Being Able To Achieve Desired Level of Involvement For Statement Number Eight

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons (Multiple Response Answers)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of opportunity to do so.</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>60.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of knowledge about reading program.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone else performs this function.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other varied reasons.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statement number nine in the questionnaire asked principals to indicate the extent to which they "Promote recreational reading at all grade levels." Table 19 shows the responses. Among the total
responses at the actual level of involvement no one indicated that they never promote recreational reading. There were 29 or 9.8% who seldom do so, 71 or 24.1% who occasionally do so, and 193 or 65.4% who indicated that they regularly promote recreational reading. At the desired level of involvement there was a small number of individuals (2.4%) who seldom desired such promotional activity, 59 or 20.0% of the respondents indicated that they occasionally wanted such reading promotion, and 203 or 68.8% desired to promote recreational reading at all grade levels on a regular basis. For this statement the mean response at the actual level was 3.53; for the desired level of involvement the mean response was 3.73. The difference in mean scores was statistically significant ($t = 7.13; p = .000$).

Table 19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promote Recreational Reading At All Grade Levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 20 indicates the reasons of 39 principals not being able to achieve the desired level of involvement. As with many of the statements, over half (55.8%) of the 43 responses were a condition of lack of time. Among the written responses for this statement 8 of the 15 indicated that someone else, either teachers or specialists, took care of promoting recreational reading at all grade levels.

Table 20

Reasons For Not Being Able To Achieve Desired Level of Involvement For Statement Number Nine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons (Multiple Response Answers)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of time to do so.</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>55.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate recreational reading materials are not available to my school(s).</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other varied reasons.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statement number ten on the questionnaire asked principals to indicate to what extent they "Participate as a functioning member of the school's reading committee." Table 21 shows the number and percentage of responses. At the actual level of involvement, 31 or 10.5% of the total respondents never participated on the school's reading committee; a slightly higher number, 41 or 13.9% indicated that they seldom do so. Of the 295 respondents 216 or 73.2% noted that they occasionally or regularly participate; nearly half (49.1%)
of the total number of respondents did so regularly. At the desired level of involvement 30 or 10.2% wanted to never or seldom participate. More than three-fourths (77.9%) of the respondents desired an occasional or regular level of reading committee participation. For the tenth statement the mean response at the actual level of involvement was 3.15; the mean response for the desired level was 3.48. The difference in mean scores was statistically significant ($t = 7.84; p = .000$).

Table 21

**Participate As a Functioning Member of the School's Reading Committee**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Actual Involvement</th>
<th>Desired Involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22 shows the reasons for principals not being able to achieve the desired level of involvement with reading committee participation. Among the 79 total responses, one individual indicated a lack of interest, 27 or 34.3% of the responses indicated too many other committee assignments, and 37 responses (46.8%) indicated that
other people provided the leadership for the school's reading committee. Of the 14 written responses, 11 of them indicated that no reading committee existed in the building.

Table 22

Reasons For Not Being Able To Achieve Desired Level of Involvement For Statement Number Ten

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons (Multiple Response Answers)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of interest to do so.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have too many other committee assignments.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone else provides leadership.</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other varied answer.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On the questionnaire statement number eleven asked principals to indicate to what extent they "Participate in reading inservice sessions along with the teachers." Table 23 shows the responses. Among the 295 responses, 57 or 19.3% of the principals indicated that they never or seldom participate in reading inservice sessions. One hundred two or 34.6% noted they occasionally participate, and 134 or 45.4% do so on a regular basis. At the desired level of involvement only 11 or 3.7% of the respondents wanted to never or seldom participate in reading inservice sessions, 105 or 35.6% desired to participate occasionally, and 157 or 53.2% desired to participate on a
regular basis. For the actual level of involvement in reading inservice sessions participation, the mean response was 3.19, and at the desired level of involvement the mean response was 3.53. The difference in mean scores was statistically significant ($t = 9.74; \ p = .000$).

Table 23
Participate In Reading Inservice Sessions Along With the Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Actual Involvement</th>
<th>Desired Involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>45.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What principals indicated as reasons for not being able to achieve the desired level of involvement in reading inservice participation is shown in Table 24. There were 98 total responses; over half (54.1%) indicated a lack of time. Thirty-eight or 38.8% noted that someone other than the principal attends reading inservice sessions along with the teachers.
Table 24
Reasons For Not Being Able To Achieve Desired Level of Involvement For Statement Number Eleven

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons (Multiple Response Answers)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of time to do so.</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone else attends in place of the administration.</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other varied reasons.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The twelfth statement on the questionnaire asked principals to indicate the extent they "Encourage teachers to evaluate the quality and usefulness of reading inservice." The number and percentage of responses are shown in Table 25. At the actual level of involvement there were 65 or 22.1% of the respondents who indicated they never or seldom encourage reading inservice evaluations. Two hundred twenty-eight or 77.2% indicated that they occasionally or regularly do so. At the desired level of involvement 30 or 10.2% indicated they never or seldom wanted to encourage inservice evaluation, and 241 or 81.7% indicated a desire to do so occasionally or regularly. For this statement the actual level of involvement mean response was 3.09, and the desired level of involvement mean response was 3.38. The difference in means was statistically significant ($t = 8.31; p = .000$).
Table 25

Encourage Teachers To Evaluate the Quality and Usefulness of Reading Inservice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Actual Involvement</th>
<th>Desired Involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>16.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>41.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 26 shows the reasons of 55 principals not being able to achieve the desired level of involvement in encouraging teachers to evaluate reading inservice. Among the 58 total responses 13 or 22.4% indicated a lack of time, 25 or 43.1% of the responses noted that no evaluations are required, and 20 or 34.5% of the responses indicated that someone else encourages inservice evaluation.

The final statement of the questionnaire asked principals to indicate the extent to which they "Encourage teachers to present their ideas during reading inservice sessions." Table 27 shows the number and percentage of responses at both the actual and desired levels of involvement. Among the 295 respondents 55 or 18.7% indicated that they never or seldom encourage teachers to share their own ideas during reading inservice. Those who occasionally do so number 104 or
35.2%, and 133 or 45.1% do so regularly. At the desired level of
involvement 242 or 82.0% of the respondents indicated a desire to
occasionally or regularly encourage teachers to share their own ideas
for reading inservice sessions. For this statement the mean response
at the actual level was 3.18, while the desired level mean response
was 3.45. The difference in mean scores was statistically significant
\(t = 7.72; p = .000\).

Table 26
Reasons For Not Being Able To Achieve Desired Level of Involvement For
Statement Number Twelve

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons (Multiple Response Answers)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of time to do so.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No evaluations are required.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>43.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone else encourages inservice evaluation.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other varied reasons.</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reasons from 58 principals not being able to achieve the desired
level of involvement are shown in Table 28. Among the 65 total
responses 18 or 27.7% indicated a lack of time, but the largest
number, 29 or 44.6% of the responses indicated that the teachers are
reluctant to share their ideas at reading inservice sessions.
Table 27

Encourage Teachers To Present Their Ideas During Reading Inservice Sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Actual Involvement</th>
<th>Desired Involvement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasionally</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regularly</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>45.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Data</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 28

Reasons For Not Being Able To Achieve Desired Level of Involvement For Statement Number Thirteen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons (Multiple Response Answers)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of time to do so.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No opportunity for my input in planning.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers seem reluctant to share their ideas.</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other varied reasons.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The analyses thus far have dealt with the numbers and percentages of responses for all 13 statements dealing with Iowa elementary principals' levels of involvement in reading-related tasks. A t-test of correlated means comparing the actual level of involvement to the desired level of involvement showed statistically significant differences ($p = .05$) for each of the 13 statements dealing with reading-related tasks.

**Analysis of Research Questions**

**Question One**

The purpose of this study was to investigate the role of the Iowa elementary school principal in the school's reading program. There were five specific questions that addressed the issue. The first question was, "Do Iowa elementary principals view their actual knowledge of reading as different from a desired level of knowledge about reading?" There were five statements on the questionnaire to which principals indicated their actual and desired levels of knowledge about reading. The five statements inquired to what extent the principals: (a) read current professional periodicals specifically dealing with reading, (b) conducted in-class demonstrations of reading instruction, (c) assisted teachers in interpreting pupils' reading test data, (d) described to others the reading program used in the school, and (e) promoted recreational reading at all grade levels. An analysis of the combined data for these five statements using Pearson correlation coefficients showed a moderate to strong positive correlation between what the principals actually know about reading and what they desire to know.
about reading ($r = .703; p = .000$). Mean responses for actual and desired levels were 2.78 and 3.27. A $t$-test of correlated means of the five combined statements showed a statistically significant difference in means ($t = 22.91; p = .000$). There was a difference between what Iowa elementary principals view as their actual knowledge of reading compared to a desired level of reading knowledge.

**Question Two**

The second research question asked, "Do Iowa elementary principals view their actual level of interaction with teachers as different from a desired level of principal-teacher interaction?"

Five statements from the questionnaire addressed this issue of interaction. Respondents were asked to indicate to what extent they: (a) shared with teachers current ideas and materials pertinent to reading instruction, (b) communicated with the school media person about current juvenile literature; (c) discussed with teachers the importance of reading in the school, (d) conducted observations during reading classes, and (e) participated as a functioning member of the school's reading committee. Analysis of the congregate data using Pearson correlation coefficients indicated a moderate to strong positive correlation between the actual and desired levels of interaction ($r = .736; p = .000$). The mean response for the combined statements at the actual level of interaction was 3.14, while that of the desired level was 3.49. A $t$-test of correlated means for the congregate data showed a statistically significant difference ($t = 16.63; p = .000$). There was a difference between what principals viewed as their actual level of interaction compared to their desired level of principal-teacher interaction.
Question Three

The third question addressed by this research was, "Do Iowa elementary principals view their actual planning and participation in reading inservice as different from a desired level of such inservice involvement?" Three questionnaire statements dealt specifically with inservice concerns. Respondents indicated to what extent they:
(a) participated in reading inservice sessions along with the teachers, (b) encouraged teachers to evaluate the quality and usefulness of reading inservice, and (c) encouraged teachers to present their ideas during reading inservice sessions. As with the foregoing research questions the individual statements were previously analyzed; numbers and percentages of responses were presented for each of the three questionnaire items. An analysis of the combined data through Pearson correlation coefficients yielded a somewhat strong positive correlation between the actual and desired levels of reading inservice involvement \( r = .815; p = .000 \). The actual level mean response for the combined statements was 3.16; the desired was 3.45. A \( t \)-test of correlated means showed a statistically significant difference \( t = 11.57; p = .000 \). For the third research question there was a difference between the principals' view of their actual planning and participation in reading inservice as compared to their desired level of such inservice involvement.

Question Four

Question number four of the research asked, "How recently have Iowa elementary principals undertaken professional development in reading?" In the second part of the questionnaire two questions
addressed this item. Respondents were asked two questions: (a) If you have taken reading or reading-related courses at the undergraduate or graduate level, in what year did you take your last course?, and (b) In what year did you last attend a professional meeting or conference dealing with reading resources and practices? Table 29 reports the numbers and percentages of responses to the question regarding recency of reading course work. Among the 233 principals who responded, 54 or 18.3% of them had taken a reading-related course within the past five years, while 45 or 15.3% had had a reading course between six to ten years ago. The largest group of respondents, 134 or 45.4%, indicated that they had not taken any reading course in 11 or more years.

Table 29

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 or fewer years</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 or more years</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>45.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No data</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It was instructive to note if there existed any difference between males and females in terms of their recency of coursework. The mean response for female principals was 15.60 years since taking
any reading coursework, while the mean response for the males was
17.45 years. An analysis of variance (Appendix C) was performed to
find whether gender of the respondents was related to recency of
coursework in reading. There was no statistically significant
difference between females and males in their recency of reading
coursework ($F = 0.185; df = 1,241; p = .668$).

Regarding the second question relating to recency of reading
coursework, Table 30 shows the numbers and percentages of
responses. Nearly three-fourths (74.3%) of the total population had
attended a conference or professional meeting dealing with reading
resources and practices within the past two years. Because the
question asked respondents to tell what year they had attended such a
conference, those who indicated 1987 were grouped in the category of
"less than one year," and those who indicated attendance in 1986 or
1985 were grouped in the "one or two years" category. The remaining
respondents, 47 or 15.9%, indicated such conference attendance in 1984
or earlier. When comparing the data from Tables 29 and 30, it appears
that principals' professional development in reading is accomplished
more through professional meeting and conference attendance than
through recent reading or reading-related coursework.

**Question Five**

The final research question of the study asked, "To what extent
are reading specialists available to assist principals with reading
questions and concerns?" The questionnaire asked respondents to check
those descriptors relevant to reading specialist/consultant service to
their schools. Table 31 indicates the multiple responses
given. Only 17 or 4.5% of the total responses indicated routine visits on either a weekly or monthly basis. The largest group of responses, 131 or 34.9% indicated that a reading specialist was available if given advance notice. Seven individuals (1.9%) indicated that the reading specialist was frequently unable to come in person to address reading concerns, but 50 or 13.3% noted that the reading specialist was an integral member of the school's reading team.

Table 30

Number of Years Since Attending a Reading Conference

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than one year</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One or two years</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>40.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three or more years</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No data</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>295</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 32 indicates the source of reading specialist service. More than half of the total responses, 166 or 61.9%, indicated that services of a reading specialist were provided by one of the 16 area education agencies in Iowa. Those served by their school district reading specialist number 78 (29.1%); only 24 or 9.0% of the responses indicated the presence of a reading specialist within their own school building. From the numbers and percentages provided by the respondents, one could conclude that services by a reading specialist
were provided primarily by the area education agency and that the specialist was available when given advance notice or about as often as needed. There was little indication that a reading specialist was immediately able to address reading-related concerns.

Table 31
Reading Specialist or Reading Consultant Services To the School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response (multiple response answers)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% of responses</th>
<th>% of cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Routine weekly visit</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine monthly visit</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available as often as needed</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>33.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Available if given advanced notice</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently unable to come in person</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integral member of school's reading team</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District or agency does not provide specialist</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>128.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 291

It is instructive to note that district size has no significant bearing on provision of reading specialist. Chi-square analysis (Appendix D) of district size with presence of an area education agency reading specialist showed no difference in services ($X^2 = .055; df = 1; p = .815$). Those districts of 999 or fewer students had only 28 instances (50.9%) of no reading specialist services from an area.
education agency; districts of 1000 or more students had only 27 (49.1%) such instances. An additional chi-square analysis (Appendix E) was performed on district size with presence of a reading specialist in the building. Again there was no difference in services ($X^2 = 1.071; df = 1; p = .301$). There were nine instances (39.1%) in districts of 999 or fewer when a reading specialist was present in the school building; in districts of 1000 or more there were 14 (60.9%) instances of such presence.

Table 32
Source of Reading Specialist or Reading Consultant Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response (multiple response answers)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% of responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area Education Agency</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>61.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Own School</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 246

Additional Analyses

The overall comparison of Iowa elementary principals' actual level of involvement in their schools' reading program to their desired level of involvement was analyzed. The mean response of the 13 statements of reading-related activities of the actual level was 3.01, while that of the desired level was 3.40. A $t$-test of correlated means showed a statistically significant difference.
(t = 21.52; p = .000). It thus appears that in general Iowa elementary principals view a difference between their actual and desired levels of involvement in their schools' reading programs.

Data for the respondents' current positions, as discussed in the demographic profile, were examined in an analysis of variance (Appendix F). Results showed that there was significant interaction (F = 6.446; df = 3,287; p = .000). It seems that those respondents who indicated their current position at only one building had a higher overall level of involvement in the school's reading program than did those who served two or more school buildings and also those who served jointly as elementary principal and superintendent. A comparison of mean responses is illustrative. Actual level of involvement mean response for those principals serving only one building was 3.11; for those serving two or more buildings, 2.99; for those acting as both principal and superintendent, 2.79. This finding is perhaps not unusual in that greater position responsibility would preclude a high level of involvement in an elementary school reading program.

Additional analysis of variance was performed on the data that indicated respondents' teaching experience at the primary level. Since reading instruction is a strong component of primary teaching, it was instructive to note whether those Iowa elementary principals with primary teaching background had a higher actual level of involvement in the school's reading programs than did those without such experience. The analysis of variance (Appendix G) showed that there was no statistically significant difference between the
respondents with primary teaching experience and those without 
($F = 1.053; df = 1,290; p = .306$).

Throughout the second part of the questionnaire several of the 
questions eliciting demographic information provided respondents an 
opportunity to indicate reading-related background information. Table 
33 shows the numbers and percentages of those respondents with 
specific reading-related experience. Only 53 or 19.0% of the 
respondents indicated reading background in one or more areas.

Table 33
Overall Reading Background of Iowa Elementary Principals Responding To 
Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading-Related Experience</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>82.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majored in reading</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majored in and taught reading</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majored, taught, and consulted</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taught reading</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taught and consulted in reading</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulted in reading</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 295
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Seven respondents indicated their major area of concentration to have been reading (2.4%), while only one respondent had served as a reading consultant (.3%) prior to becoming an elementary school principal. Of the total 53 respondents with reading background, the largest group was those who had taught reading, 39 or 13.3%.

An analysis of variance was performed for each of the 13 statements of involvement at the actual level comparing those respondents with a reading background and those without any reading background experience. Table 34 shows the number of respondents in each category, the mean response, the standard deviation, and F-value, and the level of significance. There were six of the 13 statements which had a statistically significant difference ($p < .05$) between the two groups. Respondents with reading background experience had a significantly higher level of actual involvement in the following reading-related tasks: (a) read current professional periodicals, (b) share current reading ideas, (c) conduct in-class reading demonstrations, (d) discuss juvenile literature with the media person, (e) discuss the importance of reading in the school, and (f) describe the reading program to others. Among the remaining seven statements concerning reading-related activities there was no statistical difference in actual level of involvement between those with reading background experience and those without.

Regarding the desired level of involvement between those with reading background experience and those without such experience, similar comparisons as those in Table 34 were made for each of the 13 statements of involvement (Appendix H). There were fewer areas of
Table 34

Means, Standard Deviations, and F Values of Actual Levels of Involvement of Respondents With Reading Background and Those Without Reading Background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement of Involvement</th>
<th>Group Number</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Read current professional periodicals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 293</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With reading background</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>.669</td>
<td>9.048</td>
<td>.003*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without reading background</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>.703</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share current reading ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 294</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With reading background</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>.643</td>
<td>4.396</td>
<td>.037*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without reading background</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>.685</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct in-class reading demonstrations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 292</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With reading background</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>.894</td>
<td>4.993</td>
<td>.026*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without reading background</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>.709</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement of Involvement</th>
<th>Group Number</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Discuss juvenile literature with media person  
 N = 292                                                                                  |              |       |       |        |                    |
| With reading background                                                                | 53           | 3.00  | .809  | 14.193 | .000*              |
| Without reading background                                                              | 239          | 2.50  | .883  |        |                    |
| Assist teachers with reading test data                                                 | N = 291      |       |       |        |                    |
| With reading background                                                                | 52           | 3.33  | .734  | 2.668  | .104               |
| Without reading background                                                              | 239          | 3.13  | .821  |        |                    |
| Discuss the importance of reading in the school  
 N = 293                                                                               |              |       |       |        |                    |
| With reading background                                                                | 53           | 3.75  | .515  | 5.445  | .020*              |
| Without reading background                                                              | 240          | 3.54  | .633  |        |                    |
| Conduct reading class observations  
 N = 294                                                                                   |              |       |       |        |                    |
| With reading background                                                                | 53           | 3.66  | .478  | 3.695  | .056               |
| Without reading background                                                              | 241          | 3.49  | .606  |        |                    |
### Statement of Involvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Number</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Describe the reading program to others</strong>&lt;br&gt;N = 290</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With reading background</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>.756</td>
<td>9.889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without reading background</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>.791</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promote recreational reading across all grades</strong>&lt;br&gt;N = 293</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With reading background</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>.618</td>
<td>1.472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without reading background</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>.677</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participate on school's reading committee</strong>&lt;br&gt;N = 288</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With reading background</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>1.080</td>
<td>.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without reading background</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>1.020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Participate in reading inservice</strong>&lt;br&gt;N = 293</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With reading background</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>.783</td>
<td>1.286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without reading background</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>.876</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(table continues)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement of Involvement</th>
<th>Group Number</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encourage reading inservice evaluations</td>
<td>N = 293</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With reading background</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>.952</td>
<td>1.400</td>
<td>.238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without reading background</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>.878</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage teachers to share ideas at inservice</td>
<td>N = 292</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With reading background</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>.875</td>
<td></td>
<td>.401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without reading background</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>.867</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. *Significant at the .05 level of confidence. N's may vary from 291 to 294 due to omissions in entry data.*
difference between the two groups. At the actual level six reading-related tasks had a statistically significant difference, while at the desired level there were only four areas with significant difference ($p = .05$). An overall comparison of the two groups indicated a significant difference in the actual level of involvement in the school's reading program (Appendix I). The mean response for actual involvement of those respondents with reading background experience was 3.22, while those without such experience had a mean overall response of 3.00. An analysis of variance showed an $F$-value of 10.933 with a significant level of .001.

There was no difference between the two groups in the area of reading inservice related tasks. Respondents without reading background experience were as involved in this area as were those respondents with reading background. Appendix J indicates an analysis of variance for actual level of involvement in reading inservice activities for the two groups. No statistically significant difference existed ($F = 1.716; df = 1,290; p = .191$).

Summary

Chapter IV has analyzed the data from the 295 respondents who answered the questionnaire. Analyses of each of the 13 reading-related task statements were presented. Actual levels of involvement were compared to the desired levels of involvement. In each instance a $t$-test of correlated means indicated a statistically significant difference between what Iowa elementary principals actually do in their involvement in the schools' reading programs and in what they
desire to do. Additionally, reasons were presented to illustrate why differences existed between the actual and desired levels.

Further analyses were performed on combined data in order to answer five research questions posed for this study. Involvement indices for both actual and desired levels were examined in three areas: (a) respondents' knowledge of reading, (b) respondents' interaction with teachers, and (c) respondents' planning of and participation in reading inservice. Demographic data provided a basis for examining recency of professional development in reading and the availability of reading specialists.

Finally, information about reading background experience was analyzed in view of actual and desired levels of involvement in reading-related tasks. Comparisons were made between those respondents with reading background experience and those without such experience to note any statistically significant areas. Chapter V will present conclusions and recommendations based on the data analyses.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This research study investigated whether Iowa elementary school principals perceive a difference between their actual levels of involvement in performing specific reading-related tasks and their desired levels of involvement for such tasks. The study sought to answer the following questions:

1. Do Iowa elementary principals view their actual knowledge of reading as different from a desired level of knowledge about reading?

2. Do Iowa elementary principals view their actual level of interaction with teachers as different from a desired level of principal-teacher interaction?

3. Do Iowa elementary principals view their actual level of planning and participation in reading inservices as different from a desired level of such inservice involvement?

4. How recently have Iowa elementary principals undertaken professional development in reading?

5. To what extent are reading specialists available to assist principals with reading questions and concerns?

The population for this study consisted of Iowa elementary principals employed during the 1987 spring semester in Iowa. A randomly selected sample of 500 principals was obtained from an alphabetized list of Iowa school districts. Although there are 926 Iowa elementary schools, there are only 750 elementary principals due to multiple building assignments. Thus the total population of 750 individuals was reduced to a sample of 500 by selecting every other
name from the listing. The process of alternative name selection was
done twice in order to acquire the sample.

Data for the study were collected through the use of a
questionnaire which was constructed in two parts. In the first
section 13 statements dealt with specific reading-related tasks which
the literature supported as being reasonable activities of elementary
principals involved in a school's reading program. Respondents were
asked to what extent they were involved in the following tasks:

1. Read current professional periodicals specifically dealing
   with reading.

2. Share with teachers current ideas and materials pertinent to
   reading instruction.

3. Conduct in-class demonstrations of reading.

4. Communicate with the school media person about current
   juvenile literature.

5. Assist teachers in interpreting pupils' reading test data.

6. Discuss with teachers the importance of reading in the
   school.

7. Conduct observations during reading class.

8. Describe to others the reading program used in the school.

9. Promote recreational reading at all grade levels.

10. Participate as a functioning member of the school's reading
    committee.

11. Participate in reading inservice sessions along with the
teachers.
12. Encourage teachers to evaluate the quality and usefulness of reading inservice.

13. Encourage teachers to present their own ideas during reading inservice sessions.

In the first section of the questionnaire respondents assessed their actual and desired levels of involvement for each of the 13 reading-related statements. Additionally, each respondent gave a reason for a difference between the actual and desired levels of involvement if a difference existed. Participants were directed to indicate their level of involvement using an evaluative Likert scale from "Never," "Seldom," "Occasionally," to "Regularly." Numbers one through four were arbitrarily assigned to the scale and a quantitative index of the evaluation measure was generated. A t-test of correlated means comparing respondents' actual level of involvement in the 13 reading-related tasks to their desired involvement level indicated a statistically significant difference in every instance (p = .05).

The second section of the questionnaire requested demographic data: (a) sex and age of the respondent, (b) highest degree held and major area of concentration, (c) recency of course work in reading, (d) recency of attendance at a reading-related professional meeting, (e) teaching and administrative positions held, (f) number of years as an administrator, (g) current position, (h) district size, (i) availability of and provisions for reading specialists, (j) teachers' attendance at professional meetings dealing with reading.

The survey instruments, initially answered by 20 elementary school principals representative of the total population, were
returned with no unanswered questions or written comments. It was assumed, therefore, that the instructions were understandable and the questionnaire's intent was clear. Following the pilot study, the research instrument was sent to the 500 Iowa elementary principals who comprised the sample. Of the questionnaires mailed out, 59% were returned. Information gathered from the questionnaire was examined using both descriptive and inferential statistics. Based on the data, numerous conclusions can be drawn regarding Iowa elementary school principals' actual and desired levels of involvement in their schools' reading programs.

Conclusions

Drawn From Reading-Related Task Statements

It is informative to look at individual statements of reading-related tasks in light of mean response. If the mean response for any given statement were 3.00 or higher, one could conclude that principals perform the task at least on an "occasional" basis. While eight of the 13 statements had an actual level mean response above 3.00, there were five statements with such mean response at less than 3.00. In these five areas the respondents were more likely to "never" or "seldom" perform the specific task. The lowest mean response (1.61) was for the statement asking the extent to which principals conduct in-class demonstrations of reading. This low level of involvement perhaps hinges on the fact that in order to feel comfortable conducting in-class reading demonstrations, one would need an adequate knowledge base about teaching reading and, perhaps, elementary teaching experience background from which to draw
confidence. In indicating reasons for a difference between what they actually did and what they desired to do, 36.4% of the responses noted a feeling of being unprepared to conduct in-class reading demonstrations.

For the statement relating to in-class reading demonstrations the mean response at the desired level (2.56) was still less than an "occasional" level of performance. Perhaps the respondents generally believe that conducting in-class reading demonstrations is an activity that does not need to be done very often. Principals might feel that competent teachers, already doing a good job, do not need examples of modeling. One respondent wrote that such modeling might be appropriate only if "an evaluation demonstrates the need"; but overall, respondents indicated this reading-related task to be one of low priority.

Another statement with less than an "occasional" performance level was the item which asked respondents to indicate the extent to which they "Communicate with the school media person about current juvenile literature." The actual mean response for this statement was 2.56. Again with this statement respondents felt no need to perform this activity on an occasional or regular basis. Perhaps principals rely on the good judgment of classroom teachers to expose the students to quality children's literature. Thus, there would be no need for the principal to interact frequently with the media person in order to become personally acquainted with current juvenile offerings in the media center. In citing reasons for a difference between the actual and desired levels, respondents noted lack of time and lack of a
media person. The former reason hinges on the number of administrative obligations in other areas, while the latter is perhaps a result of school district finances. In any case, respondents generally indicated that this reading-related activity was another item with a low priority.

A third statement with a less than occasional mean response dealt with the extent to which principals describe the reading program to others. The actual level mean response was 2.74. In giving reasons for the difference between actual and desired levels, the majority (60.5%) of the responses cited a lack of opportunity to discuss the reading program. Perhaps those principals who do not discuss their reading programs with others like parents or school board members could devise opportunities to share what is happening with reading in their schools. Undoubtedly there would be times when the principals met with parents or spoke to a parent-teacher association meeting. Even if no one specifically asked, "What is happening in the school's reading program?", principals could use such opportunities to point out positive attributes of the schools' reading programs. Strong or rising test scores, individual classroom projects, statewide writing competitions involving their own students, and numerous other instances of reading activity would be the type of reading program information that could be shared even if the opportunity for such sharing might be artificially manufactured.

Two more statements: (a) Read current professional periodicals specifically dealing with reading, and (b) Share with teachers current ideas and materials pertinent to reading instruction, had an actual
mean response only slightly lower than an occasional performance level. The mean responses were 2.92 and 2.95 respectively. While the mean responses indicated nearly an occasional performance, compared to the desired level means, 3.66 and 3.55 respectively, principals reported a desire to read professional periodicals and share current ideas on a regular basis.

In citing reasons for the difference between actual and desired levels of involvement in reading professional reading-related periodicals, principals indicated a lack of time and a tendency to read other professional publications instead. Reading other professional publications might provide some references to current reading research and practices. However, journals specifically devoted to reading might provide a wider scope of pertinent information.

Among the 13 statements of reading-related activities, there were three that had mean responses at the actual level approaching a regular performance level. The three statements included:
(a) Discuss with teachers the importance of reading in our school,
(b) Conduct observations during reading classes, and (c) Promote recreational reading at all grade levels. The actual level mean responses for the three statements were 3.56, 3.51, and 3.53 respectively.

It is perhaps not too surprising that these reading-related tasks would have a strong mean performance level. For example, conducting observations during reading classes is an expected activity inasmuch as teacher evaluation is a required activity of the principal. Since
evaluations are to be made anyway, it could be reasonable to assume that many, if not most, teacher evaluation visits might occur during reading instruction. Thus, principals with a high actual level of involvement in this task are accomplishing two things at once: making obligatory teacher evaluation visits and conducting observations during reading classes. Regardless of the reason for visiting, a principal is seeing first-hand what is happening in the reading program at various grade levels.

The other two high actual mean response statements reflect concern by the principal about reading. The principal does not necessarily need special reading knowledge or background experience to discuss the importance of reading in the school or to promote recreational reading. Because good reading habits among students are a foundation for not only academic success, but also for developing lifelong interest in reading, it would not seem unusual for a building principal to stress the very activities needed to cultivate such reading habits.

Among the 13 statements of reading-related tasks, whenever a difference existed between actual and desired levels, respondents noted various reasons for not achieving the desired levels. Of the 13 statements, nine of them showed that "lack of time" was the main reason for not achieving the desired level of involvement. One can sympathize with the predicament of most principals in finding enough time during a school day to attend to necessary duties. Time management is an important consideration for those principals who indicated a desire to have a regular level of involvement.
Besides lacking time to perform at a desired level, another frequent reason given for not achieving the desired level was that "someone else" performed the various tasks. If that "someone else" is a member of the school's staff and is able to share current reading ideas, monitor test data, describe the reading program to others, and participate on the school's reading committee, then that individual working with the principal can help provide leadership to the school's reading program. However, if that "someone else" is merely on-call or has infrequent building visits as part of a larger responsibility, then the building principal might not be as able to develop in-house leadership for the school's reading program. As was indicated in the demographics profile, only 38.1% of the total respondents had reading consultant services in either the district or their own school. Thus, the building principal might want to gain some of the skills needed to provide the leadership important for guiding the school's reading program. To rely on another individual when that person is not always available might result in unanswered questions or unresolved concerns.

**Drawn From Research Questions**

In addition to analyses of individual statements from the questionnaire, congregate data were presented in terms of the five research questions. Question number one asked: "Do Iowa elementary principals view their actual knowledge of reading as different from a desired level of knowledge about reading?" Analyses indicated a statistically significant difference between what they know and what they desire to know. Principals in Iowa elementary schools want to improve their knowledge of reading and reading instruction.
Another research question relating to knowledge of reading was question number four which asked: "How recently have Iowa elementary principals undertaken professional development in reading?" One could assume that during professional development through either college studies or conference attendance, knowledge would be gained. The questionnaire specifically asked respondents to indicate reading-related professional development. The data showed that the largest group of respondents, 134 of the total population of 295, had not taken any reading course work in 11 or more years. The mean number of years since taking a reading course was 17.2 years.

As opposed to the not-so-recent reading course work, conference attendance where reading matters were presented was very recent. One-third of the respondents had attended a conference or professional meeting during 1987. An additional 40.7% had attended such events in either 1986 or 1985. Iowa elementary principals seem to be growing professionally through conference attendance. This conclusion concurs with the data indicating that principals in Iowa want to improve their knowledge about reading. Nearly three-fourths of the respondents indicated conference attendance within the past two years; possibly their attendance at such meetings provided knowledge about reading.

The second research question asked: "Do Iowa elementary principals view their actual level of interaction with teachers as different from a desired level of principal-teachers interaction?" There was a statistically significant difference between what Iowa elementary principals actually do and what they desire to do. It could be concluded that Iowa elementary principals want to share ideas
about reading with the teaching staff more often than they currently are able to share. They seem to desire greater principal-teacher interaction in discussing current juvenile literature, the general reading program, and concerns about reading throughout the various grade levels.

Research question number three dealing with reading inservice issues asked: "Do Iowa elementary principals view their actual planning of and participation in reading inservice as different from a desired level of such inservice involvement?" Even though the principals indicated that they desire a greater level of involvement than they actually have, the actual mean response for the inservice index (3.16) was slightly higher than either the knowledge index mean response (2.78) or the interaction index mean response (3.14). Thus it would seem that principals generally have a slightly higher level of actual involvement in reading inservice than in the other areas. Perhaps this is reasonable in view of the fact that principals often designate reading inservice content when such inservices are held.

The final research question asked: "To what extent are reading specialists available to assist principals with reading questions and concerns?" The data, as previously presented, indicated that immediate, in-building assistance was generally not available. Only 23 of the 293 individuals responding to the question about reading consultant services indicated that their own schools had reading consultants or specialists employed at the buildings. Of those responses, 166 indicated that the area education agencies provided reading specialist services. While having a reading specialist in
one's own school would not necessarily be better than having area education agency service, it is possible that concerns and questions could be answered more quickly. Those principals desiring a greater degree of reading specialist involvement could consider alternative measures in acquiring reading specialist input.

**Drawn From Additional Analyses**

Besides the analyses for the research questions, additional data analyses were performed. Some of the findings were supported by the literature. One study (Kean et al., 1979) found that schools whose principals had been reading professionals had the highest reading achievement scores of the schools in the study. While this researcher did not look at reading scores, there was an attempt made to compare those individuals with reading background to those without. Among the 295 respondents 53 of them had some type of reading background experience. Statistical analysis indicated that the individuals with reading background had a statistically significant difference in their actual level of involvement than did those without reading background experience. The same was true at the desired level of involvement. Iowa principals with some reading background experience seem more knowledgeable and perhaps more interested in the total dimensions of the schools' reading programs. Because of their training and experience in reading, their personal bias might make a difference in their perceptions of how often and to what extent reading-related tasks should be done. In this study those principals with reading background were generally more involved at the actual level and desired an even greater level of involvement.
Data presented regarding principals' current positions yielded significant findings. Principals who are in charge of only one building are more involved than are those with multiple building responsibilities or those serving as both an elementary principal and superintendent. While logic supports the idea that greater responsibilities would possibly preclude regular involvement in the school's reading program, there is reason to look at this situation. Currently it is possible for superintendents to assume the role of an elementary principal even though their educational and academic preparation may have been almost exclusively for secondary education. This is not to say that such an individual would lack concern or interest in the elementary school; but through no personal doing, the individual is serving in a capacity for which there might not be a very strong experiential or academic base.

Another concern in this area is the number of Iowa elementary principals who serve at two or more building sites. There were 18.2% of the respondents serving two or more schools. This percentage may be representative of the entire Iowa principal population, or it may be lower. This researcher noticed when selecting the random sample that one of those chosen was in charge of five buildings. Such an assignment seems quite challenging. When principals indicate that the biggest reason they are not able to accomplish their desired levels of involvement is due to lack of time, one can understand their situations considering multiple building assignments. Perhaps not all buildings need equal allocation of time and attention. However, size
of student body and staff notwithstanding, multiple assignments seem to create more work for the principal.

This study analyzed Iowa elementary principals' actual and desired levels of involvement in their schools' reading programs. Those individuals with reading background tend to have a higher level of involvement; those in charge of only one school are more involved. In general, respondents have at least an "occasional" level of involvement and desire to perform reading-related tasks on an even more frequent basis. Based on the findings several recommendations can be made.

Recommendations

Based On the Study

This study examined the levels of involvement, both actual and desired, of Iowa elementary school principals in their schools' reading programs. Based on the findings some recommendations can be made that will enable principals to approach a regular level of involvement in reading-related tasks that guide the schools' reading programs. The following recommendations are made regarding such increased involvement:

1. Iowa elementary school principals should obtain a membership in a local, state, and/or national reading association, thereby receiving periodic information specifically dealing with current reading practices and reading research findings.

2. Iowa elementary school principals should assess the building's reading committee, establish one where none exists, and use it as a source of information for self and staff, an arena for sharing
concerns and airing problems, and a regularly scheduled time for keeping reading and reading instruction an important element of the elementary program.

3. Iowa elementary school principals should develop strong working relationships with the reading specialists who provide services to the buildings and use those services to the utmost. Principals should insure that scheduled visits are meaningful and as frequent as possible, set aside time to "talk reading" and benefit from the specialists' expertise, and invite the specialists to reading inservice sessions to not only present but to also listen to others.

4. Iowa elementary school principals should continue to attend conferences and professional meetings dealing with reading-related matters in an effort to heighten interest in and awareness of current reading trends and practices.

5. Iowa elementary school principals should encourage staff members to share ideas and materials pertinent to sound reading instruction, and when possible, employ staff members who indicate a strong reading knowledge base and a commitment to reading instruction based on such knowledge.

6. Colleges and universities with administration preparation programs should consider including a course offering specifically related to reading curriculum, not as part of a total elementary curriculum course.

7. The state licensing agency or state board in charge of administrative endorsements should evaluate the need for continuing education credits in the area of reading so that principals would be
required on a periodic basis to take college credits beyond their initial administration preparation program.

8. Local school boards should assess the value of principals being assigned to multiple building sites and consider that valuable educational leadership can be accomplished best when site assignments are minimized.

For Further Study

In light of the findings of this study there are some recommendations that can be made for further study in this area of principal involvement in the school's reading program. They include the following ideas:

1. Since this study dealt with only Iowa elementary school principals, the study should be replicated in other geographic locations, thereby gaining more generalizable information about the status of principal involvement in reading programs.

2. Because this study relied on self-assessment, a similar questionnaire should be sent to Iowa elementary teachers to gain insight as to the perceptions teachers have regarding their principals' levels of involvement in the schools' reading programs. It would be interesting to know whether teachers believe principals are as "occasionally" involved in the various tasks as the principals believe themselves to be.

3. Another study should be designed that would specifically address whether the reading-related tasks as suggested by the literature are indeed statistically significant factors in guiding a
reading program when measured against, for example, student achievement in reading.

4. As changes occur in years to come regarding administrative multiple assignments, the study should be replicated to see if there were any differences in the levels of involvement. At that time when superintendents no longer serve as elementary principals, levels of involvement in the schools' reading programs might be greater.
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April 20, 1987

Dear School Administrator:

We are conducting a survey among a sample of Iowa elementary school principals regarding their involvement in their schools' reading programs. The study is being conducted under the auspices of Dr. Norman L. McCumsey of the Department of Education Administration and Counseling. The purpose of the survey is to learn if principals are able to accomplish certain reading-related program activities as often as they would like. Your name was selected at random from a list of Iowa school principals for inclusion in our study.

Enclosed is a brief questionnaire which we would appreciate your completing and returning in the postage paid envelope provided. How you respond to the questions will only be known to you since we do not ask for your name.

By your participation in this study, you will be providing valuable information which will be used by administrators, teachers and others in assessing various aspects of the reading programs in Iowa's elementary schools. We value your thoughts and opinions on this important matter and appreciate your completing and returning the questionnaire.

Sincerely,

Roberta L. Bodensteiner
Project Director

RLB:nh
Enclosures
Survey of Involvement in Reading Program

Directions: Below are some statements regarding school administrators' involvement in the reading program at their schools. Below each statement is the following "involvement scale":

Actual: N S O R
(N) Never (S) Seldom
(O) Occasionally (R) Regularly

Desired: N S O R

Please read each statement and circle what you consider to be your ACTUAL involvement in the activity specified. Next, circle what you consider to be your DESIRED involvement.

If your ACTUAL involvement is less than your DESIRED involvement, that is, if you perform the activity less often than you would like, please check [ ] the reasons for the difference between the two conditions.

Read current professional periodicals specifically dealing with reading.

Actual: N S O R [ ] Lack of time to do so.
[ ] Read other professional publications instead.

Desired: N S O R [ ] Someone else keeps me informed of current reading trends.
[ ] Other (Please specify:)

Share with teachers current ideas and materials pertinent to reading instruction.

Actual: N S O R [ ] Lack of time to do so.
[ ] Have no information to share.

Desired: N S O R [ ] Someone else shares current ideas with the staff
[ ] Other (Please specify:)

Conduct in-class demonstrations of reading instructions.

Actual: N S O R [ ] Lack of time to do so.
[ ] Feel unprepared to do this.

Desired: N S O R [ ] Someone else takes care of this.
[ ] Other (Please specify:)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
N (Never), S (Seldom), O (Occasionally), R (Regularly)

Communicate with the school(s) media person about current juvenile literature.

Actual:  N S O R [ ] Lack of time to do so.
        [ ] There is no media person.
Desired: N S O R [ ] Other (Please specify:)

Assist teachers in interpreting pupils' reading test data.

Actual:  N S O R [ ] Lack of time to do so.
        [ ] Lack expertise in this area.
Desired: N S O R [ ] Someone else monitors test data.
        [ ] Other (Please specify:)

Discuss with teachers the importance of reading in our school.

Actual:  N S O R [ ] Lack of time to do so.
        [ ] Feel unprepared to do this.
Desired: N S O R [ ] Someone else stresses the importance of reading.
        [ ] Other (Please specify:)

Conduct observations during reading classes.

Actual:  N S O R [ ] Lack of time to do so.
        [ ] Feel unprepared to do this.
Desired: N S O R [ ] Someone else observes reading lessons.
        [ ] Other (Please specify:)

Describe to others the reading program used in my school(s).

Actual:  N S O R [ ] Lack of opportunity to do so.
        [ ] Lack of knowledge about reading program.
Desired: N S O R [ ] Someone else performs this function.
        [ ] Other (Please specify:)
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N (Never), S (Seldom), O (Occasionally), R (Regularly)

Promote recreational reading at all grade levels.

Actual: N S O R [ ] Lack of time to do so.
        [ ] Adequate recreational reading materials are not available to my school(s).

Desired: N S O R [ ] Other (Please specify:)

Participate as a functioning member of the school's reading committee.

Actual: N S O R [ ] Lack of interest to do so.
        [ ] Have too many other committee assignments.

Desired: N S O R [ ] Someone else provides leadership.
        [ ] Other (Please specify:)

Participate in reading inservice sessions along with the teachers.

Actual: N S O R [ ] Lack of time to do so.
        [ ] Someone else attends in place of the administration.

Desired: N S O R [ ] Other (Please specify:)

Encourage teachers to evaluate the quality and usefulness of reading inservice.

Actual: N S O R [ ] Lack of time to do so.
        [ ] No evaluations are required.

Desired: N S O R [ ] Someone else encourages inservice evaluation.
        [ ] Other (Please specify:)

Encourage teachers to present their ideas during reading inservice sessions.

Actual: N S O R [ ] Lack of time to do so.
        [ ] No opportunity for my input in planning.

Desired: N S O R [ ] Teachers seem reluctant to share their ideas.
        [ ] Other (Please specify:)
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In order to have a better understanding of the school administrators participating in this survey, and the schools they serve, we would appreciate your answering the following background information questions.

What is your sex? [ ] Female [ ] Male

What was your age on your last birthday?

What is the highest degree you hold and your major area of concentration?

[ ] Bachelor's  (Major): ___________________________
[ ] Master's  (Major): ___________________________
[ ] Specialist's (Major): _________________________
[ ] Ed.D.  (Major): _____________________________
[ ] Ph.D.  (Major): _____________________________

If you have taken reading or reading related courses at the undergraduate or graduate level, in what year did you take your last course?

(Year): ___________

In what year did you last attend a professional meeting or conference dealing with reading resources and practices? If you have never attended such a meeting or conference, please enter a zero (0).

(Year): ___________

What teaching and administration positions have you held in education? (Please check all that apply.)

Teaching
[ ] Primary grades
[ ] Middle grades (4-6)
[ ] Upper grades (7-9)
[ ] Upper grades (10-12)
[ ] Taught reading course

Administration
[ ] Elementary Principal
[ ] Junior High/Intermediate Principal
[ ] Secondary Principal
[ ] Superintendent
[ ] Reading Consultant

For approximately how many years, including this one, have you been employed:

In the area of education? _______ Years
As a school administrator? _______ Years
As a school administrator for the school district you serve? _______ Years
Which of the following best describes your current position? (Please check all that apply.)

[ ] Principal of one school
[ ] Principal of two or more schools
[ ] Principal and superintendent
[ ] Other (Please specify).  

What is the size of your school district?

[ ] 249 and below  [ ] 1,000-2,499  
[ ] 250-399    [ ] 2,500-7,499  
[ ] 400-599    [ ] 7,500 or more  
[ ] 600-999

Which of the following best describes the reading specialist or reading consultant that serves your school(s)? (Please check all that apply.)

[ ] Routinely visits the school on a weekly basis.
[ ] Routinely visits the school on a monthly basis.
[ ] Is available as often as needed.
[ ] Is available if given advanced notice.
[ ] Is frequently unable to come in person to address school concerns.
[ ] Is an integral member of the school's reading team.
[ ] School district or Area Agency does not provide specialist.

If a reading specialist is available for your school(s), which of the following provides this service. (Please check all that apply.)

[ ] Area Education Agency  [ ] School District  [ ] Own School

Which of the following best describes your teachers' attendance at professional meetings or conferences dealing with reading resources and practices? (Please check all that apply.)

[ ] Teachers attend with most or all expenses paid by school district.
[ ] Teachers attend, but most or all expenses are not paid by the district.
[ ] Specialists (i.e., Chapter One) are more likely to attend than classroom teachers.
[ ] Teachers usually do not attend.
[ ] Other (Please specify):  

--- THANK YOU FOR PARTICIPATING IN THIS STUDY ---
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### APPENDIX B

**Written Responses To Question Regarding Current Position**

\[ N = 26 \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principal with teaching duties</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal with special programs director</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal with additional administrative duties</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal with curriculum directing duties</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal and athletic director</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal and counselor</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal and truant officer</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX C

Analysis of Variance For Gender of Iowa Elementary Principals By Recency of Reading Course Work
N = 243

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>76.722</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>76.722</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>.668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>100,067.945</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>415.220</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX D

Chi-Square Analysis of District Size By Area Education Agency Provision of Reading Specialist

\[ N = 293 \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>No AEA Specialist</th>
<th>Specialist Provided</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>999 or fewer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>49.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>50.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>81.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** \[ X^2 = .055; df = 1; p = .815 \]
APPENDIX E

Chi-Square Analysis of District Size By Presence of Reading Specialist In Own School
\[ N = 293 \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Size</th>
<th>Building Specialist</th>
<th>No Building Specialist</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>999 or fewer</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>49.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000 or more</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>50.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Column  | 23  | 270  | 293  |
Total   | 7.8 | 92.2 | 100.0|

Note. \( X^2 = 1.071; \text{df} = 1; p = .301 \)
APPENDIX F

Analysis of Variance For Current Position of Iowa Elementary Principals By Actual Involvement In the Schools' Reading Programs

N = 291

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>3.756</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.252</td>
<td>6.446</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>55.744</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

Analysis of Variance For Primary Teaching Experience of
Iowa Elementary Principals By Actual Involvement
In the Schools' Reading Programs

\( N = 292 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td>1.053</td>
<td>.306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>59.406</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>.205</td>
<td>1.053</td>
<td>.306</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## APPENDIX H

### Means, Standard Deviations, and F Values of Desired Levels of Involvement of Respondents With Reading Background and Those Without Reading Background

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement of Involvement</th>
<th>Group Number</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Read current professional periodicals</strong>&lt;br&gt;N = 280</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With reading background</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>.394</td>
<td>4.706</td>
<td>.031*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without reading background</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.542</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Share current reading ideas</strong>&lt;br&gt;N = 276</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With reading background</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>.459</td>
<td>4.451</td>
<td>.036*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without reading background</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>.590</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conduct inclass reading demonstrations</strong>&lt;br&gt;N = 273</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With reading background</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>.720</td>
<td>1.878</td>
<td>.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without reading background</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>.899</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(appendix continues)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement of Involvement</th>
<th>Group Number</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discuss juvenile literature with media person</td>
<td>N = 270</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With reading background</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>.706</td>
<td>12.933</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without reading background</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>.741</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist teachers with reading test data</td>
<td>N = 265</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With reading background</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>.627</td>
<td>.396</td>
<td>.530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without reading background</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>.682</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss the importance of reading in the school</td>
<td>N = 267</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With reading background</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>.476</td>
<td>.122</td>
<td>.727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without reading background</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct reading class observations</td>
<td>N = 269</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With reading background</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>.401</td>
<td>2.927</td>
<td>.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without reading background</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.489</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(appendix continues)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement of Involvement</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>With reading background</th>
<th>Without reading background</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Describe the reading program to others</td>
<td>N = 264</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>.701</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote recreational reading across all grades</td>
<td>N = 269</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>.315</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate on school's reading committee</td>
<td>N = 260</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in reading inservice</td>
<td>N = 273</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(appendix continues)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement of Involvement</th>
<th>Group Number</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encourage reading inservice evaluations  N = 271</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With reading background</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>.783</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>.696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without reading background</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>.709</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage teachers to share ideas at inservice  N = 269</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With reading background</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>.781</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without reading background</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>.675</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *Significant at the .05 level of confidence. N's may vary from 260 to 280 due to omissions in entry data.
APPENDIX I

Analysis of Variance For Overall Actual Involvement In Reading Program Between Those Respondents With Reading Background Experience and Those Without

\( N = 291 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2.166</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.166</td>
<td>10.933</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>57.456</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>.198</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX J

Analysis of Variance For Actual Level of Involvement In Reading Inservice Between Respondents With Reading Background Experience and Those Without

\(N = 291\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>(F)</th>
<th>Significance Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>.833</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.833</td>
<td>1.716</td>
<td>.191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>140.854</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>.486</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>