THE ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICES OF PRINCIPALS

TOWARD THE GOAL OF PREPARING STUDENTS FOR

CITIZENSHIP IN MANITOBA'S HIGH SCHOOLS

BY

ZHIDE LI

A Thesis
Submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Educational Administration, Foundations and Psychology
Faculty of Education
University of Manitoba

THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
*****
COPYRIGHT PERMISSION PAGE

THE ADMINISTRATIVE PRACTICES OF PRINCIPALS TOWARD THE GOAL OF
PREPARING STUDENTS FOR CITIZENSHIP IN MANITOBA'S HIGH SCHOOLS

BY

Zhide Li

A Thesis/Practicum submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies of The University

of Manitoba in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree

of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

ZHIDE LI ©2001

I believe

> The meaning of schooling lies in the
> indisputable truth: Our children, our future.

I ask myself

> What kind of people do we want our children grow up to
> be?

*This dissertation is dedicated to my parents.
They educated me and modeled for me
the value of education.*

*This dissertation is also dedicated to
Jia Jia, Kai Kai, Ding Ding and Wei Wei.
The future of the world is theirs.*

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my deep appreciation and thanks to the principals in this study for their invaluable participation. Their help and support of this study made the project possible.

I would like to express my sincere appreciation to the Chair of my advisory committee, Dr. John Stapleton, Rector of St. Paul's College, University of Manitoba, for his guidance, supervision and encouragement throughout this project. His high expectation for my academic achievement and confidence in my efforts of achieving my goal has motivated me to reach for the targets that would have remained unreachable if he had expected otherwise. I cannot adequately express my gratitude to Dr. Jim Nickels, a member of my advisory committee, Professor of Psychology, University of Manitoba, for his encouragement, statistical insights, time, dedication, and unlimited patience particularly during my data treatment phases. I also want to thank Dr. Tony Riffel, a member of my advisory committee, Professor Emeritus of Faculty of Education, University of Manitoba, for his thoughtful advice and concern for this project.

A special word of thanks is due to Dr. Clay Bottrell, Director of School Experience Office, Faculty of Education, University of Manitoba, for his unfailing support and help to this project. Mr. John V. Brandon is gratefully acknowledged for his kind help, time, and commitment rendered to this research project.

Finally, I want to thank my parents in China. But for their continued and selfless support and many personal sacrifices, this project and dissertation could never have come into being.

to this project. Mr. John V. Brandon is gratefully acknowledged for his kind help, time, and commitment to this research project.

Finally, I want to thank my parents in China. But for their continued and selfless support and many personal sacrifices, this project and dissertation could never have come into being.

Abstract

The two basic purposes underlying the present study were: first, to identify the administrative practices that were used by principals during the 1998-99 school year to help prepare students for citizenship and to determine whether or not some administrative activities/actions were more common than others; and second, to examine how effective the identified administrative activities were, based on the principals' perceptions and the reasons they gave for their perception

Based on literature about the school principalship, a questionnaire was developed to investigate principals' perceptions of administrative activities in six major task areas. The 81 responding principals from high schools in Manitoba, Canada, provided a total of 439 activities. Each activity was classified in terms of who performed each action (doer) and who was the direct recipient of each action (target). Also studied were six characteristics of principals, namely, gender, years of being a principal, highest level of education completed, administrative certification status, the school type, and grade levels of the principals' schools. Four major research questions asked who performed each administrative action ("doer") and who was the direct recipient of each action ("target"), which characteristics of the principals were most associated with their more frequently mentioning one particular doer or target rather than another, which doer/target classifications and characteristics of these principals were most associated with their giving higher effectiveness ratings to these administrative efforts, and what reasons these principals gave for the effectiveness ratings of the given administrative activities.

Findings include the following. First, whether principals worked alone or worked through/with others and whether the students, staff, school or other party was the direct

recipient of the administrative activities varied depending on the task areas. Second, this study failed to find either statistical differences in the doer and target classifications of administrative activities or statistically significant associations between doer/target classifications and any of the six personal characteristics of the principals. This study found that the principals gave generally high effectiveness ratings to their administrative activities, but it failed to find statistical differences in such ratings for doer and target classifications and between male and female principals, between public and private school principals, between principals of schools with different grade levels, between principals with graduate and undergraduate degrees, or between principals with different levels of specialist certificates. In the task area of managing financial resources, there was a statistically significant association between effectiveness ratings and principals' years of administrative experience. Principals with 1-5 years of experience of being a principal gave lower effectiveness ratings to the examples of the administrative activity than principals with 6-10 years of experience did. The effectiveness ratings provided by principals with 11+ years of experience were neither significantly lower nor higher than either the principals with 1-5 years of administrative experience or the principals with 6-10 years of administrative experience. Third, regardless of whether their ratings were low, medium, or high, the criteria principals gave for their effectiveness ratings were related most frequently to their perceptions of the effects of the activities on student outcome, on student participation in school governance, on the relationships between students and staff, on curriculum offerings of the school, and on the opportunities created for students by the involvement in the school of parents and community organizations and interested members.

The participants emphasized the importance of school context and the need for educational opportunities where characteristics of good citizenship can be understood, learned and practiced, instead of merely taught.

This is the first empirical study that examines the education practices of preparing students for citizenship in a framework of educational administration. More studies, particularly studies using variables and methods different from those used in the present study, are needed to increase our understanding of successful educational practices at the school level.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of this study

Educating for citizenship has long been a purpose of education in Canada (McLeod, 1989; Osborne, 1988; Sears, 1996b). The school improvement initiative, New Directions (ND), undertaken in the 1990s by the provincial government of Manitoba, set three overall goals for education and schooling in Manitoba schools (Manitoba Education and Training, 1994), one of which was preparing students for citizenship. According to Sears, Clarke and Hughes (1998b), in attempting to improve the quality of schooling in the late 1990s, ministries/ departments of education across Canada had taken a remarkably similar approach to citizenship education and, in all provinces and territories, the goal of citizenship education was "to create knowledgeable individuals committed to active participation in a pluralist society" (p. 3).

The principle of the ND initiative was that greater decision-making for schools and schooling was to be "located in schools and communities" (Manitoba Education and Training, 1994, p. 3). School principals were designated as the primary instructional leaders in schools (Manitoba Education and Training, 1994; 1995) and were in charge of all matters of organization, management, instruction and discipline of a school, subject to *The Public School Act* and its regulations, and the instructions of the school board (McIntosh, 1997). As a result, what a principal did in administrative practice could, in many aspects, influence the educational practice of a school, including the school's practice of preparing students for citizenship.

That a principal can influence a school's educational practice toward preparing students for citizenship has been recognized and discussed in the academic literature. This body of literature has three features. First, as will be seen in Chapter Two, its size is small. Secondly, the writings on this topic are mainly recommendations based on personal opinions about what principals can do or should do to promote the goal of educating students for citizenship. Thirdly, the recommendations help us see that principals, as chief educational administrators at the school level, can play multiple roles in helping prepare students for citizenship. Some of these roles are summarized below.

First, principals can exert a leadership role, one aspect of which is to help build a vision of preparing students for citizenship (Cogan, 1999; Cogan & Derricott, 1998; McGowan, Plugge & Reynolds, 1986; Perry, 1992) around the principles, values, knowledge, skills and attitudes that students will gain as desired outcomes of citizenship education. From this vision can come more specific objectives of citizenship education. A second leadership aspect is to influence the school's curriculum and instructional strategies (Cogan, 1999; Cogan & Derricott, 1998; Osborne, 1994; Perry, 1992; Remy & Wagstaff, 1982). For example, they can allocate sufficient instructional time to citizenship education, encourage the adoption of new instructional materials and approaches to promote learning, facilitate in-service teacher professional development process, and assess how the existing official and hidden curricula support the goal of preparing students for citizenship. The third aspect is to help create a school climate and school structure where the administrators, faculty, staff, the curriculum, the assessment measures and the general atmosphere all exhibit the characteristics of equitable rules and basic democratic principles. This means that the school climate and structure will "model" the desired outcomes of democratic citizenship education

(Cogan, 1999; Cogan & Derricott, 1998; Osborne, 1994; McGowan, Plugge & Reynolds, 1986; Remy & Wagstaff, 1982). Examples in this respect include creating a non-threatening school climate that encourages creative teaching and learning activities and involving teachers and students in school governance. The fourth aspect is to facilitate the citizenship education process by promoting school-community cooperation. The task of preparing students for citizenship can only be carried out through a concerted effort between a school and its community (Cogan, 1999; Cogan & Derricott, 1998; Osborne, 1994; McGowan, Plugge & Reynolds, 1986; Remy & Wagstaff, 1982). The school and the larger community can act upon their shared responsibility of preparing students for citizenship with a global and future-oriented vision (Cogan, 1999; Cogan & Derricott, 1998). Remy & Wagstaff (1982) hold that, in the larger community, business and labor, voluntary organizations, religious organizations and families are sources of the knowledge, skills, attitudes and experiences that students acquire as citizens. School administrators can encourage teachers to draw upon the "talent tank" of the adult members of the community to facilitate teaching and learning. They can encourage students to become involved in citizenship-related activities and initiate activities that can increase the capacities of interested citizens to work collaboratively with the school to promote citizenship education programs (p. 59).

Second, principals can also contribute to the attainment of the goal of preparing students for citizenship by being a role model (Gluckman, 1984; McGowan, Plugge & Reynolds, 1986). They can be a role model of "a democratic style of leadership," as well as a person who is concerned, active, responsible, caring and cooperative (McGowan, Plugge & Reynolds, 1986, p. 28-29). One component of the role model has to do with the principal's professional competence. Gluckman (1984) relates that, because principals are the "key" to

13

the "key" to the achievement of the goal of citizenship education at the school level, they should possess certain qualities in order to establish and maintain appropriate standards of behavior. They should demonstrate a concern for all people, be fair in dealing with all teachers, students and parents, display a sense of professional commitment, be sensitive to the needs of staff and students, and be approachable and "open" to different opinions.

The concept and function of role model can also be applied to the entire school community (Cogan, 1999; Cogan & Derricott, 1998; Osborne, 1994). This means that the school as a whole can model the characteristics of good citizenship. For example, a school can be environmentally sensitive in its careful use of resources and waste disposal (Cogan, 1999, pp. 79-80). When a school models the characteristics of good citizenship, the building administrators, faculty and staff, as well as the school policies and practices should all support the attainment of the desired outcomes of citizenship education (Cogan, 1999, p. 81). Levin (2000) maintained that, since "the skills and dispositions necessary for effective democracy can only be learned by practicing them" (p. 6), student participation in educational processes should be encouraged at classroom, school, school system and provincial levels. Similarly, Sears and Perry (2000) reminded us of the importance of the context of citizenship education at classroom, school and system levels. They also maintained that well developed policies and programs are not enough; "[c]hildren must also have the opportunity to see and experience democracy in their schools" (p. 30).

One salient feature of these recommendations is that principals do not necessarily work directly with students to help attain the goal of preparing students for citizenship. Instead, principals frequently work with other people who often have more direct contact with students, such as teachers, parents, and other members of the school and extended

communities, as well as through policies, educational decisions, school ethos and learning environment, and educational programs. In the literature, the view of principals' role in school effectiveness (Hallinger & Heck, 1996) also reveals that effects of principal leadership "occur indirectly". Indirect effects occur through principal's effort "to influence those who come into more frequent direct contact with students," through shaping the "school's instructional climate and instructional organization," and through principals' personal actions such as maintaining high visibility, supervising instructional programs, modeling expectations, and shaping school goals, policies, and norms (p. 24).

It can be assumed that, as one of multiple overall goals of education, preparing students for citizenship was accorded a high but variable priority in Manitoba's schools. Principals had various options and a high degree of flexibility to decide on what they chose to do in their administrative practice to help prepare students for citizenship. Moreover, in striving to reach the goal, it is highly likely that these principals achieved results not only through their direct contact with students but also in a more indirect fashion by involving parents/community in educational processes, by working with and for teachers, by being engaged in the school's educational programs, by helping create an environment that supports learning, and by being a role model.

1.2 Purposes of this study

There were two basic purposes underlying the present study: first, to identify the administrative practices that were used by principals during the 1998-99 school year to help prepare students for citizenship and to determine whether or not some administrative activities/actions were more common than others; and second, to examine how effective the

identified administrative activities were, based on the principals' perceptions and the reasons they gave for their perceptions.

Although the major research questions ask the principals to indicate their administrative practices, it is well understood that the principal may not be the only educational leader in school to work toward the goal of preparing students for citizenship.

1.3 Significance of this study

This study has practical and theoretical significance. Part of the significance lies in the fact that, to the knowledge of the investigator of this research project, it is the first empirical study in Canada that examines the practice of preparing students for citizenship at the school level from the perspective of educational administration. The potential audiences of this study can be policy makers at provincial, division and school levels, educators at the school level, people involved in principal preparation programs, scholarly audiences in citizenship education, and community and society members who are concerned about citizenship education in school.

1.3.1 Significance for educational practice

This study can provide information about how the goal of preparing students for citizenship was treated in some high schools from the perspective of principals' administrative practices. Information of this type can help enhance the awareness of the audiences of issues pertaining to educational policy-making and practices towards preparing students for citizenship and encourage them to explore how they can possibly contribute to the achievement of this goal.

1.3.2 Significance for educational theory

Based on their review of research literature on principal's contribution to school effectiveness (1980-1995), Heck and Hallinger (1999) conclude that "principal leadership does have indirect effects on students outcomes via a variety of in-school processes," but "important questions about how leaders achieve improvement in schools remain unanswered" (p. 141). They note that "an important *blank spot* concerns in-depth descriptions of how principals and other practices of school leaders create and sustain the in-school factors that foster successful schooling. Sustained, narrowly-focused inquiry of this type is necessary to fill blank spots in the knowledge base" (p. 141). They further note that there are also *blind spots* in existing views of knowledge that "impede us from seeing other facets" of leadership and school improvement (p. 141). One such *blind spot* concerns the definition of school effectiveness. Since 1980, student academic outcome has been used most frequently as a variable in studies of school effectiveness. Currently, educators all over the world believe that the components of effective education consist of "a wide range of cognitive and affective variables" (Heck and Hallinger 1999, p. 151). The present study can help "fill" the "*blank spots*" in the knowledge base of "how principals and other practices of school leaders create and sustain" actions toward preparing students for citizenship. It can also help address the *blind spot* in the picture of school leadership through analysis of reasons given by the principals for the effectiveness ratings for their activities/actions.

1.4 Limitations of this study

This study has the following limitations.

1. As no previous empirical study on the topic of the thesis was found, a comparison of findings between two or more studies becomes impossible.

2. Principals may have different conceptions of citizenship, although as will be seen in Chapter Two, there is some recent literature that suggests the existence of a consensus. The examples of administrative activity given by the principals may in reality be connected to different conceptions of preparing students for citizenship. That is, principals holding a certain conception of Canadian citizenship may perceive some administrative practices as relevant to the goal of preparing students for citizenship, while other principals may disagree and therefore may not supply similar examples.

3. There is only one investigator in this study, and the investigator is a Ph.D. student with very limited time and resources to devote to this project. This fact makes extensive study with complex methods and analytic techniques impossible. For example, this study could not triangulate the findings from the survey study with prolonged on-site observation or in-depth interviews.

4. Data are limited by how well principals can remember about what they did one year ago. Therefore, there may be gaps between what they actually did and what they can retrieve from memory when they completed the questionnaire in the year 2000. There may also be gaps between how effective they perceived their administrative practices were in year 1999 and how effective they perceived the same actions in year 2000.

CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW AND CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The overall purpose of the literature review is to supply relevant information upon which this study can be built. In other words, it is literature for use directly for the design of the study as well as for later interpretation and analysis. For the purposes of the study, two groups of literature were reviewed. The first group is on principals' administrative practices, and it consists of three sub-sections. The first sub-section describes the roles of Manitoba school principals' as prescribed in ND documents. The second sub-section is about principals' administrative task areas. The third sub-section is about the relation between features of principals' administrative practices and some personal and school environmental variables. These three sub-sets help generate a conceptual framework of day-to-day administrative practices of Manitoba high school principals, and provide information regarding relations between some personal and school contextual features and principals' administrative practices. The second body of literature includes some recent research on citizenship and citizenship education in schools of English Canada. This body of literature provides an outline of what is known and what has yet to be discovered about preparing students for citizenship in schools of English Canada.

2.1 The administrative practice of Manitoba high school principals

2.1.1 Manitoba principals' roles prescribed in New Directions documents

Manitoba's school improvement project, New Directions, was initiated in July 1994. It identified three overall goals of education for Manitoba's schools: preparing students for citizenship, for employment (including self-employment), and for lifelong learning. Skills

emphasized as four fundamental skill areas that should be taught across all subject areas. It specified six priority areas as foci of improvement: essential learning for today and tomorrow (a curriculum issue); educational standards and evaluation; school effectiveness; parental and community involvement in school and schooling; distance education and technology; and teacher education (Manitoba Education and Training, 1994, 1995). To facilitate the achievement of the priority areas and goals, the Province issued over one hundred curricula and related documents. Further, the Public School Amendment Act, Chapter 51 was promulgated in 1996, and Manitoba Regulation 468/88R was amended in 1997 (McIntosh, 1997) to help facilitate the school improvement process and sustain the success achieved.

School principals were designated as the person in charge of all matters of organization, management, instruction and discipline of a school, subject to *The Public School Act* and its regulations, and the instructions of the school board (McIntosh, 1997). More specifically, they were required to play certain roles when implementing New Directions. These roles included: leading curricula implementation; assessing and reporting student achievements; developing, communicating, and implementing annual school plans; establishing and supporting Advisory Councils for School Leadership (ACSL); involving parents in their child(ren)'s education; participating in school reviews; integrating technology and distance education into school; supporting teacher professional development; and participating in teacher hiring, assignment, and evaluation. These roles set the framework of the general day-to-day administrative practices of the principals of the schools under the jurisdiction of Manitoba Education and Training. They also set the framework of the roles

that the principals were required to play towards promoting the goal of preparing students for citizenship in their administrative practices (Li, 2000).

A review of the research literature on school improvement initiatives taken by different countries in the 1980s and 1990s demonstrated that these initiatives had several common features including an emphasis on the important contributions principals were to make. It was generally agreed that the role of the principal evolved from program manager before the 1980s to instructional leadership during the 1980s and to transformational leadership in the 1990s (Hallinger, 1992). Moreover, Crow and Peterson (1994) synthesized recent research findings of principals' roles in restructured schools and concluded that principals face four new tasks. (1) Playing new roles. Principals need to play new roles in at least four areas: political, cultural, environmental, and managerial. These roles require principals to manage relationships between different groups of people involved in school management, to shape school culture, to promote external constituents' support for the school mission, and to handle their remarkably increased workload. (2) Following new work rules. Principals need to work with new rules in their administrative practices such as decentralized decision making, commitment to collegiality norms, and new patterns of information sharing. (3) Building and maintaining new relations. Restructuring reshapes interpersonal relationships between principals and important school constituents. For example, in shared decision-making processes, teachers are more like colleagues and parents more like partners to principals than they were before. (4) Being accountable for new outcomes as results of school improvement. Principals are accountable for the results in student experiences, teachers' working lives, and parental/ community commitment.

To help principals to cope with these new tasks, the Interstate School Leaders Licensure

Consortium (ISLLC) generated six standards against which a principals' job performance

could be assessed (Ubben et al., 2001). According to these standards, a school administrator

is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students

1. by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community;
2. by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth;
3. by ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment;
4. by collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interest and needs, and mobilizing community resources;
5. by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner; and
6. by understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context. (Ubben et al., 2001, pp. 392-397)

It is not difficult to tell that the major points of New Directions were in line with the

characteristics of the global trend of school improvement during the 1990s. The roles of the

principals prescribed in New Directions documents were also in line with the roles of the

principals expected in school improvement initiatives in other jurisdictions.

2.1.2 School principals' administrative task areas

The tasks of school principals can be described in different ways. One way, as shown

above, is to describe their roles as prescribed in official documents. This type of description

is comparatively tentative. When the official policy changes, the prescribed roles change.

Another way is to describe the tasks of a principal according to the task areas to which a

principal must attend; this way of description is less likely to be affected by the change of

policies, provided the change is not radical.

Recently, Leithwood and Duke (1999) reviewed all articles dealing with school

leadership in four major educational administration journals over approximately the past

decade and found that school leadership can be summarized into six distinctly different models. Instructional leadership focuses *"on the behaviors of teachers as they engage in activities directly affecting the growth of students"* (p. 47). Transformational leadership focuses on *"the commitments and capacities"* of the members of an organization (p. 48). Moral leadership focuses on *"the values and ethics of the leader"* (p. 50). Participatory leadership emphasized *"the decision-making processes of the group"* (p. 51). Contingent leadership centers on *"how leaders respond to the unique organizational circumstances or problems that they face"* (p. 54). The sixth model is "managerial leadership" (pp. 52-54). According to Leithwood and Duke, "managerial leadership focuses on *the functions, tasks, or behaviors of the leader* and assumes that if these functions are carried out competently the work of others in the organization will be facilitated" (pp. 52-53). They summarized 10 sets of managerial tasks mentioned in 40 original studies on principal leadership in the context of school restructuring (21 studies) and principals' practice and effects in various educational contexts (19 studies). Their list is as follows:

1. Providing adequate financial and material resources;
2. Distributing financial and material resources so they are most useful;
3. Anticipating predictable problems and developing effective and efficient means for responding to them;
4. Managing the school facility;
5. Managing the student body;
6. Maintaining effective communication patterns with staff, students, community members, and district office staff;
7. Accommodating policies and initiatives undertaken by district office in ways that assist with school empowerment goals;
8. Buffering staff so as to reduce disruptions to the instruction program;
9. Mediating conflict and differences in expectations;
10. Attending to the political demands of school functioning.
(Leithwood & Duke, 1999, p. 54)

A review of other literature on principalship (Alvy & Robbins, 1998; Dembowski, 1998; Field, 1985; Hughes, Ribbins, & Thomas, 1985; Legdesog, 1995; Lipham & Hoeh, 1974; Lipham, Rankin, & Hoeh, 1985; Sergiovanni, 1987) revealed that the tasks to be performed by principals fall into the following six areas:

A. curricula and instruction programs;

B. student personnel;

C. staff/ teacher personnel;

D. school-community relations;

E. financial resources, and

F. physical resources.

Administrative activities in each of the six task areas are briefly described below. In the area of "curricula and instruction programs," principals need to attend to matters such as the development, implementation, and assessment of curricula, student graduation requirements, student performance evaluation policies, and the contents of student report cards. In the area of "student personnel," principals need to attend to matters relating to the recruitment, admission, and grouping of students in classes, student involvement in decision making, extra/co-curricular programs, student councils, guidance programs, compulsory school attendance, student responsibilities and discipline, and students' legal rights. In the area of "staff personnel," a principal's administrative work includes developing, implementing, and assessing policies and practices regarding professional and support personnel recruitment; selection, assignment, supervision, and evaluation; professional development; and staff-student relationship. In the area of "school-community relations," a principal's administrative work means activities of involving parents and community

members in educational matters of the school. Involvement here means a process through which parents and community members contribute time, energy, expertise, and other resources to the educational matters of the school, as well as the process of solving problems and reducing conflicts between the home, the school, and the community (Lipman, Rankin & Hoeh, 1985, p. 261). Principal's administrative work in the area of "financial resources" involves activities of planning, acquiring, using and reporting financial resources for educational matters of the school. Principal's administrative work in the area of school "physical resources" involves activities of planning, acquiring, using, and maintaining school physical resources/ facilities (Alvy & Robbins, 1998; Field, 1985; Hughes, Riggins, & Thomas, 1985; Lipham & Hoeh, 1974; Lipham, Rankin, & Hoeh, 1985; Sergiovanni, 1987).

In the present study, there were four basic reasons why the six lettered task areas were chosen rather than the ten numbered areas as the theoretical framework of managerial leadership for examinations of principals' administrative functions and behaviors. First, the six task areas represent a more traditional foundation of literature on principalship. Second, Leithwood and Duke's list tends to emphasize the processes of administrative practices and is not explicit on the curriculum and instruction area. Third, principals' managerial tasks mentioned in Leithwood and Duke's list can be clearly identified in the six lettered task areas. For example, Sets 1, 2 and 4 are represented in Task Areas E and F. Set 5 (managing student body) has the same meaning as Task Area B (student personnel). Fourth, the six letter task areas also cover a wider scope of principals' administrative actions than the numbered list. For example, Task Area C (staff personnel) and D (school-community relations) cover all types of administrative activities to which principals need to attend in these areas, while Set 6 mentions only "maintaining effective communication patterns" with

such groups and Set 8 lists only "buffering" staff. Sets 3, 7, 9, and 10 are more about administrative processes than the tasks themselves. Since this study concentrated on tasks that the principals did rather than on the processes, the six lettered task areas were chosen rather than the ten numbered areas.

2.1.3 Variables of principals/schools and features of principals' administrative activities/actions

A brief review of this body of literature reveals mixed findings on correlations between some variables of principals or schools and features of principals' administrative activities/ behaviors.

Gender. Eagly and others (1992) reviewed 50 studies comparing the leadership styles of public school principals, most of whom worked in elementary schools. Findings include: female principals score higher than male principals on task-oriented style and score about the same on interpersonally oriented style measures. Females tend to adopt a more democratic or participatory style compared to males. Gips (1989) found that in general, female principals value human relationships, care, responsibility, equity, fairness, intimacy, and cooperation, and construct their roles accordingly. Zheng (1996) found that female principals are more positively rated than their male counterparts by their teachers in effectiveness level ratings of instructional leadership. However, Mertz and McNeely (1997) did not find that gender is a salient factor in high school principals' approach to decision making.

Riehl and Lee (1996) conducted an extensive literature review and found theoretical and empirical evidence to support the notion that gender of the principal "impacts on many dimensions of organizational life, and that successful leaders need to understand and manage

26

these gender issues" (p. 903). At the same time, however, they also found that "summary reviews and meta-analyses have concluded that male and female school administrators are far more similar than different" (p. 904). They explain that there were many possible reasons for lack of strong evidence about gender differences, such as lack of adequate samples, leadership dimensions examined and methodological rigor. Training and selection processes might also prepare and expect male and female leaders to think and behave in similar ways. They caution that the question of gender issues is not about whether all women lead in particular ways or ways that differ from men. Rather, the question is whether women, through their leadership practice and research, promote and contribute to "more effective leadership and more successful schools" (p. 905).

Alex (1997) reported that in 1996, female principals comprised 31.8 % of the total number of secondary level principals in Winnipeg School Division No.1, which was the only one of the 49 school divisions in Manitoba that had implemented an Affirmative Action for Women in Administration policy. Between January 1986 when the policy was adopted and November 1996, the percentage of female secondary school principals increased from 22% to 31.8%. In Alex's study, all four female principals and vice-principals reported that the Affirmative Action for Women in Administration policy was a benefit to them in their appointment to an administrator's position. In the 1998-99 school year, it was unlikely that the percentage of Manitoba high school principals who were female could have been greater than 30 percent. The present study included gender as a variable to examine whether the administrative activities of male and female principals were similar pertaining to preparing students for citizenship and whether male and female principals perceived their administrative activities to be effective.

Years of service. Years of service means years of being a principal. Findings from

Zheng's (1996) comprehensive study showed that "While it remains unclear whether

teaching experience is a positive factor associated with principals' performance in

instructional leadership, administrative experience is obviously not a positive one.... In

general, the longer a principal stays in school administrative positions, the more negatively

he/she is perceived by teachers" (p. 20). Allison and Allison (1991) found that on-the-job

experience did not necessarily contribute to the expertise of the principals in administrative

problem-solving approaches. Some other researchers reported that years of being a principal

was a factor that may help differentiate between experienced and less-experienced principals

in the willingness of sharing power in decision making (Bullock et al., 1995) and in the

topics that the principals chose to discuss with others (Garber, 1991). It appears that the

findings vary depending on which administrative aspects were researched. The present study

examined whether principals with different years of on-the-job experience contributed to the

difference in the approaches they took in preparing students for citizenship.

Educational background and specialist certification status. Academic degrees

held have quite often been used as indicators for levels of formal education completed.

Zheng (1996) found that, if education levels were the only factor to consider, higher degrees

(Master's degree or beyond) made no significant difference among public school principals

in their perceived effectiveness in instructional leadership, but were significant for private

school principals (p. 18). When level of formal education was combined with other factors

such as academic major and in-service training, education level became a significant and

positive factor for both public and private school principals. Allison and Allison (1991)

found that differences in problem-solving approaches possibly had something to do with

different principal certification requirements. The present study examined whether there were differences in principals' administrative activities toward preparing students for citizenship based on the principals' educational background and specialist certification status.

School type: public vs. private. There is little doubt that some aspects of principals' administrative practice in public schools are different from those of principals in private schools. But on which aspects and how large are such differences? Zheng (1996) found that variables such as race, gender, age, education and training of the principals as well as the location, size and grade level of schools all seem to be factors when comparing perceived effectiveness between public and private school principals. In general, private school principals are rated as being more effective by their teachers in leadership than are principals of public schools (p. 24). In Zheng's interpretation, the perceived differences in leadership effectiveness were more likely to be due to different environmental constraints based on school type. In the present study, 205 high schools were contacted initially, of which 167 were public schools and 38 private schools. The present study included school types of public vs. private for examination to see if there were differences in the features of principals' administrative practices when it comes to preparing students for citizenship.

Grade levels in school. Zheng (1996) claims that different grade levels of the schools is a factor that impacts principals' perceived effectiveness in instructional leadership. In his study, principals of both public and private schools that serve only secondary level students were rated more negatively than their counterparts in schools that serve only elementary level students. Zheng also maintains that his claim is supported by findings from other studies (Zheng, 1996, p. 22). Buettner (1995) found a significant relation between principals' use of some coping skills and school grade-span, but the relation between

principals' use or effectiveness of other types of coping mechanisms and school grade-span was less than conclusive. The present study examines whether there was a difference in features of principals' administrative activities pertaining to preparing students for citizenship based on grade levels in their schools.

Personal variables such as gender, experience, education level and certification, and school physical variables such as school type, location, and grade level have been researched for their possible associations with features of school principals' administrative practices. Findings vary depending on which aspects of administration were examined and how. The present study examined if there is a relation between the features of principals' administrative practices and some principals' personal variables and school environmental variables. It also examined if there is a relation between the levels of principals' self-perceived effectiveness of their administrative actions and some of their personal variables and school physical variables.

2.2 Recent research about citizenship education in schools of English Canada

In his latest book, The world we want: Virtue, vice, and the good citizen (2000), Mark Kingwell noted that there is a "vast and growing scholarly literature on the topic of citizenship" (p. 223) and that many leading theorists of citizenship are Canadian. Among his list are eminent scholars such as Will Kymlica, James Tully, Ronald Beiner, Wayne Norman, Joseph Carens, Leslie Green, Judith Baker and Denise Réaume. Kingwell regarded this as evidence of "both an ongoing constitutional crisis in the country and (perhaps by the same token) a willingness to think beyond the limits of crude nationalism" (p. 224). At the same time, Sears, Clark and Hughes (1999) also noted that the number of government-sponsored investigations, academic publications and graduate theses, and popular books and articles on

citizenship and citizenship education is growing. According to these authors, the first

explanation for this to this growth is "an overarching concern" in Canada about the place of

Québec with the federation in the future. Other explanations include the "struggles

concerning the distribution of powers between the Federal and Provincial Governments,"

pressure from Western Canada to reform the upper house of the Federal Parliament to make

it an elected body with equal number of senators from each province, pressure from

aboriginal groups "to be recognized as nations within the Canadian federation," the

"patriation of the Canadian Constitution from Britain in 1982, with the addition of the

Charter of Rights and Freedoms," and the birth of "The Canadian Multiculturalism Act"

(Sears, Clark and Hughes, 1999, pp. 112, 113). The authors further stated that the response

of citizenship education in Canada to all these debates "has been remarkably uniform" (p.

113). They cited the statement in the High School Foundation Program in the Province of

New Brunswick as representative: "We hoped that all students will become active and

concerned citizens, knowledgeable about their community, province and country and its

place in the global village" (Curriculum Development Branch, 1996, p. iv).

The foci of the research literature on citizenship education practices in the schools of

English Canada fall mainly into the areas of social studies curricula and instruction or official

policies related to curricula. However, it is also true that, in some research literature, the

borderline blurs between the achievement of teaching and learning outcomes of citizenship

education curricula and the achievement of the overall goal of preparing students for

citizenship as part of successful schooling. This tendency is particularly apparent in the

typology presented in Sears (1996a) and Sears and Hughes (1996), which illustrates a

continuum from elitist to activist conceptions of citizenship and a corresponding continuum

of conceptions of citizenship education. A message conveyed is that different conceptions of citizenship give rise to different types of desired outcomes of citizenship education, and entail different instructional approaches. The two continua end at the development of desired citizen characteristics in students as the learning outcomes of citizenship education curricula. Osborne (2000) examined the role of public schools in Canada as agents of citizenship education from a historical perspective and proposed a conception of citizenship education. He claimed that, from the very beginning of public schools in Canada, the major duty of the public schools has been preparing the young for citizenship. He maintained that, although the meaning of citizenship "can never be once and for all decisively fixed" and "will always be the subject of debate and disagreement" (p. 11), over the years in Canada, the nature and content of citizenship education has come to consist of some seven elements: "a sense of identity; an awareness of one's rights and respect for the rights of others; the fulfillment of duties; a critical acceptance of social values; political literacy; a broad general knowledge and command of basic academic skills; and the capacity to reflect on the implications of all these components and to act appropriately" (p. 19). To help students learn citizenship, "the classroom is not the only place where learning occurs in school" (p. 25). "School sports, music programs, and student clubs of all types" and in particular "the whole corporate life of the school" have all long been recognized as contributors to students' learning of citizenship (p. 26). His conception of citizenship consists of 12 "C's": Canadian, cosmopolitan, communication, coherence, critical, creativity, curiosity, civilization, community, concern, character, and competence, and he believed that these elements should be the key points of citizenship education.

In 1998, Canada participated in Phase 1 of the Civic Education Project conducted by the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA) and presented a national Case Study on citizenship education in Canada's schools (Sears, Clarke, & Hughes, 1998a). "The IEA achieved consensus from the participating countries that the core components of citizenship are contained within the domains of democracy, national identity, and social cohesion/diversity" (Sears, Clarke & Hughes, 1998b, p. 2). When answering the IEA research questions formed around these "core components of citizenship," the authors maintain that citizenship in Canada has been a contested concept. First, there exist varying conceptions of citizenship along the continuum from elitist to activist conceptions. An elitist conception of citizenship is in the belief that only a small group of people "fit" for ruling the country should govern and that participation in public affairs by ordinary citizens beyond voting is undesirable and should be discouraged. According to this conception, the highest duty of a citizen is to become a well-informed voter at election time. An activist conception of citizenship assumes "a significant level of participation by all citizens." According to this conception, good citizens participate actively in community or national affairs (Sears, Clarke and Hughes, 1998a, p. 6). National identity is one more central and also controversial component of citizenship and citizenship education in Canada. Drawing on Taylor (1993), Sears, Clarke and Hughes (1998a) summarize that, while "English Canada has struggled to find its centre and ... has focused its nationalism around the structures of the federal state," some other Canadians, particularly Francophone Québecers and aboriginal groups, "see themselves as fitting into the larger society ... through their membership in their historical communities" (p. 12-13). The core obstacle to a unified Canada identity, however, lies not so much in different understandings of citizenship, but in

the fact that both Anglophone people and Francophone Québecers see their understanding "as having universal application" (Sears, Clarke and Hughes, 1998a, p. 13). As a response to the different opinions of national identity, Cairns (1999) pointed out that, in a diverse and pluralist society, single identities are wrong. He held that citizenship has two dimensions. One dimension links individuals to the state by "reinforcing the idea that it is "their" state" (p. 4). The other dimension is "the positive identification of citizens with each other as valued members of the same civic community" (p.4). As such, citizenship "is a linking mechanism, which in its most perfect expression binds the citizenry to the state and to each other" (p. 4). In a diverse and pluralistic society, we should guard against any politics that exaggerates small differences between us and ignores the much greater similarities that we share. It is the multiple identities in each of us that "links us with different fellow citizens who share some but not all of what we are" (p. 21). Social cohesion and social diversity is yet another important issue in Canadian citizenship education. This area contains such constructs as multiculturalism, gender equality, and representation of working-class people in decision-making processes. Sears, Clarke and Hughes (1998a) see that finding the appropriate balance between social cohesion and social diversity in Canadian citizenship education "remains a sticky one" (p. 22).

It can be expected that the Manitoba high school principals may hold the conceptions of citizenship and citizenship education that may fall on any points along the continuum of elitist to activist views. They may also hold different understandings of national identity, and endorse varying theories of social cohesion and social diversity. However, in a recent writing, Sears, Clarke and Hughes (1998b) pointed out that consensus can be found in spite of conceptual variation in the field of educating for Canadian citizenship. Examples include

that "ministries/ departments of education across Canada have taken a remarkable similar approach to citizenship education" and that "in all provinces and territories the goal of citizenship education is to create knowledgeable individuals committed to active participation in a pluralist society" (p. 3). They further observe that the commitment to fostering a pluralist civic society with wide participation from many different individuals and groups encourages the willingness of setting aside private interest in favor of the common good (p. 4). They cite Hughes (1994) in noting that a general consensus is found that good citizenship is characterized by dispositions such as "open-mindedness, civic mindedness, respect, willingness to compromise, tolerance, compassion, generosity of spirit, and loyalty" (Hughes 1994, p. 21, cited in Sears, Clarke and Hughes, 1998b, p. 4). There seems to be a consensus that, while conceptions of Canadian citizenship vary, some shared ideas and agreement exist among varying conceptions of Canadian citizenship and social cohesion.

Since A. B. Hodgetts' landmark report, <u>What Culture? What Heritage?</u>, was published in 1968, quite a number of studies have been conducted on citizenship education regarding student learning outcomes, instructional approaches, curricula and policies, and history of citizenship education in the schools of English Canada. Sears (1994) classified these studies into four categories. First, nine survey studies up to year 1990 were about students' knowledge, skills, and political attitudes, with sample size ranging from 290 to 14,051. A purpose shared by these studies was examining relationships between outcomes of citizenship education and selected demographic variables of the students (p. 18). Secondly, several studies up to 1992 focused on instructional approaches. Findings from three out of four studies favored a contemporary-issue/inquiry-based approach to the traditional classroom lecture approach (p. 21). The third category consists of over a dozen studies up to

year 1992 that examined curricula, policies, and structure in citizenship education in Canada's schools. Issues studied include multiculturalism, political education, sexism, heritage language programs, and human rights education (p. 28). Historical studies form the fourth category of the literature review. These studies examined the history of citizenship education in Canada and covered the time span from the beginning of public education in Canada to the year 1992 (p. 29). The foci of these studies include national initiatives on citizenship education, social study curricula across Canada, status of the study of history in schools, the school's role in educating students for citizenship, and histories of some school programs. Sears (1994) observed that the number of studies on citizenship education is small, and more and good quality studies on this topic are badly needed to help understand and improve the process of development of "capable, informed, and participating citizens" (p. 37).

Sears' observations were echoed in his another review of recent research on citizenship education in English Canada (Sears, 1996b). He pointed out that, among other things, "the orientation towards citizenship education in curricula and policy across the country is to promote wide and active citizenship participation;" and yet "very little is known about the practice of citizenship education in Canadian classrooms" (Sears, 1996b, p. 121). He again reminds us of the gap between what was stated in official curricula and what actually happens behind classroom doors.

Sears, Clarke, and Hughes (1998a) recently summarized what is known and what has yet to be discovered in the field of citizenship education in the schools of English Canada. The authors held that certainly much more is known today about the history of citizenship education in Canada, official policy and curricula across the country, and the role of the

federal state in citizenship education (p. 22). Yet, little is known about the practice of citizenship education in classrooms, about the information and understanding of and attitudes toward citizenship education of young people, and about who the most effective citizenship educators are (pp. 22-23). To fill in these gaps in citizenship education research, in March 1998, a pan-Canada research program was framed. This program, the Citizenship Education Research Network (CERN), includes four components: (a) models of citizenship, typologies of citizens and contexts of citizenship, (b) values in citizenship education, (c) behaviors, attitudes, skills and knowledge in citizenship education, and (d) teaching practices in citizenship education (Hébert and Page, 2000). It can certainly be expected that much more will be known on these topics when the program is completed.

Up to today, while there is literature that calls our attention to citizenship education practice at school level (Levin, 2000; Sears and Perry, 2000), studies completed in the practice of preparing students for citizenship mostly examined "citizenship education" practices at school level from the perspective of curriculum and instruction. No study has been found in Canada devoted to principals' administrative practices towards preparing students for citizenship. Recommendations are numerous of what principals can do towards preparing students for citizenship; yet, little is known of what principals actually do in this respect. It is hoped that the present study will contribute to the knowledge base of principals' administrative actions pertaining to the achievement of the goal of preparing students for citizenship.

2.3 An empirical study on citizenship education
through the eyes of school principals

One empirical study examined citizenship education practices through the eyes of school principals (Tucker, 1986). This study examined the status of citizenship education curriculum in Florida public elementary schools. The principals were first asked to assign priorities to each of four dimensions of citizenship education curriculum. They were interpersonal understandings, citizenship participation, enculturation, and moral and ethical character. One major finding was that the dimension of moral and ethical issues and the dimension of interpersonal understandings were rated higher as priorities than enculturation and citizenship participation dimensions. Then, the principals were asked to supply examples of what they had done to promote the implementation of citizenship education curriculum. Fifteen out of 47 principals failed to give a single example. The remaining 32 principals provided 136 examples with "a great concentration on extra-curricular activities" (p. 10). The main conclusion drawn was that principals did not have sufficient understanding of the knowledge base in citizenship education curriculum and related social science areas, which impeded their leadership capacity in developing and implementing citizenship education programs (p. 11).

An assumption underlying the purpose of Tucker's study is that principals can influence the development and implementation of citizenship education programs in their school through their administrative practices. The present study is built on a similar assumption that, in their administrative practices, principals can influence the achievement of the goal of preparing students for citizenship. However, the present study is different from Tucker's study in that the present study examined principals' administrative practices from a theoretical framework of educational administration, while Tucker's study examined

principals' perception and understanding of the citizenship education curriculum and their practices in promoting the implementation of the citizenship education curriculum. Also, in the present study preparing students for citizenship was regarded as an overall goal of education, while in Tucker's study the term "citizenship education" referred to citizenship education curriculum.

2.4 Re-statement of the two basic purposes of the study

The two basic purposes underlying the present study were: first, to identify the administrative practices that were used by principals during the 1998-99 school year to help prepare students for citizenship and to determine whether or not some administrative activities/actions were more common than others; and second, to examine how effective the identified administrative activities were, based on the principals' perceptions and the reasons they gave for their perceptions. Based on the literature review, the two basic purposes of this study can be restated in terms of four major research questions:

Research question 1: When Manitoba high school principals are asked to indicate their 1998-99 administrative actions ("tasks") toward preparing students for citizenship, who performed each action ("doer") and who was the recipient of each action ("target")? More specifically, which doers and targets were more frequently mentioned by the principals for each task area?

Research question 2: When Manitoba high school principals are asked to indicate their 1998-99 administrative actions ("tasks") toward preparing students for citizenship, which characteristics of these principals were most associated with their more frequently

mentioning one particular doer or target rather than another for each task area? Among the characteristics studied were:

1. the gender of the principals,
2. the years of administrative service of the principals,
3. the educational background of the principals,
4. the administrative certification status of the principals,
5. the school type of the principals (i.e., public vs. private schools), and
6. the grade levels in the principals' schools.

Research question 3: When Manitoba high school principals are asked to indicate their 1998-99 administrative actions ("tasks") toward preparing students for citizenship, which doer/target classifications and characteristics of these principals were most associated with their giving higher effectiveness ratings to these administrative efforts? Among the characteristics studied were:

1. the gender of the principals,
2. the years of administrative service of the principals,
3. the educational background of the principals,
4. the administrative certification status of the principals,
5. the school type of the principals (i.e., public vs. private schools), and
6. the grade levels in the principals' schools.

Research question 4: When Manitoba high school principals are asked to indicate their 1998-99 administrative actions ("tasks") toward preparing students for citizenship, what reasons did they give for the level of their effectiveness rating of these administrative activities?

2.5 Summary

The overall purpose of the literature review was to find literature that could be used for the design of the study. Two groups of literature were reviewed. The first group concerns principals' administrative practices. School principals in Manitoba are designated as the person in charge of all matters of organization, management, instruction and discipline of a school, subject to *The Public School Act* and its regulations, and the instructions of the school board. Principals' administrative work can be summarized into six task areas: curricula and instruction programs, student personnel, teacher/staff personnel, school-community relations, financial resources, and physical resources. Findings from empirical studies showed whether that was a relationship between some variables of principals/ schools and features of principals' administrative activities/ actions, depending on what aspects of administrative actions were researched and under what circumstances.

The second group of literature includes some recent research on citizenship education in the schools of English Canada. According to the International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA), the core components of citizenship are contained within the domains of democracy, national identity, and social cohesion/diversity. In Canada, the conceptions of citizen participation in decision-making vary along the continuum from elitist to activist views. Anglophone people, Francophone Quebecers and aboriginal people all have their own understandings of national identities. Social cohesion and social diversity area contains such constructs as multiculturalism, gender equality, and representation of working-class people. Finding balance in each of these constructs is by no means an easy job.

Currently, the orientation towards citizenship education in curricula and policy across the country is to promote wide and active citizenship participation. Yet, little is known about the practice of citizenship education in classrooms, about the information and understanding of and attitudes toward citizenship education of young people, and about who are the most effective citizenship educators.

No empirical study was found directly bearing on the topic of this thesis. One empirical study did examine the status of citizenship education curriculum through the eyes of principals, but the foci of that study were on principals' perceptions of the citizenship education curriculum and their practices to promote the implementation of the curriculum (Tucker, 1986) rather than on the general set of administrative task areas.

CHAPTER THREE
METHODOLOGY

This chapter contains five sections which summarize the procedures of the present study and the methodologies used. The first section is about the development of the survey questionnaire. The foci are on the validity and reliability of the questionnaire. The second section relates the steps undertaken to obtain approval of the present study from the Research and Ethics Review Committee of the Faculty of Education, University of Manitoba, and describes the pilot study of the questionnaire. The third section is about the process of the main study, including the phases of data collection and analysis. The fourth section states the statistical tests employed for data analysis. The fifth section is a summary of this chapter.

3.1 Development of the survey questionnaire

3.1.1 Validity of the questionnaire. The purpose of the survey questionnaire is to collect data about the administrative practices of the principals for preparing students for citizenship. The questionnaire asks principals to supply four types of information. The first involves a group of demographic questions about principals and their schools. The second involves a group of open-ended questions about those task areas as derived from the literature review (Alvy & Robbins, 1998; Field, 1985; Huges, Ribbins, & Thomas, 1985; Lipham & Hoeh, 1974; Lipham, Rankin & Hoeh, 1985; Serviovanni, 1987). The task areas are curricula and instruction programs, student personnel, staff personnel, community-school relations, financial resources, and school physical resources. The participants were asked to list the most important administrative activity that they did in each of the administrative task areas during the 1998-1999 school year towards the goal of preparing students for citizenship. The third type of information involves a scale to rate how effective the principals perceived each

of the given administrative activities was in promoting the goal of preparing students for citizenship. In other words, they were asked to reflect on the given administrative activities and to rate how effective each of the activities was. The fourth involves an open-ended question asking for brief reasons for their ratings.

Usually, when preparing an instrument for research purposes, the degree of validity of the instrument is the most important criterion to meet. A simplistic definition of validity is "the degree to which a test measures what it is supposed to measure" (Gay 1992, p. 155). There are three major types of validity: content validity, construct validity, and criterion validity (Fraenkel & Wallen, 1990, pp. 127-133; Gay, 1992, pp. 154-161). Content validity is the degree to which a test measures an intended content area. In other words, items included in an instrument should be representative of the content area which is measured. Content validity is determined by expert judgement. Construct validity refers to "the degree to which a test measures an intended hypothetical construct" (Gay 1992, p. 157), and the process of validating a test of construct is a complex and comprehensive task. For example, it may involve studies of how the test was developed, what theory underlies the test, how the test functions with a variety of people and in a variety of situations, and how the scores obtained relate to the scores obtained through other appropriate instruments. Criterion validity consists of concurrent validity and predictive validity. The former refers to the degree to which the scores on a test are related to the scores on another well-established test administered nearly at the same time. The latter refers to "the degree to which a test can predict how well an individual will do in a future situation" (Gay 1992, p. 159). A key index in both forms is correlation coefficient. The closer the coefficient r value is to +1.00 or -1.00, the higher the validity coefficient obtained (Fraenkel & Wallen 1990, p. 131). The

three types of validity are very important to a checklist or scale for a pre-designed experiment. In the present study, however, the questionnaire is not a checklist or simply a scale to measure an intended hypothetical construct. Instead, the questionnaire contains open-ended questions to bring forth data presented in literal expressions. As such, of the three major types of validity, neither construct validity nor criterion validity applies here. Content validity of the questionnaire is maintained, as the questionnaire was developed following an examination of the research literature about the task areas performed by the principals.

3.1.2 Reliability of the questionnaire. Reliability is another important criterion to meet when preparing an instrument for research purpose. Basically, reliability refers to the degree of consistency of scores or answers that a test measures. When measurements are taken more than once, error of measurement occurs. The bigger the error, the less consistent a test is. Such error can be measured by a reliability coefficient. If a test is perfectly reliable, the coefficient would be 1.00 (Fraenkel and Wallen, 1990; Gall *et al*, 1996; Gay, 1992; Wallen and Fraenkel, 2001). The difference between a validity coefficient and a reliability coefficient lies in the different types of relationship that they each express. A validity coefficient expresses the relationship "between scores of the same individuals on two different instruments," while a reliability coefficient expresses "a relationship between scores of the same individuals on the same instrument at two different times, or between two forms of the same instrument" (Wallen and Fraenkel, 2001, p. 98). Degree of reliability can be estimated through particular types of tests. For example, "test-retest" method is used for information of stability of test scores over time, "equivalent-forms" method for information on consistency of test scores over two different forms of an instrument, and "internal

consistency" method for consistency of test scores over different parts of an instrument (Fraenkel and Wallen, 1990; Gall *et al*, 1996; Gay, 1992; Wallen and Fraenkel, 2001). In the present study, none of these reliability tests was taken. First, the questionnaire used in the present study contains open-ended questions for information presented in literal expressions. Because of the open-ended nature of the questionnaire and the possible biasing effect if the same questionnaire were given more than once to the same principals, no measurement on test-retest reliability was taken. Second, as the present study is the first one under the topic of this thesis, no "equivalent-form" is available and the "equivalent-forms" method is thus out of the question. Third, the questionnaire contains open-ended questions about six different task areas and in reality principals do different things relating to different task areas. Therefore, the "internal consistency" method for measuring reliability over different parts of an instrument does not apply either.

3.2 The pilot study

The two purposes of the pilot study were to clarify the meanings of the questions in the questionnaire and to find if the questions could bring forth the data needed to answer the research questions.

In September of 1999, an application to conduct a pilot study of this research project was submitted to the Research and Ethics Review Committee of Faculty of Education, University of Manitoba. The application package included a set of application forms, the questionnaire, the cover letter, the letter to the school, and a form of whether or not a participant would like to receive a summary of the major findings of the study. After some corrections to the package (see Appendix 1), the Research and Ethics Review Committee

approved the application for pilot study in early November of 1999. The pilot study was conducted during November of 1999.

Five participants were recruited for the pilot study. All had been principals in Manitoba high schools who left their positions before the 1998-99 school year. There were two reasons for recruiting these participants instead of current high school principals. One was to ensure that there would be no overlapping of participants in the pilot study and the main study. The other was to ensure that the pilot study would not affect the sample size of the main study due to using up potential main study participants. The participants were selected with the consideration of gender difference, their experience as principals in Manitoba high schools, educational background, type of school in which they held the position of principal (i.e., public vs. private), location of schools, and grade levels in their schools.

Based on the feedback from the pilot study, the questionnaire, the cover letter, the letter to schools, and a form asking whether a participant would like to receive a brief summary of this study were revised. In middle December of 1999, the revised survey package together with the application forms were submitted to the Research and Ethic Review Committee of the Faculty of Education, University of Manitoba, for approval for the main study. In late January of 2000, the Committee approved the application for the main study unconditionally. (See Appendix 2 for a sample letter to schools, Appendix 3 for a sample cover letter to the principals, Appendix 4 for a sample form of whether a participant would like to receive a summary of the major findings of this study, and Appendix 5 for a sample questionnaire.)

3.3 The main study

3.3.1 Data collection

Participants. Participants were selected against four criteria. First, during the 1998-1999 school year, they were principals of a Manitoba high school. Second, they were principals of a public or private high school that contained grade Senior 4, which is Grade 12 and the final year of high school in Manitoba. Third, they were principals of a high school that followed the curricula prescribed by Manitoba Education and Training. Fourth, they were principals of a high school where the language of instruction is English. In other words, people contacted and invited to participate in the study constituted the entire population of those who were principals during the 1998-1999 school year in a Manitoba high school that contained grade Senior 4, that followed the curricula prescribed by Manitoba Education and Training, and that used English as the language of instruction. Schools were selected from the list of schools in Schools in Manitoba, 1999 (Manitoba Education and Training, 1999).

Return of completed questionnaires. The process of data collection for the main study started in early February, 2000. A survey package was sent to the selected high schools by regular mail. Enclosed in the envelope were a letter to the school, a cover letter to the principal, a survey questionnaire, a form of whether a participant would like to receive a summary of major findings of the study, and a self-addressed, stamped envelope for returning the completed questionnaire. The letter to the school asked the person who opened the envelope to forward the cover letter and the questionnaire to the person who was the principal of the school in the 1998-1999 school year. The questionnaires were coded for tracking the returning rate and for further contact. In the cover letter, a preferred date of February 25, 2000 was indicated for sending back the completed questionnaire. This date

gave the principals three weeks to complete the questionnaires. The return rate was 35 out of 232 questionnaires sent.

In late March, after spring break of the schools, a survey package was sent by regular mail to the schools for the second-round contact. Enclosed in this package were the same materials as were enclosed in the survey package for the initial contact with two changes. One change was that two sentences were added to the cover letter to the principal. They read: "A questionnaire was sent to you in February. As I did not hear from you, I am sending you the same questionnaire again." The other change was that a preferred date of April 25, 2000 was indicated for sending back the completed questionnaire.

About 10 days after the questionnaires were put in the mail, the investigator started calling the principals and asking for their help with this study. This telephone contact proved to be quite useful particularly in two aspects. First, it helped increase the return rate from 35 to 87 out of 232 sample schools. Secondly, the investigator learned from the telephone conversations with the secretary or the principal or the person who answered the phone call that some schools in fact should not be included in the sample. Those schools, during the 1998-1999 school year, did not have grade S4, or shared a principal with other schools, or did not exist any more. As a result, the number of sample schools was reduced from 232 to 205. Out of the 87 returned questionnaires, 81 cases (principals) were selected for study based on two criteria. One criterion was that the demographic section was completed; the other was that answers were provided to at least three out of six task areas of the questionnaire. As a result, questionnaires from six respondents were excluded. Three respondents completed only the demographic section. Of the remaining three, one was not a principal during the 1998-1999 school year, one wrote all answers on a page and failed to

place them in distinguishable task areas, and one principal claimed that the school did not follow the curricula prescribed by Manitoba Education and Training during the 1998-99 school year. Therefore, the study is based on 81/205 cases, which equals 40% of the entire sample. The data collection phase was completed by the end of June, which was the end of the 1999-2000 school year.

3.3.2 Data analysis

Data coding. Data were coded to provide an interpretable database. Codes reflected two essential elements/aspects of an administrative activity, namely, who performed a given activity and for whom this activity was performed. The categories of codes are as the follows:

WHO PERFORMED THE ACTIVITY ("Doers")

    A. The principal answering the questionnaire

    B. Someone besides the principal

WHO WAS THE TARGET OF THE ACTIVITY ("Target")

1. Students (This category includes activities directly for or about the students.)

2. School-staff (This category includes activities directly for or about the staff of the school. Staff of the school includes administrators, teachers, and other employees of the school.)

3. School (This category includes activities directly for or about the school as an organization.)

4. Other (This category includes activities that do not fall into any of the above three categories.)

Each of the administrative activities (tasks) was given a two-digit doer-target code. For example, a coding of "A-1" would be used if the principal's response was based primarily on an activity performed by the principal for the students. To illustrate further how the activities were coded, examples have been selected from each task area.

Task Area A (curricula and instruction programs)

- I recommended that SSS School Division implement a mandatory number of hours for each student to fulfil for graduation. (A-1)

- All teachers were encouraged to attend seminars and workshops regarding curriculum implementation. Substitute teachers were provided. (A-2)

- At Division level led request for re-evaluation of grad requirement to align more closely to prov. requirements. (A-3)

- Our School Division made changes to curriculum based on technology. I was part of the committee whose main purpose was to spearhead advances in use of technology in all curriculum areas. (A-4)

- Our school, with support from the division, introduced, wrote, and implemented an Information Technology Program which allows students to earn a dual diploma in high school, should they choose. (B-1)

- Our school division has strongly encouraged teachers to attend new curriculum in-service. (B-2)

- Our school held meetings with each curriculum group to assess our curricular offerings and the possibility of introducing new courses. (B-3)

Task Area B (student personnel)

- Asked students for input of high school courses they would like and actually implemented most popular ones. (A-1)

- We worked on a code of Conduct + Belief statement. I chaired a committee of students, parents, + teachers which researched + developed a program that we could all buy into. (A-3)

- The Student Council was utilized often for their input to various items. Such items include school spirit, extra-curricular activities, student admission policies, and student discipline. (B-1)

- As part of the Teacher Growth model of supervision, students have been asked to comment on courses (both positive + negative are encouraged). (B-2)

- Student Council president and vice-president are active members of our Advisory Council. (B-3)

- Student council involved in relief efforts for Mozambique Relief. (B-4)

Task Area C (staff personnel)

- I initiated a teacher-advisory program similar to the home room concept. The goal was to enhance the relationship between students + students as well as between staff + students. (A-1)

- Recruited staff who will be able to function in this cultural environment, particularly related to aboriginal culture. (A-2)

- In conjunction with the advisory council and student council, I began a feasibility study to assess the impact of combining 2 area high schools. (A-3)

- We decided to focus on some of the positive aspects of student work and accomplishments rather than the few, but serious, misbehaviors of a few students. (B-1)

- Each Day we have a staff devotional for all teachers at our school. The devotionals focus on how we as Christian teachers need to meet the needs of our children and guide them to be a productive person in society. (B-2)

- We have developed a collaborative model of decision making for the staff. We are attempting to include students, i.e., in School Plans. (B-3)

- Our Division has introduced a mentoring program for future school administrators. (B-4)

Task Area D (school-community relations)

- I have encouraged the businesses in our community to allow us to use their various business sites as work sites for our students in the school's BBB program. Students would receive academic training at the school site while the different business sites would deliver the practical components of the course. (A-1)

- Interact frequently with the CCC teachers who instruct the same student body. (A-2)

- Promote interactions between teachers + parents and school + parents. (A-3)

- This year our school hosted its 2nd annual Student Conference. Over 30 individual sessions as well as key note speakers were available for our students. Topics ranged from stress management to Youth and the Law. (B-1)

- Parent Advisory Council involvement at staff meetings, in the hiring process + in decision making. (B-2)

- A school plan is developed and presented to Advisory Council for reactions. Suggestions for changes are made. The plan includes school budget, school policies, courses and programs to be offered. (B-3)

- Our school staff is well represented on a community-education group called CCC. Regular meetings discuss items of mutual concern. (B-4)

Task Area E (school financial resources)

- Negotiated contract with HRDC for TTT Program to train students in information technology with the goal of employment. (A-1)

- At budget time, requests from teachers for financial resources to teach a course are usually honored. (A-2)

- Allocated monies to computer and other technological areas. (A-3)

- Funding was secured from HHH to support students in pursuit of post-secondary education. The selected students were identified as possessing the ability BUT unlikely to seek post-secondary due to family histories, finances, etc. (B-1)

- Financial resources and decisions related to them are discussed + decided by committees of staff + administration + students (when applicable). (Nothing is done arbitrarily by myself.) (B-3)

Task Area F (school physical resources)

- I utilized the largest room in the school, the library, for Student Voice meetings and workshops. (A-1)

- Requested another line for Senior 1 teachers; as Senior 1 was housed between a primary and intermediate class. (A-2)

- I made great efforts to make the school a place in which the students take pride + want to be there + want to maintain its appearance + spirit. (A-3)

- Space is always made available for visiting speakers, such as politicians, Lieutenant Governor, representatives of higher education... the timetable is adjusted to maximize attendance + discussion. (A-4)

- We have always made a point of supporting any of our programs which heighten awareness of social issues. (B-1)

- Physical resources are allocated prior to the school year. We adjust this to meet periodic demands, e.g., debates, guest speakers, etc. (B-3)

Validation of data codes. The process of data coding involves to a great extent interpretation of the written presentations of the administrative activities. Rather than based on a single source of interpretation of data for data coding, the technique of triangulation (Berg, 1995) was employed to enhance the level of validity/ credibility/ confirmability of the codes of data (Denzin, 1988). One form of triangulation involves the evaluation of *different* sources of the *same* information. For example, "No report was credited unless it could be verified by another person" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 305).

In the present study, three raters were used: the investigator and two other raters. One of the three raters was female; two were male. One rater is a faculty member in the Faculty of Education at the University of Manitoba and a former principal; the other two are doctoral candidates in Educational Administration at the same university. One of them was a former principal. The investigator knows the other two raters, but the other two raters do not know each other. This enhanced the degree of credibility of independent rating. A complete set of examples of administrative activities supplied by the respondents was provided to each of the raters, together with instructions for rating these data. (See Appendix 6 for a sample of "Instructions to Data Raters.") As a result, each administrative activity received three two-digit codes altogether from three independent sources, that is, from two raters as well as from

the investigator. When deciding on a code for a particular administrative activity, the three

sets of codes were compared. The decision was made according to the following procedure.

(1) When at least two codes out of three were the same, the majority judgement was

selected as the final code for a particular administrative activity.

(2) When all three codes on a particular administrative activity disagreed with one

another, the response was sent to an "arbitrator" for final evaluation. The

investigator's Ph.D. program advisor, a male faculty member at Faculty of

Education, University of Manitoba, served as the "arbitrator." The arbitrator

made his judgement independently. He was provided with the same instructions

of data rating as that to the other raters. He did not see the ratings from any of the

three raters when he made his judgement. As a result, out of 439 first-mentioned

activities provided by all 81 principals, 26 were sent to the arbitrator for final

decisions.

Data for an activity were omitted under either of the following two conditions: (a) no

example of an activity was given or (b) the arbitrator's judgement on an activity did not agree

with any of the three initial raters. (The second situation never occurred.)

Selection of cases. Contrary to the pilot questionnaire, which asked the respondents

to provide three examples of administrative action to each task area, the research

questionnaire asked the respondents to provide only ONE example of an administrative

activity, namely, the "most important" activity that they did in each of six task areas during

the 1998-1999 school year to promote the goal of preparing students for citizenship. This

change was due to the feedback from the pilot study. The related feedback said that

principals were busy people and that the more time a questionnaire demanded of them the

less likely they would do it. Also, some participants in the pilot study provided only one example to some task areas. Since it looked likely that not everyone would provide three examples, there was no point asking for three. In the main study, the same situation happened again. Some participants provided one example of an administrative activity to each of the six task areas, while others voluntarily provided multiple examples to at least one task area. In this case, the first mentioned activity in each task area was considered as the "most important" activity. Then, a question emerged: Do the effectiveness ratings of those giving only one answer differ from the ratings of those providing multiple answers? To determine whether there was significant difference between the perceptions of these two groups of respondents, six independent t-tests were conducted to answer this question. The t-tests were based on the effectiveness level ratings of the first-mentioned administrative activity provided by the respondents in each of the six task areas. The results of the t-tests are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. Comparison of effectiveness level ratings of first-mentioned administrative activities by single-example cases vs. multiple-example cases: Independent t-test summary.

Task Area	One-Example		Multiple-Example		t-test.(2-tailed)	
	M	SD	M	SD	t	Significance
Task Area A One-example N: 29 Multiple-example N: 47	4.21	.66	4.11	.63	.655	.514
Task Area B One-example N: 28 Multiple-example N: 45	4.11	.74	4.20	.81	-.491	.625
Task Area C One-example N: 30 Multiple-example N: 47	3.73	1.28	4.13	.86	-1.623	.109
Task Area D One-example N: 31 Multiple-example N: 47	3.68	1.25	3.98	.90	-1.24	.218
Task Area E One-example N: 23 Multiple-example N: 42	4.39	.66	4.12	.63	1.637	.107
Task Area F One-example N: 23 Multiple-example N: 41	4.04	.82	4.27	.67	-1.183	.241

Since no significant differences were found based on effectiveness level ratings of first-mentioned administrative activity by single-example cases and by multiple-example cases in any task area, all 81 cases were used in statistical tests for answers to the major research questions.

3.4 Tests

The purpose of data analysis was to find responses to the four major research questions. (See pp. 35, 36 for the four major research questions.) Responses to Research Questions 1, 2, and 3 were analyzed quantitatively. Responses to Research Question 4 were analyzed qualitatively. The software *SPSS* 10 for Windows was used for developing a quantitative database, and the same software was used to analyze data quantitatively when it was applicable. Research Questions 1 and 2 were tested by a series of Chi-squares. Research Question 3 was tested by a series of ANOVAs.

3.5 Summary

A questionnaire was used to collect data about principals' administrative activities, the ratings of effectiveness level of the given administrative activities, and the brief reasons for the ratings. The questionnaire was constructed on the basis of six major task areas of school principals, namely, the areas of curriculum and instruction programs, student personnel, staff personnel, community-school relations, financial resources, and school physical resources. The questionnaire was pilot-tested and revised based on the feedback from the pilot test. The participants were the entire population of those who were principals during the 1998-1999 school year in a Manitoba high school (a) that contained grade Senior

4, (b) that followed the curricula prescribed by Manitoba Education and Training during the 1998-99 school year, and (c) that used English as the language of instruction. The return rate of completed questionnaires was 40%.

Data were coded to provide an interpretable database. Codes reflected two essential elements of an administrative activity, namely, who performed a given activity and for whom this activity was performed. The technique of triangulation was used for validation of the codes, where three raters were involved. An arbitrator was used when agreement on a particular coding could not be reached between the raters. Findings from t-tests suggested that all 81 cases could be used for data analysis. A series of Chi-squares and ANOVAs were used in data analysis.

CHAPTER FOUR
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In this chapter, results of the statistical tests for the answers to Research Questions 1-3 are presented and discussed. Qualitative results for the answers to Research Question 4 are also presented and discussed.

4.1 Characteristics of the principals

In the present study, "gender" means the gender of the participating principals. This variable has two categories: 1 = female, and 2 = male. "Years of service" refers to the years of administrative service of being a principal. This variable has three categories: 1 = 1-5 years, 2 = 6-10 years, and 3 = 11 years and above. "Education" refers to the highest level of formal education completed. This variable has three categories: 1 = Bachelor's degree, 2 = Post Baccalaureate Certificate in Education (PBCE), and 3 = Master's degree. PBCE is a one-year continuing education program beyond the degree of Bachelor of Education. It is also required for enrolment into counselling and special education programs for the Master's degree in Education in the Faculty of Education, University of Manitoba. "Certificate" refers to the School Administrator's Certificate Level I and School Principal's Certificate Level II, which are granted by Manitoba Education and Training. School administrators in Manitoba need to obtain a Teacher's Certificate before they can receive a school administrator's certificate. This variable has three categories: 1 = neither of these two certificates, 2 = Level I certificate only, and 3 = both of these two certificates. The variable "school type" has two categories: 1 = public school, and 2 = private school. "Grade levels in school" refers to the levels of grade in the schools. It has three categories: 1 = Senior grades only, 2 = Grade

7(G7) to Senior 4(S4) only, and 3 = G7-S4 plus other grades. Characteristics of these variables of the principals are listed in Table 2.

Table 2. Frequencies of demographic characteristics of principals

Variable	Category	Frequency	Percent
Gender	Female	15	18.5
	Male	66	81.5
	Total	81	100.0
Years of Service	1-5 years	31	38.3
	6-10 years	23	28.4
	11 years and above	27	33.3
	Total	81	100.0
Education	Bachelor's[1]	33	40.7
	PBCE	16	19.8
	Master's	32	39.5
	Total	81	100.0
Certificate	Neither Level I or II	22	27.2
	Level I only	24	29.6
	Both Level I and II	35	43.2
	Total	81	100.0
School Type	Public	69	85.2
	Private	12	14.8
	Total	81	100.0
Grade levels in School	Senior Grades only	31	38.2
	G7 to S4	16	19.8
	G7-S4 and other grades	34	42.0
	Total	81	100.0

1. Only one principal did not have a Bachelor's degree. This person was included in the category of "Bachelor's Degree."

The 81 participants in the sample group were recruited on a voluntary basis. One-way Chi-square tests were conducted to determine if the differences between the frequencies of the categories within each of the six demographic variables of the principals were statistically significant. (Frequencies of these variables by task area are presented in Appendices 7-12.) Results of Chi-square tests for these variables are summarized in Table 3.

Table 3. Chi-squares for demographic characteristics of the principals per task area

Task Area	Chi-square Statistics	Characteristics of Principals					
		Gender	Years of Service	Educa-tion	Certifi-cate	School Type	Grades In School
A	Chi-square	31.132	1.584	6.649	4.234	39.286	6.727
	df	1	2	2	2	1	2
	Significance	<.001	.453	.036	.120	<.001	.035
B	Chi-square	29.453	1.040	5.360	5.360	37.463	7.280
	df	1	2	2	2	1	2
	Significance	<.001	.595	.069	.069	<.001	.026
C	Chi-square	29.453	.560	6.080	5.040	43.320	6.080
	df	1	2	2	2	1	2
	Significance	<.001	.750	.046	.080	<.001	.046
D	Chi-square	32.924	1.241	6.101	3.367	44.063	7.620
	df	1	2	2	2	1	2
	Significance	<.001	.536	.047	.186	<.001	.022
E	Chi-square	27.597	.925	5.940	5.045	32.970	8.716
	df	1	2	2	2	1	2
	Significance	<.001	.630	.051	.080	<.001	.013
F	Chi-square	21.879	1.182	3.364	6.636	40.970	4.456
	df	1	2	2	2	1	2
	Significance	<.001	.554	.186	.036	<.001	.106

Considering .008 as the within-area significance level [.05 level / 6 separate analyses (i.e., 6 characteristics of principals)], the result shows that only the variables of "gender" and "school type" are significant, and the significance is found in all task areas. This means that there were more responding male principals than female principals (regardless of task area). Likewise, the responding principals were from public schools more often than from private schools (regardless of task area). These two findings were actually expected to a certain extent. First, as mentioned in the section of "Gender" in Chapter Two, female high school principals are fewer than male high school principals in Manitoba. It should not be surprising if there are more male principals than female principals among the respondents.

Secondly, the ratio between public and private high schools is 167 vs.38, or 81.5% vs.18.5% of the 205 schools contacted initially. The ratio of the responding principals from public high schools and from private high schools is 69 vs.12, or 85.2% vs.14.8%, which is close to the ratio of the public and private schools in the initial contact.

4.2 Characteristics of administrative activities

Eighty-one principals were selected for this study, but not all of them provided an example of an administrative activity in each of the six task areas. Therefore, the number of administrative activities in different task areas varies, depending on how many administrative activities are identified. Table 4 summarizes the frequencies of administrative activities identified in each task area, showing a range of percentages from 81.5% (Task Area F) to 97.5% (Task Area D). The principals provided 439 examples of administrative activities, which results in a ratio of 90.3% between the total numbers of the activities identified and the total number of the sample in six task areas.

Table 4. Frequencies of administrative activities per task area

Task Area	Sample n	# of Activities	Percentages
A	81	77	95.1%(77/81)
B	81	75	92.6%(75/81)
C	81	75	92.6%(75/81)
D	81	79	97.5%(79/81)
E	81	67	82.7%(67/81)
F	81	66	81.5%(66/81)
Total	486	439	90.3%(439/486)

It is noticed that fewer administrative activities were identified in Task Areas E and F than in Task Areas A, B, C, and D. One explanation might be that some principals did not perceive any direct linkage between the activities they undertook in managing the financial and physical resources of their schools and preparing students for citizenship.

4.3 Research Question 1

Research Question 1: When Manitoba high school principals are asked to indicate their 1998-9 administrative actions ("tasks") toward preparing students for citizenship, who performed each action ("doer") and who was the recipient of each action ("target")? More specifically, which doers and targets were more frequently mentioned by the principals for each task area?

As stated in Chapter Three, each administrative activity/action is given two codes: "doer" and "target." "Doer" represents who performed each action: (A) principal, and (B) other. Category (B) also includes the activities performed by the principal working with other people. "Target" represents who is the direct recipient of each action: (1) students, (2) staff, (3) school, and (4) other. Category (4) includes all situations that do not fit in categories (1), (2), or (3).

Both "target" and "doer" are categorical data, and the data are recorded in frequencies. When data are frequencies, to find how unlikely the observed value is if the null hypothesis is true, the Chi-square statistic is an appropriate approach. The assumption needed to use the Chi-square test is independent observation/ sampling, which "simply means that the observations within or between the two groups are not paired, dependent, correlated, or associated in any way" (Glass & Hopkins 1996, p. 295). Therefore, an

individual can appear only once in a Chi-square table (Norusis, 1995). In the present study, data were coded to make sure that an observation does not fall into more than one category. Also, no participant supplied more than one response in a single analysis. Apart from independent sampling, another condition needs to be satisfied in order for the Chi-square statistic to be used properly. Aron and Aron (1999) believe that even expected frequencies as low as 1 per cell may be acceptable in terms of Type 1 error, provided the principle is followed that there are "at least five times as many individuals as there are cells" (p. 451). Of the Chi-squares performed for responses to Research Question 1, the 2×4 Chi-squares had the most cells (i.e., 8). Because $8 \times 5 = 40$ and the least number of participants in this study is 66 (Task Area F), the performed Chi-squares fell within the principle.

To answer Research Question 1, one-way Chi-squares were calculated to find if there were significant differences of frequencies between the categories within target and doer classifications per task area (Table 5). Also, two-way Chi-squares were performed to find if there were significant differences of frequencies for the association of doer $\times$ target classifications per task area (Table 6). Chi-square statistic has its limitations as a measure for association. When the data are categorical and "do not have meaningful order," there is no way to tell the directions of the associations. As the purpose of the current research question was not on the "direction of association" but on the presence of association, two-way Chi-squares were the appropriate tests for nominal variables (Norusis, 1995, p. 368).

4.3.1 Doer and target classifications

Considering .025 as the within-area significance level [.05 level / 2 separate analyses (i.e., doer and target)], the results of chi-squares for doer and target classifications per task area are presented in Table 5.

Table 5. Separate chi-squares for doer and target classifications per task area

Task Area	Doer	Doer Frequency	Doer Percent	Doer Chi-square	Doer df	Doer Significance	Target	Target Frequency	Target Percent	Target Chi-Square	Target df	Target Significance
A	Principal	27	35.1				Student	59	76.6			
	Others	50	64.9				Staff	6	7.8			
	Total	77	100.0	6.970	1	.009	School	10	13.0			
							Other	2	2.6			
							Total	77	100.0	111.104	3	<.001
B	Principal	40	53.3				Student	53	70.7			
	Others	35	46.7				Staff	2	2.7			
	Total	75	100.0	.333	1	.564	School	19	25.3			
							Other	1	1.3			
							Total	75	100.0	94.333	3	<.001
C	Principal	41	54.7				Student	30	40.0			
	Others	34	45.3				Staff	29	38.7			
	Total	75	100.0	.653	1	.419	School	15	20.0			
							Other	1	1.3			
							Total	75	100.0	29.907	3	<.001
D	Principal	46	58.2				Student	8	10.1			
	Others	33	41.8				Staff	2	2.5			
	Total	79	100.0	2.139	1	.144	School	66	83.5			
							Other	3	3.8			
							Total	79	100.0	145.456	3	<.001
E	Principal	51	76.1				Student	37	55.2			
	Others	16	23.9				Staff	4	6.0			
	Total	67	100.0	18.234	1	<.001	School	26	38.8			
							Other	0	0			
							Total	67	100.0	56.040	3	<.001
F	Principal	50	75.8				Student	24	36.4			
	Others	16	24.4				Staff	3	4.5			
	Total	66	100.0	17.516	1	<.001	School	37	56.1			
							Other	2	3.0			
							Total	66	100.0	52.667	3	<.001

Note. Doer has 2 categories and target has 4 categories.

The variable "doer" refers to the person who performed the administrative activity/action. It has two categories: A = principal him-/herself, and B = other people beside principal. This variable was generated from the nominal data supplied by the participating principals. Significance was found between the categories within "doer" in Task Areas A, E, and F. These results suggest that, in the task area of "curricula and instruction programs," participants believed that the most important administrative activities/ actions pertaining to preparing students for citizenship were performed most often by people other than the principal or through the principal's working with other people. In Task Areas E (financial resources of the school) and F (physical resources of the school), participants believed that the most important administrative activities/actions pertaining to preparing students for citizenship were performed most often by the principals themselves, rather than by other people or through principals' working with others. No significant difference was found between the categories within "doer" in Task Areas B, C, and D. This suggests that, in these task areas, the present study failed to find a difference between how frequently the principals saw themselves as performing an administrative activity perceived as most important pertaining to preparing students for citizenship and how frequently they saw such an activity as being performed by other people or through their working with others.

Hallinger and Heck (1996) reviewed a large amount of literature on the principals' role in school effectiveness. They claimed that effects of principal leadership "occur indirectly." Indirect effects occur through the principal's effort "to influence those who come into more frequent direct contact with students," through shaping the "school's instructional climate and instructional organization," and through the principal's personal actions such as maintaining high visibility, actively supervising instructional programs,

modeling expectations, and shaping school goals, policies and norms (p. 24). The present study confirms their claim that, to achieve the "indirect" effects, principals either take personal actions or work through/with others. Further, findings from the present study suggest that principals' administrative activities/actions take on different patterns in terms of who performs the activity/action in different task areas. To promote the goal of preparing students for citizenship, when performing administrative activities/actions regarding curricula and instruction programs (Task Area A), principals claimed that they worked through or with others significantly more frequently than the times they acted alone. When performing administrative activities/actions regarding student personnel (Task Area B), staff personnel (Task Area C), and school-community relations (Task Area D), principals worked through others or with others statistically the same frequently as when they took personal actions. When performing administrative activities/actions regarding school financial resources (Task Areas E) and physical resources (Task Area F), principals worked alone significantly more frequently than the times they work through others or with others.

The variable "target" refers to the persons or groups who were the direct recipient of the administrative activity/ action. This variable has 4 categories: 1 = student-related activity, 2 = staff-related activity, 3 = school-related activity, and 4 = other. As shown in Table 5, significance was found between the categories within "target" in all task areas. In Task Area A, student-related activities received the highest frequency ($n1$ = 59 or 76.6%). In Task Area B, student-related activities received the highest frequency ($n1$ = 53 or 70.7%). In Task Area C, student-related activities received the highest frequency ($n1$ = 30 or 40.0%) and staff-related activities received a similar level of frequency ($n2$ = 29 or 38.7%). In Task Area D, school-related activities received the highest frequency ($n3$ = 66 or 83.5%). In Task Area

E, student-related and school-related activities received 94.0% of the frequencies of the administrative activity in this task area ($n1$ = 37 or 55.2%, $n3$ = 26 or 38.8%). In Task Area F, school-related activities received the highest frequency ($n3$ = 37 or 56.1%), and student-related activities received the second highest frequency ($n1$ = 24 or 36.4%).

This group of findings suggests that, to promote the goal of preparing students for citizenship, when principals' administrative activities/actions concern curricula and instruction programs (Task Area A), in most cases (76.6%) students are the direct recipients of principals' administrative activities/actions. When principals' administrative activities/actions are regarding student personnel (Task Area B), in most cases (70.7%) students are the direct recipients of principals' administrative activities/actions. When principals' administrative activities/actions are regarding staff personnel (Task Area C), in most cases (40.0% and 38.7%), either students or staff are the direct recipients of principals' administrative activities/ actions. When principals' administrative activities/actions are regarding school-community relations (Task Area D), in most cases (83.5%) the entire school is the direct recipient of the activities/actions. When principals' administrative activities/actions are regarding school financial resources (Task Areas E) and physical resources (Task Area F), the direct recipients of the activities/actions are mostly school and students (55.2% and 38.8% for Task Area E, 56.1% and 36.4% for Task Area F).

4.3.2 Association between doer and target

Chi-squares for doer × target association answer the question: Is there more than a chance classification of activities to the two doer and four target categories? The results of Chi-squares for doer × target classifications per task area are presented in Table 6. Results show that doer × target association is not significant in any of the 6 task areas. Or, there is no

"more than a chance" classification of actions to the two doer and four target categories.

This means that the participating principals did not mention a particular target category of administrative actions performed by principal alone significantly more frequently than their mentioning of any other target category performed by other people or by the principal working with others. In other words, in any of the six task areas, when principals worked alone, they did not direct their administrative actions directly toward either students, staff, the entire school, or any other party significantly more often than the times they worked through/with others.

Table 6. Combined chi-squares for the association of doer and target classifications per task area

Task Area	Doer Category	Target				Total	Chi-Square	df	Significance
		Student-Related	Staff-Related	School-Related	Other				
A	Principal	18	4	3	2	27			
	Other	41	2	7	0	50			
	Total	59	6	10	2	77	6.986	3	.072
B	Principal	31	0	9	0	40			
	Other	22	2	10	1	35			
	Total	53	2	19	1	75	4.267	3	.234
C	Principal	13	20	8	0	41			
	Other	17	9	7	1	34			
	Total	30	29	15	1	75	5.164	3	.160
D	Principal	4	1	39	2	46			
	Other	4	1	27	1	33			
	Total	8	2	66	3	79	.386	3	.943
E	Principal	28	3	20	0	51			
	Other	9	1	6	0	16			
	Total	37	4	26	0	67	.016	2	.992
F	Principal	20	3	25	2	50			
	Other	4	0	12	0	16			
	Total	24	3	37	2	66	3.701	3	.296

Note. Doer has 2 categories and Target has 4, so the combination has 2 × 4 or 8 categories.

4.3.3 Summary of Research Question 1

During the 1998-99 school year, in their administrative practices, principals sometimes took personal actions by working alone and sometimes worked through or with others. In Task Area A (curricula and instruction programs), principals worked through/with others significantly more often than working alone. The present study failed to find significant difference between how often principals worked alone and how often they worked through/with others in Task Areas B, C, and D (student personnel, staff personnel and school-community relations, respectively). In Task Areas E and F (financial and physical resources, respectively), principals worked alone significantly more often than they worked through/with others.

In Task Areas A (curricula and instruction programs) and B (student personnel), students were most often the direct recipient of principals' administrative actions. In Task Area C (staff personnel), students or staff were most often the direct recipient of principals' administrative actions. In Task Area D (school-community relations), the entire school was most often the direct recipient of principals' administrative actions. In Task Areas E and F (financial and physical resources, respectively), students and the school were most often the direct recipient of principals' administrative activities.

The study failed to find a significant association between doer and target in any task area. This means that the participating principals did not mention a particular target category of administrative actions performed by a principal alone significantly more frequently than their mentioning of any other target category performed by other people or by the principal working with others.

4.4 Research Question 2

Research Question 2: When Manitoba high school principals are asked to indicate their 1998-9 administrative actions ("tasks") toward preparing students for citizenship, which characteristics of these principals were most associated with their more frequently mentioning one particular doer or target rather than another for each task area? Among the characteristics studied were:

1. the gender of the principals,

2. the years of administrative service of the principals,

3. the educational background of the principals,

4. the administrative certification status of the principals,

5. the school type of the principals (i.e., public vs. private), and

6. the grade levels in the principals' schools.

Two-way Chi-squares were performed to examine the association between the characteristics of the principals and their doer/target classifications. Considering .004 as the within-area significance level [.05/12 separate analyses (i.e., doer and target times 6 characteristics of principals)], the results of the Chi-squares per task area are presented in Table 7. According to Aron and Aron (1999), the principle of "at least five times as many individuals as there are cells" (p. 451) should be followed for chi-squares to be used properly. Of the chi-squares performed for responses to Research Question 2, the 4×3 chi-squares had the most cells (12). Because $12 \times 5 = 60$ and the least number of participants in this study was 66 (Task Area F), the chi-squares performed here fell within the principle.

Table 7. Combined chi-squares for the association of doer and target classifications and characteristics of the principals per task area

Task Area	Doer/ Target	Chi-square Statistics	Characteristics of Principals					
			Gender	Years of Service	Education	Certificate	School Type	Grades in School
A	Doer	Chi-square	.003	.064	4.407	1.193	.608	.582
		df	1	2	2	2	1	2
		Significance	.955	.969	.110	.551	.435	.748
	Target	Chi-square	1.985	7.170	9.764	7.300	.653	5.451
		df	3	6	6	6	3	6
		Significance	.576	.305	.135	.294	.884	.487
B	Doer	Chi-square	.077	.287	3.683	.176	.322	.244
		df	1	2	2	2	1	2
		Significance	.782	.866	.159	.916	.571	.885
	Target	Chi-square	.761	5.520	7.132	4.001	7.731	8.376
		df	3	6	6	6	3	6
		Significance	.859	.479	.309	.676	.052	.212
C	Doer	Chi-square	.043	1.079	2.079	1.901	1.878	.571
		df	1	2	2	2	1	2
		Significance	.837	.583	.354	.387	.171	.752
	Target	Chi-square	.624	11.228	7.223	12.017	1.724	3.171
		df	3	6	6	6	3	6
		Significance	.891	.082	.301	.062	.632	.787
D	Doer	Chi-square	1.653	2.773	.043	1.320	.015	1.449
		df	1	2	2	2	1	2
		Significance	.199	.250	.979	.517	.903	.485
	Target	Chi-square	6.807	1.229	3.938	5.190	2.803	3.539
		df	3	6	6	6	3	6
		Significance	.078	.975	.685	.520	.423	.739
E	Doer	Chi-square	.010	7.356	1.288	3.019	1.680	1.371
		df	1	2	2	2	1	2
		Significance	.920	.025	.525	.221	.195	.504
	Target	Chi-square	1.201	3.574	1.954	7.288	4.168	4.993
		df	2	4	4	4	2	4
		Significance	.548	.467	.744	.121	.124	.288
F	Doer	Chi-square	.181	7.393	2.629	2.178	.080	.204
		df	1	2	2	2	1	2
		Significance	.670	.025	.269	.337	.777	.903
	Target	Chi-square	2.014	9.233	8.278	9.453	1.054	3.275
		df	3	6	6	6	3	6
		Significance	.569	.161	.218	.150	.788	.774

Note. Doer has 2 categories, Target 4, Gender 2, Years of Service 3, Education 4, Certificate 3, School Type 2, and Grades in School 3.

None of the tests reached statistical significance. The present study failed to find significant associations between any doer/target classification and the characteristics of the principals in any task area.

The research literature on features of male and female principals' leadership behaviors revealed mixed findings. For example, Eagle and others (1992) reviewed 50 studies and found that female principals scored higher than male principals on task-oriented style and scored about the same in interpersonally oriented style of administrative behaviors. Riehl and Lee (1996) found that summary reviews and meta-analyses concluded that male and female school administrators were "far more similar than different" in their administrative behaviors (p. 904). The present study failed to find significant differences in doer/target classifications of the administrative activities performed by male and female principals. It seems that in terms of doer/target aspects of administrative activities, the present study confirmed Riehl and Lee's findings that the administrative behaviors of male and female principals were more similar than different.

Zheng's (1996) comprehensive study showed, "In general, the longer a principal stays in school administrative positions, the more negatively he/she is perceived by teachers" (p. 20). Allison and Allison (1991) found that on-the-job experience did not necessarily contribute to the expertise of the principals in administrative problem-solving approaches. It appears that the findings vary depending on which administrative aspects were researched. The present study failed to find significant differences in doer/target classifications of the administrative activities performed by less experienced principals and more experienced principals. This seems to suggest that years of being a principal did not contribute to the

doer/target aspects of administrative activities, and this seems to confirm Allison and Allison's (1991) findings.

Zheng (1996) found that, if education level was the only factor to consider, Master's degree and beyond was not necessarily associated with perceived effectiveness of instructional leadership among public school principals, but was among private school principals. When level of formal education was combined with other variables such as academic major and in-service training, education level would become a significant and positive factor for the principals of both public and private schools. Allison and Allison (1991) found that principals' problem-solving approaches might have to do with different principal certification requirements. The present study failed to find significant differences in doer and target aspects of the administrative activities performed by those principals with Master's degrees as their highest level of formal education completed, those with PBCE certificates, and those with undergraduate degrees. The present study also failed to find significant differences in doer and target aspects of the administrative activities performed by the principals who had neither of the two certificates for Manitoba school administrators, those who had only Level I certificate and those who had both of the certificates. These results do not appear to support the findings of Zheng (1996) and Allison and Allison (1991). These may be surprising results for those who might think that having undertaken the education that lead to advanced degrees and certificates, principals might have a broader repertoire of activities to promote the citizenship of their students. This was not the case here, however, and one might wonder if the supposition was wrong or if the questionnaire was unable to pick up the sought distinctions. In the present study, either explanation might be true to a certain extent. Actually, the possibilities are many. For example, principals can

influence the practices of preparing students for citizenship in many ways; doer and target are but two aspects of their administrative activities and may not among them. Also, the principals' professional repertoires developed through their education and training may contribute to the effectiveness of their administrative practices toward other goals or objectives, but may not contribute to the practices toward the goal of preparing students for citizenship. Or, if they do, the contributions may be in ways that are less likely to be picked up.

Findings from a comprehensive study revealed that there were perceived differences in leadership effectiveness between the principals of public schools and their counterparts in private schools and that the perceived differences in leadership effectiveness were more likely to be due to different environmental constraints based on school type, rather than on the race, gender, age, education and training of the principals or the location, size of student population, and grade levels of the schools (Zheng, 1996). The present study failed to find significant difference in doer/target aspects of the administrative practices of the principals of public schools and the principals of private schools. This result may be due to the aspects (i.e., doer and target) of administrative activities examined, or it may be due to the fact that the doer/target aspects of the administrative activities were not examined in combination with any environment constraints of the schools.

Buettner (1995) found a significant relation between principals' use of some coping skills and school grade-span, but the relation between principals' use or effectiveness of other types of coping mechanisms and school grade-span was less than conclusive. Zheng (1996) claimed that principals of both public and private schools with only secondary level grades were rated more negatively than their counterparts in schools that served elementary grades

only. Both Buettner's study and Zheng's study suggest that the grade-span of a school might have an impact on principals' administrative practices. The present study failed to find significant difference in doer/target aspects of the administrative activities performed by the principals of the schools that have senior grades only, Grade 7 to Senior 4 only, and Grade 7 to Senior 4 plus other grades. This result may have to do with the aspects (i.e., doer and target) of the administrative activities examined, and may also have to do with the fact that, in the present study, the administrative activities were reported by the principals themselves rather than perceived by other people.

As indicated above, in some instances, the present study supported previous research, but in other cases it did not. The fact that the tests in the present study failed to find significant results may be due to the variables used in this study, namely, the doer, target, and six personal characteristics. If this is the reason, then, the use of different variables might increase the likelihood that a significant association would be found.

4.5 Research Question 3

Research question 3: When Manitoba high school principals are asked to indicate their 1998-9 administrative actions ("tasks") toward preparing students for citizenship, which characteristics of these principals and doer/target classifications were most associated with their giving higher effectiveness ratings to these administrative efforts? Among the characteristics studied were:

1. the gender of the principals,

2. the years of administrative service of the principals,

3. the educational background of the principals,

4. the administrative certification status of the principals,

5. the school type of the principals (i.e., public vs. private), and

6. the grade levels in the principals' schools.

4.5.1 Tests for associations

There were 5 levels of effectiveness ratings. 5 = Very high level of effectiveness; 4 = High level of effectiveness; 3 = Moderate level of effectiveness; 2 = Low level of effectiveness; and 1 = Very low level of effectiveness. Frequencies of different levels of ratings in each task area are presented in Table 8. Descriptive statistics of the effectiveness level ratings for each task area are presented in Table 9. Descriptive statistics of the effectiveness level ratings for doer/target classification for each task area are presented in Table 10.

Table 8. Frequencies of effectiveness level ratings per task area

| Task Area | n | Category | Effectiveness Level Rating | | | | | |
			1	2	3	4	5	Total
A	76	Count	0	0	11	43	22	76
		Percent	0	0	14.5	56.6	28.9	100.0
B	73	Count	0	3	8	36	26	73
		Percent	0	4.1	11.0	49.3	35.6	100.0
C	75	Count	0	3	14	32	26	75
		Percent	0	4.0	18.7	42.7	34.7	100.0
D	78	Count	4	4	13	35	22	78
		Percent	5.1	5.1	16.7	44.9	28.2	100.0
E	65	Count	0	0	8	35	22	65
		Percent	0	0	12.3	53.8	33.8	100.0
F	64	Count	0	2	6	34	22	64
		Percent	0	3.1	9.4	53.1	34.4	100.0

Table 9. Descriptive statistics of the effectiveness level ratings per task area

Task Area	n	Minimum	Maximum	M	SD
A	76	3	5	4.14	.65
B	73	2	5	4.16	.78
C	75	2	5	4.08	.83
D	78	1	5	3.86	1.05
E	65	3	5	4.22	.65
F	64	2	5	4.19	.73

Table 10. Separate descriptive statistics of the effectiveness level ratings for doer and target classifications per task area

Task Area	Doer				Target							
	Principal		Other		Student-related		Staff-related		School-related		Other	
	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
A	4.19	.63	4.12	.66	4.12	.62	4.17	.75	4.22	.83	4.50	.71
B	4.13	.81	4.20	.76	4.16	.83	3.50	.71	4.26	.65	4.00	0
C	4.02	.91	4.15	.74	3.90	.76	4.07	.92	4.47	.74	4.00	0
D	3.82	1.05	3.91	1.07	4.36	.92	3.50	.71	3.85	1.02	3.00	2.00
E	4.22	.62	4.20	.77	4.14	.71	4.67	.58	4.28	.54	0	0
F	4.22	.68	4.07	.92	4.25	.74	3.33	1.53	4.20	.63	4.50	.71

Tables 8 and 9 show that, in general, principals rated their administrative activities in which they attempted to promote preparation for citizenship among their students as high or very high. It might be observed that Task Area D (School-community relations) has a lower average point and a wider spread of the ratings, which might imply that in this area in which they provided a greater number of examples of administrative activities, they were more prepared to judge some of the activities as being less effective in attaining their goal. Table

10 gives more detailed information on the effectiveness ratings for doer and target in each task area and provides the basis for subsequent ANOVAs that were calculated.

To determine if effectiveness ratings are related to specific principal characteristics, one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) statistic was chosen (Norusis, 1995; Glass and Hopkins, 1996). In the ANOVAs conducted for responses to Research Question 3, the dependent variable is the effectiveness level ratings in each task area. The independent variables are the doer and target classifications and the demographic characteristics of the principals in each task area. Eight ANOVAs were performed. Results of ANOVAs are presented in Tables 11 – 18.

Table 11. ANOVA for the association between doer and effectiveness ratings per task area

Task Area	Groups	Sums of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
A	Doer	.089	1	.089	.211	.647
	Within Group	31.318	74	.423		
	Total	31.408	75			
B	Doer	.085	1	.083	.138	.712
	Within Group	43.942	71	.619		
	Total	44.027	72			
C	Doer	.280	1	.280	.398	.530
	Within Group	51.240	73	.702		
	Total	51.520	74			
D	Doer	.144	1	.144	.128	.722
	Within Group	85.305	96	1.122		
	Total	85.449	77			
E	Doer	.005	1	.005	.011	.918
	Within Group	26.980	63	.428		
	Total	26.985	64			
F	Doer	.241	1	.241	.447	.506
	Within Group	33.509	62	.540		
	Total	33.750	63			

Table 11 fails to reveal a significant association between doer and effectiveness level ratings in any of the 6 task areas. This means that principals did not assign a particular rating to the administrative activities performed by any particular category of doer. Whether principals worked alone or worked through or with others when performing the given administrative activities/actions, they failed to rate these administrative activities/actions differentially in each task area.

Table 12. ANOVA for the association between target and effectiveness ratings per task area

Task Area	Groups	Sums of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
A	Target	.350	3	.117	.270	.847
	Within Group	31.058	72	.531		
	Total	31.408	75			
B	Target	1.098	3	.366	.588	.625
	Within Group	42.929	69	.622		
	Total	44.027	72			
C	Target	3.225	3	1.075	1.580	.202
	Within Group	48.295	71	.680		
	Total	51.520	74			
D	Target	4.612	3	1.537	1.407	.247
	Within Group	80.837	74	1.092		
	Total	85.449	77			
E	Target	.954	2[1]	.477	1.136	.328
	Within Group	26.031	62	.420		
	Total	26.985	64			
F	Target	2.483	3	.828	1.586	.202
	Within Group	31.267	60	.521		
	Total	33.750	63			

1. The *df* for Task Area E is 2, because only three categories of target were supplied.

Table 12 fails to reveal a significant association between target and effectiveness level ratings in any of the 6 task areas. This means that principals did not assign a higher rating more frequently to the administrative activities/ actions of any particular target category.

Table 13. ANOVA for the association between gender and effectiveness ratings per task area

Task Area	Groups	Sums of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
A	Gender	.002	1	.002	<.001	.990
	Within Group	31.406	74	.424		
	Total	31.408	75			
B	Gender	1.397	1	1.397	2.326	.132
	Within Group	42.631	71	.600		
	Total	44.027	72			
C	Gender	2.302	1	2.302	3.415	.069
	Within Group	49.216	73	.674		
	Total	51.520	74			
D	Gender	.797	1	.797	.715	.400
	Within Group	84.652	76	1.114		
	Total	85.449	77			
E	Gender	.044	1	.044	.102	.751
	Within Group	26.941	63	.428		
	Total	26.985	64			
F	Gender	.630	1	.630	1.179	.282
	Within Group	33.120	62	.534		
	Total	33.750	63			

Table 13 fails to reveal a significant association between gender and effectiveness level ratings in any of the 6 task areas. The effectiveness level ratings of the given administrative activities/actions supplied by male principals were not significantly different from the ratings supplied by female principals, regardless of task areas, which perhaps adds more weight to Riehl and Lee's (1996) contention that male and female administrators may be more similar than different in their approaches to administration.

Table 14. ANOVA for the association between years of service and effectiveness ratings per task area

Task Area	Groups	Sums of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
A	Years of service	.158	2	.079	.185	.832
	Within Group	31.250	73	.428		
	Total	31.408	75			
B	Years of service	.435	2	.218	.349	.706
	Within Group	43.592	70	.623		
	Total	44.027	72			
C	Years of service	.666	2	.333	.472	.628
	Within Group	50.854	72	.706		
	Total	51.520	74			
D	Years of service	2.344	2	1.172	1.058	.352
	Within Group	83.105	75	1.108		
	Total	85.449	77			
E	Years of service	.685	2	.343	.808	.450
	Within Group	26.299	62	.424		
	Total	26.985	64			
F	Years of service	4.009	2	2.005	4.111	.021
	Within Group	29.741	61	.488		
	Total	33.750	63			

Table 14 fails to reveal (except for Task Area F) a significant association between years of administrative service of the principals and effectiveness level ratings in the other 5 task areas. In Task Areas A, B, C, D, and E, the effectiveness level ratings of the administrative activities/actions supplied by the principals with fewer years of administrative service are not significantly different from the ratings supplied by the principals with more years of administrative service. This finding, combined with the earlier conclusions depicted in Tables 8 and 9, seems to suggest that novice and experienced principals alike rate their administrative activities highly. In Task Area F (physical resources), however, a significant association is found ($p=.021$) between years of administrative service of the principals and effectiveness level ratings. Results of a Tukey test for multiple comparisons show that the

significant difference is between the categories of 1-5 years of administrative service and 6-10 years of administrative service. Principals with 1-5 years of administrative service supplied lower effectiveness level ratings (M=3.92) than the principals with 6-10 years of administrative service did (M=4.53). The effectiveness ratings supplied by the principals with 11+ years of administrative service (M=4.21) were neither significantly lower nor higher than either the principals with 1-5 years of administrative service or the principals with 6-10 years of administrative service. As presented in Chapter Two, the empirical literature on associations between principals' experience of being a principal and features of their administrative practices showed that, generally, the longer a principal had been in the position, the more negatively the principal was perceived by the teachers (Zheng, 1996). The present study examined the effectiveness of the administrative activities perceived by the principals rather than the teachers. Therefore, it is not surprising that the findings based on Table 14 are different from Zheng's (1996).

Table 15. ANOVA for the association between highest level of education and effectiveness ratings per task area

Task Area	Groups	Sums of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
A	Education	.557	2	.279	.659	.520
	Within Group	30.851	73	.425		
	Total	31.408	75			
B	Education	1.489	2	.744	1.225	.300
	Within Group	42.538	70	.608		
	Total	44.027	72			
C	Education	2.913	2	1.457	2.158	.123
	Within Group	48.607	72	.675		
	Total	51.520	74			
D	Education	.382	2	.168	.845	
	Within Group	85.067	75			
	Total	85.449	77			
E	Education	.128	2	.064	.148	.862
	Within Group	26.856	62	.453		
	Total	26.985	64			
F	Education	.444	2	.222	.407	.668
	Within Group	33.306	61	.546		
	Total	33.750	63			

Table 15 fails to reveal a significant association between the highest level of education of the principals and effectiveness level ratings in any of the 6 task areas. This means that the effectiveness level ratings of the given administrative activities/actions are not significantly different based on principals' highest level of education completed.

Table 16. ANOVA for the association between certificate status and effectiveness ratings per task area

Task Area	Groups	Sums of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
A	Certificate	1.405	2	.702	1.709	.188
	Within Group	30.003	73	.411		
	Total	31.408	75			
B	Certificate	1.710	2	.855	1.416	.250
	Within Group	42.317	70	.605		
	Total	44.027	72			
C	Certificate	.458	2	.229	.323	.725
	Within Group	51.062	72	.709		
	Total	51.520	74			
D	Certificate	3.038	2	1.519	1.382	.257
	Within Group	82.411	75	1.099		
	Total	85.449	77			
E	Certificate	.126	2	.063	.145	.865
	Within Group	26.859	62	.433		
	Total	26.985	64			
F	Certificate	1.151	2	.575	1.077	.347
	Within Group	32.599	61	.534		
	Total	33.750	63			

Table 16 fails to reveal a significant association between administrative certificate status of the principals and effectiveness level ratings in any of the 6 task areas. Administrative certificates here refer to Manitoba School Administrator Certificate Level I and School Principal Certificate Level II. These results mean that the effectiveness level ratings of the administrative activities supplied by the principals with none or only Level I of the certificates are not significantly different from the ratings supplied by the principals with both certificates.

Table 17. ANOVA for the association between school type and effectiveness ratings per task area

Task Area	Groups	Sums of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
A	School type	.278	1	.278	.660	.419
	Within Group	31.130	74	.421		
	Total	31.408	75			
B	School type	1.090	1	1.090	1.803	.184
	Within Group	42.937	71	.605		
	Total	44.027	72			
C	School type	1.358	1	1.358	1.997	.164
	Within Group	50.162	73	.687		
	Total	51.520	74			
D	School type	1.334	1	1.334	1.205	.276
	Within Group	84.115	76	1.107		
	Total	85.449	77			
E	School type	.145	1	.145	.341	.561
	Within Group	26.839	63	.426		
	Total	26.985	64			
F	School type	.016	1	.016	.029	.866
	Within Group	33.734	62	.544		
	Total	33.750	63			

Table 17 fails to reveal a significant association between school type of the principals and effectiveness level ratings of the administrative activities/actions in any of the 6 task areas. This means that, in each task area, the effectiveness level ratings supplied by the public school principals to the given administrative activities/actions are not significantly different from the ratings supplied by the private school principals.

Table 18. ANOVA for the association between levels of grade in school and effectiveness ratings per task area

Task Area	Groups	Sums of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Significance
A	Grades	.914	2	.457	1.094	.340
	Within Group	30.494	73	.418		
	Total	31.408	75			
B	Grades	.657	2	.328	.530	.591
	Within Group	43.371	70	.620		
	Total	44.027	72			
C	Grades	.531	2	.266	.375	.689
	Within Group	50.989	72	.706		
	Total	51.520	74			
D	Grades	1.709	2	.854	.765	.469
	Within Group	83.740	75	1.117		
	Total	85.449	77			
E	Grades	1.110	2	.555	1.330	.272
	Within Group	25.875	62	.417		
	Total	26.985	64			
F	Grades	1.221	2	.611	1.145	.325
	Within Group	32.529	61	.533		
	Total	33.750	63			

Table 18 fails to reveal a significant association between the grade levels in the schools of the principals and effectiveness level ratings supplied in any of the 6 task areas. This means that, in each task area, the effectiveness level ratings supplied by the principals whose schools have senior grades only or Grade 7 to Senior 4 only are not significantly different from the ratings supplied by the principals whose schools have Grade 7- Senior 4 plus other grades.

4.5.2 Summary of Research Questions 3

Principals in general gave high effectiveness ratings to the administrative activities they mentioned. In each task area, rating 4 received the highest frequency and rating 5 the 2nd highest. It might be observed Task Area D has a lower M and larger SD, which suggest that more principals gave low effectiveness ratings in this task area than in any other task area and the ratings provided were more spread-out.

The present study failed to find significant associations between effectiveness ratings and the independent variables: doer, target, gender, education, certificate, school type, and grade levels in school. A significant association was found between years of administrative service and the level of effectiveness ratings in Task Area F (physical resources). Results of the Tukey test indicate that principals with 1-5 years of administrative service supplied lower ratings than the principals with 6-10 years of administrative service did. The effectiveness ratings supplied by the principals with 11+ years of administrative experience are neither significantly lower nor higher than either the principals with 1-5 years of administrative experience or the principals with 6-10 years of administrative experience.

As was found on the analyses for Research Question 2, the scarcity of significant results for Research Question 3 may imply that effectiveness ratings may strongly relate to some variables but doer/target and the six personal characteristics are not among them.

4.6 Research Question 4

Research question 4: When Manitoba high school principals are asked to indicate their 1998-9 administrative actions ("tasks") toward preparing students for citizenship, what reasons did these principals give for the levels of their effectiveness rating of these administrative activities?

The questionnaire asked the principals to provide an example of their most important administrative activity in each of the six task areas pertaining to preparing students for citizenship during the 1998-99 school year. The principals were also asked to rate the effectiveness of this activity, and to supply a reason for their effectiveness rating of this activity. In total, 367 reasons were supplied to the 439 administrative activities. In each task area, each principal gave one reason that was coded into a single category.

To find responses to Research Questions 1-3, the information about the administrative activities was treated quantitatively. The activities were coded, analyzed and reported based on the codes. To obtain a fuller picture of the principals' administrative practices, the reasons supplied for the effectiveness ratings of the administrative activities were analyzed qualitatively.

The reasons were supplied to explain why a particular rating was given to a particular example of administrative action pertaining to preparing students for citizenship. In the present study, the effectiveness ratings have 5 levels and the frequencies of different levels of ratings differ. There are 431 ratings provided in total. The ratings 1, 2, and 3 altogether consist of 17.6% of the 431 ratings provided, rating 4 consists of 49.9%, and rating 5 consists of 32.5%. To help make meaningful comparisons of the reasons given for different levels of ratings, the investigator combined ratings 1, 2, and 3 and treated them as "low" level ratings. Rating 4 was treated as "medium" level ratings, and rating 5 as "high" level ratings. Frequencies of collapsed effectiveness level ratings for each task area are presented in Table 19. Frequencies of reasons given for collapsed effectiveness level ratings for each task area are presented in Table 20.

Table 19. Frequencies of collapsed effectiveness level ratings per task area

| Task Area | N | Category | Effectiveness Level Ratings | | | Total |
			Low	Medium	High	
A	76	# of Ratings	11	43	22	76
		Percent	14.5	56.6	28.9	100.0
B	73	# of Ratings	11	36	26	73
		Percent	15.1	49.3	35.6	100.0
C	75	# of Ratings	17	32	26	75
		Percent	22.7	42.7	34.7	100.0
D	78	# of Ratings	21	35	22	78
		Percent	26.9	44.9	28.2	100.0
E	65	# of Ratings	8	35	22	65
		Percent	12.3	53.8	33.8	100.0
F	64	# of Ratings	8	34	22	64
		Percent	12.5	53.1	34.4	100.0
Total	431	# of Ratings	76	215	140	431
		Percent	17.6	49.9	32.5	100.0

Table 20. Frequencies of reasons given for collapsed effectiveness level ratings per task area

| Task Area | N | Category | Effectiveness Level Ratings | | | Total |
			Low	Medium	High	
A	66	# of Reasons	10	35	21	66
		Percent	15.2	53.0	31.8	100.0
B	66	# of Reasons	10	36	20	66
		Percent	15.2	54.5	30.3	100.0
C	65	# of Reasons	13	27	25	65
		Percent	20.0	41.4	38.5	100.0
D	66	# of Reasons	15	31	20	66
		Percent	22.7	47.0	30.3	100.0
E	55	# of Reasons	8	29	18	55
		Percent	14.6	52.7	32.7	100.0
F	49	# of Reasons	6	26	17	49
		Percent	12.2	53.1	34.7	100.0
Total	367	# of Reasons	62	184	121	367
		Percent	16.9	50.1	33.0	100.0

The investigator read over and over again all of the 367 reasons supplied for the effectiveness ratings of the administrative activities. First, the investigator looked for the clusters of meaning of the reasons. Then, the investigator grouped the clusters based on the perspectives or the angles through which the reasons were used to judge the levels of effectiveness of the administrative actions. Based on the results of this grouping, the investigator classified the reasons in 19 categories. (See Appendices 13 - 18 for a full list of reasons supplied for the effectiveness ratings of the administrative activities in each task area). The 19 categories of reasons for the effectiveness ratings are summarized below:

1. student outcome

2. student participation in school governance

3. student participation in other activities

4. curriculum offering

5. extra-curricular program/activity

6. instructional effectiveness

7. teacher quality or teacher P.D

8. staff-student relationship

9. staff participation in school governance/initiative

10. staff/student satisfaction

11. school physical environment

12. parent/community participation in school education

13. parent/community satisfaction

14. response/action from outside school community

15. student attendance

16. school management routine/strategy

17. school funding/money management

18. expectation/goal/objective of education

19. school morale

On the next page, Table 21 summarizes frequencies of categories of reasons given for collapsed effectiveness level ratings for each task area.

Table 21. Frequencies of categories of reasons given for collapsed effectiveness level ratings per task area

Task Area	Level Of Ratings	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	Total
A	Low	2	3		2		2	1													10
	Medium	12			11		4		1				5	2							35
	High	5			8	2	2					1			2				1		21
B	Low		4			1			2			1								2	10
	Medium	6	18	4		1			2		3					1			1		36
	High	6	3	3	2								4			1			1		20
C	Low	2					1	3	5								1		1		13
	Medium	1	1		1	1	2	2	9	5					1		1		3		27
	High	3					1	3	5	3					1		2		4	3	25
D	Low					1			1				12		1						15
	Medium								1				26	3					1		31
	High	1							1				17	1							20
E	Low	1			2	4												2			8
	Medium		1		4	8					1	2	1		4	1	2	5			29
	High	4			3							2	2					6			18
F	Low				1							4					1				6
	Medium	2	1	2		5					3	10	1	1			2				26
	High			1	1	2	1				2	6	1	1		1	1				17
Total	Low	4	7		5	6	3	5	8			5	12					2	2	1	2	62
	Medium	22	21	6	16	13	6	2	13	5	7	12	33	6	5	2	5	5	4	1	184
	High	18	3	4	14	3	4	3	6	3	2	9	24	2	5	2	3	7	5	4	121
	Total	44	31	10	35	22	13	10	27	8	9	26	69	8	11	4	10	14	10	7	367

Sections 4.6.1- 4.6.6 summarizes reasons provided for effectiveness ratings of the administrative activities in each task. Examples of reasons are listed in the order of their appearance in Table 21.

93

4.6.1. Reasons given in Task Area A (curricula and instruction programs)

Sixty-six reasons were provided for the effectiveness ratings of administrative activities in Task Area A. Category 1 (student outcome) was used 19 times and category 4 (curriculum offering) 21 times. Combined, these two categories comprise 60.1% of the 66 reasons provided for Task Area A. Category 6 (instructional effectiveness) was used 8 times, or 12.1% of the 66 reasons provided for Task Area A. It would appear, then, that the principals made judgements about the low, medium, or high effectiveness of their schools' curricula and instruction programs on the basis of their perceptions of the quality of these programs, of the quality of the teaching carried out in them, and on the changes in the outlooks, achievements, and behaviors of students that were produced by them. (See Appendix 13 for a full list of reasons for effectiveness ratings of administrative activities in Task Area A.)

4.6.2. Reasons given in Task Area B (student personnel)

Sixty-six reasons were provided for the effectiveness ratings of the administrative actions in Task Area B. Category 2 (student participation in school governance) was used 25 times, or 37.9% of the 66 reasons. Category 1 (student outcome) was used 12 times, or 18.2%. Category 3 (student participation in other school activities) was used 7 times, or 10.1%. The other 22 reasons scatter sparsely among 8 categories. In two-thirds of the activities and regardless of whether they rated the effectiveness of these activities to be high, medium, or low, the principals seemed to use as criteria their perceptions of the effectiveness of such activities on student outcomes, on student participation in various activities of the school, and on student involvement in a wide range of curricular and extra-curricular

activities including volunteer activities. (See Appendix 14 for a full list of reasons for effectiveness ratings of administrative activities in Task Area B.)

4.6.3 Reasons given in Task Area C (staff personnel)

Sixty-five reasons were provided for the effectiveness ratings of administrative activities in Task Area C. Category 8 of reasons (staff-student relationship) was used 19 times, or 28.8% of the 65 reasons. Category 7 (teacher quality/teacher P.D.), category 9 (staff participation in school governance) and category 18 (expectation/ goal/ objective of education) were used 8 times each, and category 1 (student outcome) was used 6 times. In fact, categories of reason in Task Area C are less concentrated than the categories of reason in any other task area. This suggests that, when principals supplied reasons for the effectiveness level ratings of the administrative activities in Task Area C, it was more likely that they chose reasons from various aspects of school life rather than limiting themselves to two or three aspects. Principals spend a lot of time on teacher and support staff selection, orientation, and assessment. They reported that when they engage in these activities, they do consider the effects the activities will have on the preparation of students for citizenship. In determining whether the activities have been effective, they tend to consider such matters as whether the activity has led to an improvement in the relationship students have with their teachers, in student outcomes, in the involvement of the faculty and staff in professional development or school governance activities with their indirect possibilities for student growth, and in shaping the goals of education in the school. (See Appendix 15 for a full list of reasons for effectiveness ratings of administrative activities in Task Area C.)

4.6.4 Reasons given in Task Area D (school-community relations)

In Task Area D, 66 reasons were provided for the effectiveness ratings of the examples of administrative activities. Category 12 (parent/community participation in school education) was used 55 times, or 83.3% of all reasons provided in Task Area D. Of the other 11 reasons, 4 fell into Category 13 (parent/community satisfaction). The remaining 7 reasons were shared among 5 other categories. This extremely high concentration of categories of reasons suggests that, when the principal supplied a reason for their effectiveness ratings of administrative activities in Task Area D, over 80% of the time they supplied a reason regarding parent/ community participation in school education.   During the 1998-99 school year, then, the principals of Manitoba's high schools saw great value in the participation of parents and a wide range of community organizations in the school. This involvement seemed to provide opportunities for the students to develop the knowledge, skills, and dispositions associated with good citizenship, and principals used this as a criterion to assess the effectiveness of their administrative activities. (See Appendix 16 for a full list of reasons for effectiveness ratings of administrative activities in Task Area D.)

4.6.5 Reasons given in Task Area E (financial resources)

Fifty-five reasons were provided for the effectiveness ratings of the administrative activities in Task Area E. Category 17 (school funding/money management) was used 13 times as a reason for an effectiveness rating of an administrative activity, or 23.6% of the time a reason was provided in this task area. Category 5 (extra-curricular program/activity) was used 12 times, or 21.8%, and Category 4 (curriculum offering) was used 9 times, or 16.3%. Three other categories were used 4 or 5 times. This comparatively less concentrated

distribution of categories of reason suggests that, when principals provided reasons for the effectiveness ratings of administrative activities in Task Area E, they tended to use reasons from various aspects of a school. Those who provided a reason for their effectiveness ratings in this task area seemed to use as criteria the availability of funds enabling them to do/not to do certain curricular or extra-curricular activities, and whether or not they judged the funds available to have been well spent. (See Appendix 17 for a full list of reasons for effectiveness ratings of administrative activities in Task Area E.)

4.6.6 Reasons given in Task Area F (physical resources)

In Task F, 49 reasons were supplied. Category 11 (school physical environment) was used 20 times, or 40.8% of the total in this task area. Category 5 (extra-curricular program/activity) was used 7 times, or 14.3%. Category 10 (staff/student satisfaction) was used 5 times, or 10.2%. Not as many principals provided an example of administrative activity in this task area as had in the first five. Of all the task areas, Task Area F also has the least number of reasons supplied for the effectiveness ratings of administrative activities. In assessing the effectiveness of the activities they undertook in the management of physical resources as they affected the promotion of citizenship among the students, principals apparently took into account the quality of the physical conditions of the school and the impact of such condition on the implementation of the school's curricular and extra-curricular programs, on the skill development of the students, and on the students' satisfaction with the physical environment of the school. Principals gave low ratings when they judged the physical environment to be unsatisfactory, and they gave medium to high

ratings when they saw a positive impact of the environment on programs, student satisfaction. (See Appendix 18 for a full list of reasons for effectiveness ratings of administrative activities in Task Area F.)

4.6.7 Summary and discussions of Research Question 4

In examining these reasons, the investigator noted that the reasons provided by the principals for their low effectiveness ratings tended to emphasize certain aspects that were lacking, while reasons given for their high level ratings highlighted actual achievements or success. Reasons given for medium level ratings emphasized achievement as well, but the "tone" used was not as forceful as the "tone" used for high level ratings. Except for this difference, the reasons given for low, medium and high level of effectiveness ratings covered nearly all the categories of reasons. More specifically, reasons given for low level ratings cover 14 out of 19 categories, while reasons given for medium and high levels of effectiveness ratings actually cover all 19 categories. The fact that reasons given for each of the three levels of ratings covered almost all categories of reason suggests that principals made judgments of the effectiveness of their administrative activities pertaining to preparing students for citizenship based on outcomes of varied aspects of educational practices at the school level.

Another feature of the reasons for effectiveness ratings across the task areas is that, according to the frequencies of the reasons presented in Table 21, over 56% of 367 reasons fall into 5 out of the 19 categories. The 5 categories are "parent/community involvement in school education" (18.8%), "student outcome" (12.0%), "curriculum offering" (9.5%), "student participation in school governance" (8.4%), and "teacher-student relationship"

(7.4%). This suggests that these five aspects of educational practices of a school were most frequently used by the principals as criteria to judge the effectiveness of their administrative actions pertaining to preparing students for citizenship.

Some major features of the reasons of these 5 most frequently mentioned categories of reason are summarized below. To help illustrate these features, a few examples of administrative activities, effectiveness ratings, and the reasons supplied for the effectiveness ratings of the activities are provided in the following sections. In the examples, the person who performed these administrative activities was the "principal," the direct recipient of the activities was "students," and the reasons given for the effectiveness ratings were related to one of the 5 most frequently used categories of reasons, depending on the topic of the section. The reason why the examples were limited to the "principal" as the doer and "students" as the target has to do with the topic of the dissertation. The focus of this project has been the principals' administrative practices pertaining to preparing students for citizenship. Administrative activities in which doer was the "principal" and target was "students" directly serve the intention of the project.

Category 12: Parent/community participation in school education

The category "parent/community involvement in school education" constitutes 18.8% of the 367 reasons provided. This category of reasons appears in four task areas with a great concentration in Task Area D. Included in this category of reasons are such matters as the efforts made by the school to involve parents and community organizations, the specific activities in which these parents and organizations participated, and the benefits brought to the school and the students. Of interest is the fact that the most frequently mentioned reason in this category involved benefits occurring to the school from a Parent Advisory Council.

As stated in Chapter One, scholars and school practioners believe that principals can exert a leadership role in the educational practices of preparing students for citizenship by promoting school-community cooperation. They believe that the task of preparing students for citizenship can only be carried out through concerted efforts between a school and its community (Cogan, 1999; Cogan & Derricott, 1998; Osborne, 1994; McGowan, Plugge & Reynolds, 1986; Remy & Wagstaff, 1982). For example, Remy & Wagstaff (1982) hold that, in the larger community, business and labor, voluntary organizations, religious organizations and families are sources of the knowledge, skills, attitudes and experiences that students acquire as citizens. A school can draw upon the "talent tank" of the adult members of the community to facilitate teaching and learning by encouraging interested citizens to work collaboratively with the school to promote citizenship education programs (p. 59). In the present study, the participating principals used things related to "parent/community participation in school education" as criteria to judge the effectiveness of their administrative activities pertaining to preparing students for citizenship. This suggests that the principals in the present study also perceived that school-community cooperation in school education had to do with the practices of preparing students for citizenship. Below are a few examples of administrative activities, ratings, and reasons given for the ratings. The reasons are related to"parent/community participation in school education."

- (Activity) I requested the Parent Council be more involved at various levels.
  (Rating: low)
  (Reason) Several ideas were not followed through by the Parent Council. (Everything is going from school, so people tend to lose interest.)

- (Activity) Our school developed an active Teens Against Drinking and Driving Committee which I strongly encouraged and supported.
  (Rating: medium)
  (Reason) The community assisted and raised funds to send students out of province for a leadership seminar.

- (Activity) I have encouraged the businesses in our community to allow us to use their various business sites as work sites for our students in the school's Co-op Vocational Education Program. Students would receive academic training at the school site which the different business sites would deliver the practical component of the course.
(Rating: high)
(Reason) The program has proven to be very popular both with the students and with the community members with whom they are working and learning from. As a result, there has been tremendous growth and interest in the program.

These examples of administrative activity and of the reasons provided for the effectiveness ratings tend to confirm that what Remy & Wagstaff (1982) recommended principals to do was feasible and was perceived by the principals to be important in the educational practice of preparing students for citizenship.

Category 1: Student outcome

"Student outcome" constitutes 12.0% of the total 367 reasons provided. Reasons in this category were used in all six administrative task areas by the principals. These reasons were associated with gains of the students not only in academic performance on tests and examinations but also in the improvement of behaviour, in ways of thinking, in the acquisition of knowledge and skills, and in a wide range of educational experiences. Two examples with medium and high ratings are provided below as illustrations of student outcomes perceived to be important pertaining to preparing students for citizenship. The data contained no case where a "student-related" administrative activity performed by the principal was given a low rating for a reason related to "student outcome."

- (Activity) Compulsory requirement of Family Studies. Grades 11 and 12 learn parenting skills of how to make community contact. Grade 9 to S1 learn skills of how to listen to friends and respect others who are different from them.
(Rating: medium)
(Reason) Better understanding of their families, friends. Good citizens are about having to understand people.

- (Activity) I have used financial resources to sponsor clinics on environment issues, e.g., dead animal disposal, farm land management, local government elections, farm and personal safety.
(Rating: high)
(Reason) These clinics are very well received by students and they gain a great deal of knowledge they retain for an extended period of their school life.

Scholars have recommended that, as educational leaders, principals can facilitate the practices of preparing students for citizenship by building a vision around the principles, values, knowledge, skills, and attitudes that students should gain as desired outcomes of citizenship education (Cogan, 1999; Cogan and Derricott, 1998; McGowan, Plugge and Reynolds, 1986; Perry, 1992). The administrative activities and reasons for effectiveness ratings of the activities provided in the present study tend to agree with these recommendations and to suggest that these recommendations are not only feasible but also comparatively effective. Moreover, the reasons in this category suggest that principals tend to perceive that they did many important things in their administrative practices in preparing students for citizenship. They also tend to perceive that a very wide range of things that the students gained from all kinds of learning experience were related to desired "outcomes" of educating students for citizenship.

Category 4: Curriculum offering

Reasons related to "curriculum offering" constitute 9.5% of all 367 reasons provided. Reasons in this category were related to particular curricula offered at the school, the effectiveness of these programs, and strategies taken to help enhance such effectiveness. Particular courses mentioned comprise both the courses that are traditionally believed to be important for citizenship education, such as history and law, and other courses/ programs relating to a wide range of skills. The latter group included Red Cross First Aid, Information

Technology, English Language Arts (ELA), Lion's Quest, and several school-initiated courses and student-initiated projects.

Some literature on preparing students for citizenship holds that principals can exert a leadership role in influencing the school's curriculum and instructional programs and implementation strategies (Cogan, 1999; Cogan and Derricott, 1998; Osborne, 1994; Perry, 1992; Remy and Wagstaff, 1982). For example, they can influence instructional time, materials and approaches. In the present study, the principals often used reasons related to "curriculum offering" to judge the effectiveness of their administrative activities pertaining to preparing students for citizenship. To illustrate this point, two examples of administrative activities and reasons supplied for the effectiveness ratings of the activities are provided below. As in the last case, the data set contained no "student-related" administrative activity that was performed by the principal and was given a low rating for a reason associated with "curriculum offering."

- (Activity) Reminding is necessary to keep the citizenship development in the forefront of their dealing with students. They are reminded that citizenship can be incorporated into every class whether science, math, social studies, etc.
  (Rating: medium)
  (Reason) Teachers responded by doing these but in using "teachable moments" to develop this area.

- (Activity) Supported student projects.
  (Rating: high)
  (Reason) There are funds set aside for all S1 and S2 students to pursue a 5 week project on: --- school plant improvement, and --- 5 weeks of anything they want, as long as they can demonstrate that learning is taking place.

Examples of administrative activities and reasons given for effectiveness ratings of the administrative activities listed above tend to confirm that principals could influence the offering of programs and courses as well as instructional time, material, and approaches.

Principals also perceived this to be important for their administrative practices pertaining to preparing students for citizenship.

Category 2: Student participation in school governance

Reasons related to "student participation in school governance" constitute 8.4% out of the total number of reasons provided. This category has a great concentration in Task Area B. "Student involvement in school governance" means student involvement in the process of decision making for the school. The reasons supplied in this category cluster under 3 themes. The first is the school's effort to enhance student involvement/ participation in school decision making process. For example, "Change takes time. We will continue to work together and try to involve students." The second is how beneficial it was to the school and/or students when students took an active part in school governance. For example, "[The policy was] effective because of input from students/parents/staff." The third is about the functioning of Student Council. The fact that principals took student involvement/ participation in school governance as a major criterion to rate the effectiveness of their administrative practice toward preparing students for citizenship suggests that they perceive participatory skills and capacities to be an important component in competent citizenship. A few examples are provided for illustration.

- (Activity) Continued effort to build a positive school culture through effective Student Council involvement. This means setting up organizational structures for Council that would introduce them to the basic tenants of democratic functioning and responsibility. A development of a Constitution was a key component.
(Rating: low)
(Reason) Student commitment (Council members) continued to be marginal and casual. A basic understanding of democratic functioning and representation was somewhat lacking. One of my recommendations was to implement a "Civics" course for all students. Staff commitment also needed to be stronger. A new Constitution was adapted.

- (Activity) Student involvement in school planning committees: facilitate student representation on committees.

(Rating: medium)
(Reason) Increased involvement and participation. Student advice is being followed --- projects have been developed and implemented. Students that have been involved are "proud" of the accomplishments.

- (Activity) At the point of school discipline due to student behavior problems, student leaders were consulted and involved in determining the cause of the behavior, discussing the issues with the students in question, and in determining the outcome within school guideline.
(Rating: high)
(Reason) Student leadership helped administration to become more effective in dealing with student discipline and were able to achieve a level of fairness/justice which was perceived to be fair by the students involved and the wider student body.

People believe that principals can play a leadership role in helping create a school climate and school structure where the administrators, faculty, staff, the curriculum, the assessment measures, and the general atmosphere will all "model" the desired outcomes of democratic citizenship education (Cogan, 1999; Cogan and Derricott, 1998; Osborne, 1994; McGowan, Plugge and Reynolds, 1986; Remy and Wagstaff, 1982). Examples in this respect include creating a school climate that encourages creative teaching and learning activities, and involving teachers and students in school governance. In the present study, out of 66 reasons provided for the effectiveness ratings of the administrative activities in Task Area B (student personnel), 25 were about "student involvement in school governance." This fact means that principals in the present study believed that "student involvement in school governance" to be an important way to build competent citizens. Further, through actions of involving students in school governance, democratic citizenship education was not merely taught, but "practiced" (Levin, 2000, p. 6; Sears and Perry, 2000, p. 30) in their schools. This is a very important step forward from "education about democracy" toward "education for democracy" (Levin, 2000, p. 6).

Category 8: Staff-student relationships

Reasons related to "staff-student relationships" consist of 7.4% of the total 367

reasons provided. Reasons supplied in this category included examples of good/ not-so-good

staff-student relationships as well as strategies taken by the school to enhance staff-student

relationship. The fact that the principals took staff-student relationships as a

criterion/explanation for the effectiveness of their administrative practices pertaining to

preparing students for citizenship suggests that principals perceive teacher-student

relationship to be an important issue when educating students for citizenship. However, why

principals perceived this area so important pertaining to preparing students for citizenship is

not related in the responses supplied. Listed below are a few examples to illustrate the

principals' perception of staff-student relationships.

- (Activity) I initiated a teacher-advisory program similar to the home room concept. The goal was to enhance the relationship between students and students as well as between staff and students.
  (Rating: low)
  (Reason) "Old guard" in staff were too set in their ways and did not give it a chance.

- (Activity) I supported the implementation of a Teacher Advisory Group system in our school. The TAG system is designed to help high school students build stronger relationships within the school community. Students may talk to teacher advisors about academic progress, career goals, hobbies, extra-curricular interests and personal concerns.
  (Rating: medium)
  (Reason) We have surveyed students and staff and we are happy with their opinions on the TAG system. We need to address the issue of attendance at TAG. Some students have the attitude that if it isn't worth credits, they don't have to go. We are hoping that as relationships build, all students will recognize the value of TAG.

- (Activity) Promote student and staff community service.
  (Rating: high)
  (Reason) High degree of student and staff rapport observed in school.

Tucker's (1986) study found that, when the elementary school principals were asked to provide examples of what they had done in their school to promote the implementation of citizenship education curriculum, the examples provided had a great concentration on extra-curricular activities. In the present study, while extra-curricular programs/activities also stand out as a frequently used category of reasons (6.0%) for the effectiveness ratings of principals' administrative practice regarding preparing students for citizenship, this category of reason does not receive a "great concentration" of frequencies. Tucker's study was conducted 15 years ago and was with elementary school principals. The present study was conducted in the year 2000 with high school principals. These differences may well explain the discrepancy of findings between these two studies about the role of extra-curricular activities in building citizenship.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

As stated at the beginning of Chapter One, educating for citizenship has long been a purpose of education in Canada. School has an important role to play in this respect particularly in providing opportunities for learning and developing citizenship knowledge, skills and disposition as well as an environment where students can practice desired citizenship characteristics (Cogan, 1999; Cogan & Derricott 1998; Osborne, 1994; Levin, 2000; Sears & Perry, 2000). The two basic purposes of the present study were, first, to identify the administrative practices that were used by principals during the 1998-99 school year to help prepare students for citizenship as well as to determine whether or not some administrative activities/actions were more common than others. The second purpose was to examine how effective the identified administrative activities were, based on the principals' perceptions and the reasons they gave for their perceptions. This Chapter summarizes conclusions drawn from the findings of the present study and presents implications for educational practices and further research.

5.1 Conclusions

5.1.1 Conclusions of Research Questions 1 – 3

Research Question 1 asked if there was a significant difference in the doer and target classification in each task area. Findings reveal that during the 1998-99 school year, in their administrative practices pertaining to preparing students for citizenship, principals worked through/with others significantly more often than working alone when their administrative practices were about curriculum and instruction programs. When the principals dealt with

school financial and physical resources issues, they worked alone significantly more often than they worked through/with others. The present study failed to find a significant difference between how often principals worked alone and how often they worked through/with others when their administrative activities were about student personnel, staff personnel and school-community relations.

In Task Areas A (curriculum and instruction programs) and B (student personnel), students were most often the direct recipient of principals' administrative actions. In Task Area C (staff personnel), students or staff were most often the direct recipient of principals' administrative actions. In Task Area D (school-community relations), the entire school was most often the direct recipient of principals' administrative actions. In Task Areas E (financial resources) and F (physical resources), students and the school were most often the direct recipient of principals' administrative activities.

The study failed to find a significant association between doer and target in any task area. In the present study, administrative activities were performed either by the principal alone or by the principal through/with others. No significant difference was found for target categories of the administrative activities performed either by the principal or by the principal through/with others.

Heck and Hallinger (1999) noted that, while it has been recognized that principal leadership has indirect effects on student outcome, important questions remain unanswered about how principals and other leaders achieve improvement in schools. Findings from Research Question 1 indicated that whether principals were more likely to work alone or work through/with others in their administrative activities pertaining to preparing students for citizenship depended on the task area. Likewise, the direct recipient of principals'

administrative actions was the students, the staff, the entire school, or a party other than students, staff and the school depended on the task area.

Research Question 2 asked if there were significant associations between doer/target classifications and the 6 characteristics of the principals, namely, gender, years of administrative service, highest level of education completed, school administrator's certificate status, type of school, and grade levels in the school. The present study failed to find any significant association between these variables. This may be due to the use of the 6 characteristic variables for examination in the present study. The possibility exists that when variables other than the ones used in the present study are examined, associations between doer/target classifications and those variables can be found.

Research Question 3 asked if there were significant associations between the effectiveness ratings and the 6 characteristics of the principals as well as doer/target classification. The present study failed to find a significant association between effectiveness ratings and the independent variables: doer, target, gender, education, certificate, school type, and grade levels in school. A significant association was found between years of administrative service and the level of effectiveness ratings in Task Area F (physical resources). Principals with 1-5 years of administrative service supplied lower ratings than the principals with 6-10 years of administrative service did. The effectiveness ratings supplied by the principals with 11+ years of administrative experience are neither significantly lower nor higher than either the principals with 1-5 years of administrative experience or the principals with 6-10 years of administrative. Again, the fact that little association was found between principals' perceptions of effectiveness of their administrative activities and the 6 personal characteristic variables of the principals as well as doer and

target classifications suggests that this result may be due the variables examined in this study. It is possible that associations between effectiveness ratings and some variables exist, but the variables used in the present study are not among them.

5.1.2 Conclusions of Research Question 4

Research Question 4 asked what reasons the principals provided for the effectiveness ratings of the administrative activities. The investigator identified 19 categories of reasons based on the clusters of meaning and themes emerged from the 367 reasons provided. Reasons supplied for low, medium and high level of effectiveness ratings all covered a very wide range of categories of reasons. The first 5 most frequently used categories of reason were "parent/community participation in school education," "student outcome," "curriculum offering," "student participation in school governance," and "staff-student relationships." This fact suggests that principals often used what happened in these 5 aspects of education practices as criteria to judge the effectiveness of their administrative activities pertaining to preparing students for citizenship. It also suggests that principals perceived education practices in these 5 aspects to be important in promoting the practices of preparing students for citizenship.

As stated in Chapter Two, Sears, Clarke and Hughes observed, currently, "in all provinces and territories the goal of citizenship education is to create knowledgeable individuals committed to active participation in a pluralist society" (1998b, p. 3). They cited the statement in the High School Foundation Program in the Province of New Brunswick as representative: "We hoped that all students will become active and concerned citizens, knowledgeable about their community, province and country and its place in the global

village" (Curriculum Development Branch, 1996, p. iv). They also noted that a general consensus is found that good citizenship is characterized by dispositions such as "open-mindedness, civic mindedness, respect, willingness to compromise, tolerance, compassion, generosity of spirit, and loyalty" (Hughes 1994, p. 21. Cited in Sears, Clarke and Hughes, 1998b, p. 4). The majority of the desired characteristics of good citizenship listed here were mentioned in the reasons given for effectiveness ratings of the administrative actions or in the actions themselves. The fact that principals in the present study used reasons related to these characteristics as criteria to judge the effectiveness of their administrative activities suggests that the principals in the present study shared the perception that these characteristics are desired characteristics of good citizenship. Moreover, principals in the present study generally gave comparatively high effectiveness ratings to their administrative practices. This suggests that they perceived that their administrative activities were promoting, directly or indirectly, these desired characteristics of good citizenship.

On the whole, the present study tends to emphasize and confirm the importance of school context where characteristics of good citizenship were understood, acquired, learned, developed, and practiced, instead of merely taught (Cogan, 1999; Cogan and Derricott, 1998; Levin, 2000; Osborne, 1994; McGowan, Plugge and Reynolds, 1986; Remay and Wagstaff, 1982; Sears and Perry, 2000). One illustration of this claim is that, in the reasons given for effectiveness ratings, principals displayed an emphasis on the learning experience of the students, and on a wide range of learning outcome that they perceived that students gained or would gain from their learning experience. In fact, all of the 19 categories of reasons are about creating a learning environment or some learning experiences where students can LEARN the desired characteristics of good citizenship. Another is that principals provided

many examples in each task area and generally perceived them to be effective pertaining to preparing students for citizenship. While "student" was the direct recipient of some of the activities, a large portion of the activities had "staff," "the entire school," and "other party" as the direct recipients. An implication is that, regardless who was the direct recipient of principals' administrative activities, everything principals did in their administrative practices was perceived by them to relate in one way or another to preparing students for citizenship.

5.1.3 Reflections on the study

As was noted earlier in this chapter, analyses for Research Question 2 resulted in no significant finding and in very few significant findings for Research Question 3. This drove the investigator into thinking that, while the doer and target classifications and the six characteristics of the principals did not reveal strong associations, the use of other variables may result in strong associations.

A difficult job with designing a survey instrument for an empirical study is to decide on the theoretical framework for the instrument. Another difficult job is to decide on the items to be included in the instrument. When the empirical study is the first one and no direct reference exists, these two jobs became more difficult. In addition, when data were collected, a new difficulty, data coding, emerged.

The major variables investigated in the present study were doer and target. They were independent in meaning, and told two essential aspects of an action, namely, who performed an action and who was the direct recipient of an action. However, these two variables did not lead to many findings, as shown in sections 4.3, 4.4 and 4.5. It is assumed

that when different variable of the administrative actions and different variables of the principals are used, more significant findings will show up.

5.2 Recommendations

5.2.1 Implications for educational practice.

Results from the present study bear several implications for educational practice.

1. The participants were asked to supply one example of the "most important" administrative action pertaining to preparing students for citizenship to each task area. Some examples supplied received comparatively low effectiveness level ratings. Since these administrative actions were regarded as the "most important" toward preparing student for citizenship, it might be worth the effort of looking into the factors that affected the effectiveness of these administrative actions.

2. Over half of the participants voluntarily provided more than one example of administrative activity to at least one task area. This may suggest that many principals have quite a lot to say about their administrative practices pertaining to preparing students for citizenship. Establishing records under this topic will be helpful for future practices.

3. The study tends to emphasize the importance of student learning experience in developing the desired characteristics of good citizenship and the importance of an education context in which students can learn these characteristics by practicing them. Therefore, the practices of preparing students for citizenship at school level should emphasize on creating opportunities for students to learn and practice good citizenship.

4. The present study tends to suggest that principals perceived that almost everything they did in their administrative practices was related to preparing students for citizenship. It is recommended that theories about different conceptions of citizenship and citizenship education be included in the agenda for principals' professional development. Principals' administrative practices toward preparing students for citizenship will become more focused when guided by related theories.

5.2.2 Implications for further research.

Design of and results from the present study suggest a few directions for future research.

1. This study asked the participants to provide an example of the "most important" administrative activity that they performed during the 1998-99 school year toward preparing students for citizenship in each of the six task areas and asked them to rate how effective that activity was. As was shown in the data supplied, examples of "important" administrative actions supplied by the principals did not always receive high effectiveness ratings. "Importance" and "effectiveness" are two different concepts. Further research should inquire into why principals perceive some administrative actions as "important" toward preparing students for citizenship when examining the perceived effectiveness of these administrative activities.

2. This study analyzed the examples of administrative actions quantitatively. Further research might take the route of qualitative inquiries for more focused and detailed information about principals' administrative practices pertaining to preparing students for citizenship.

3. This study also analyzed the reasons for effectiveness ratings qualitatively. Further research might pursue the feasibility of doing this from a more quantitative or statistical perspective.

4. The concepts of citizenship and citizenship education are another direction to explore. The exploration can be connections between principals' concepts of citizenship and their administrative practices pertaining to citizenship education.

5. Principals' administrative practices pertaining to preparing students for citizenship can be examined in a theoretical framework other than managerial leadership, such as instructional leadership, moral leadership, and participative leadership (Leithwood and Duke, 1999).

6. In general, empirical studies that examine the attainment of the goal of preparing students for citizenship from the perspective of educational administration are needed for our understanding of successful educational practices at school level.

7. Principals in the present study provided very rich information about what they did during the 1998-99 school year in their administrative practices toward preparing students for citizenship, about how effective they perceived these administrative activities were and why they perceived these activities effective/not so effective. If there were a chance to do this study again, the investigator would like to do a structured qualitative study with a sample group of 20-30 principals. The investigator would like to interview each principal in the sample group based on a structured survey questionnaire. The questionnaire would start with questions on principals' beliefs/concepts of citizenship and citizenship education, their administrative practices pertaining to preparing students for citizenship, their perceptions of effectiveness and the reasons for the level of effectiveness. This

method would allow the study to identify connections between the concepts of citizenship, citizenship education, principals' administrative practices, perceptions of effectiveness of the administrative actions, and reasons for the level of effectiveness.

8. The study, however, did indicate that the principals engaged in activities that they perceived to contribute to their students' development as citizens. The content of such activities needs to be addressed, and it is recommended that future studies examine, for example, the extent to which the activities promote the conception of citizenship as embodied in the twelve elements described by Osborne (2000). Moreover, it would be helpful to know if male and female principals, public and private school principals, and more or less experienced principals differ in the content of their administrative activities which pertain to citizenship education.

References

Alex, G. S. (1997). Women principals and vice-principals: the impact of one Manitoba school division's affirmative action policy on their appointments to administration and on selected aspects of their practices. Master of Education degree thesis. University of Manitoba. Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada.

Allison, P.A. & Allison, D.J. (1991). Experience and expertise in administrative problem solving. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL, April 3-7, 1991). (ED 333 583)

Alvy, H. B. & Robbins, P. (1998). If I only knew...: Success strategies for navigating the principalship. Thourand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Aron, A., & Aron, E. N. (1999). Statistics for psychology (2nd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Bandura, A. (1995). Exercise of personal and collective efficacy in changing societies. In A. Bandura (Ed.) Self-efficacy in changing societies. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Berg, B.L.(1995). Qualitative research methods for the social sciences. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Buettner, R. (1995). Coping mechanisms used by rural principals. SSTA Research Centre Report #95-13. Summary of a Master's Thesis, "Coping mechanisms used by rural principals in Saskatchewan in response to stressful events," by Richard Buettner. (ED399 103)

Bullock, K., James, C., & Jamieson, I. (1995). An exploratory study of novices and experts in educational management. Educational Management & Administration, 23(3), 197-205.

Cairns, A. C. (1999). Introduction. In Alan. C. Cairns, John C. Courtney, Peter MacKinnon, Hans J. Michelmann, and David E. Smith (Eds.) Citizenship, Diversity, and Plurialism: Canadian and Comparative perspectives. (pp. 3-22) Montreal & Kingston, Canada: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Cogan, J.J. (1999). Multidimentional citizenship as educational policy for the millenium: Putting research into practice. Momentum, April/May, 73-82.

Cogan, J.J., & Derricott, R. (Eds.) (1998). Citizenhip for the 21st century: An international perspective on education. London, UK: Kogan Page Limited.

Crow, G.M., & Peterson, F. (1994). School principals: Role in restructured schools. In T. Husen and T. Postlethwaite (Eds.), The international encyclopedia of education (2nd ed.). (pp. 5268-5273). London: Pergammon.

Curriculum Development Branch (1996). The high school fundation program. Fredericton, New Brunswick: Department of Education. (cited in Sears, Clark and Hughes, 1999.)

Dembowski, F.L. (1998). The assessment of management policies and practices in school districts. Paper presented at the national Conference on Education, February 1998, San Diego, CA. (ED 420 112)

Denzin, N.K. (1988). Triangulation. In Keeves, J.P. (ed.) Educational research, methodology, and measurement: An international handbook. (pp.511-513) Patts Point, NY: Pergamon.

Eagly, A.H., Karau, Steven J., & Johnson. Blair T. (1992). Gender and leadership style among school principals: A meta-analysis. Educational Administration Quarterly, 28(1), 76-102.

Field, D. (1985). Headship in secondary school. In M. Hughes, P. Ribbins, and H. Thomas (Eds.) (1985). Managing education: The system and the institution. (pp.308-324) London: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Fraenkel, J.R. & Wallen, N.E (1990). How to design and evaluste research in education. New York: MeGraw-Hill.

Gall, M. D., Borg, W. R., & Gall, J. P. (1996). Educational research: An introduction (6th ed.). New York: Longman.

Gay, L.R. (1992). Educational research: competence for analysis and application (4th ed.). New York: Macmillan.

Gips, C.J. (1989). Women's ways: A model for leadership in democratic schools. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Council of States on In-service Education (San Antonio, TX, November 17-21, 1989. (ED 314 860)

Glass, G.V., & Hopkins, K.D. (1996). Statistical methods in education and psychology (3rd ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Gluckman, I.B. (1984). Values education in the public schools. NASSP Bulletin, 68(470), 98-104.

Hallinger, P. (1992). The evolving role of American principals: From managerial to instructional to transformational leaders. Journal of Educational Administration, 30(3), 35-48.

Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. H. (1996). Reassessing the principal's role in school effectiveness: A review of empirical research, 1980-1995. Educational Administration Quarterly, 32(1), 5-44.

Heck, R.H., & Hallinger, P. (1999). Next generation methods for the study of leadership and school improvement. In J. Murphy and K. Seashore-Louise (Eds.) (1999). A handbook of research in educational administration. (pp.141-162) San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Hébert, Y., & Pàge, M. (2000). Research initiatives in citizenship education. Education Canada, 40(3), 24-27.

Hughes, M., Ribbins, P. & Thomas, H. (Eds.) (1985). Managing education: The system and the institution. London: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Kingwell, M. (2000). The world we want: Virtue, vice, and the good citizen. Toronto, Canada: Viking.

Legdesog, C.S. (1995). An effectiveness analysis of prefessional development programs for school administrators in Yap, SY 1992-93 through SY 1993-94. Master's degree project. University of Hawaii-Manoa. (ED 385 900)

Leithwood, K. & Duke, D. L. (1999). A century's quest to understand school leadership. In J. Murphy and K. S. Louis (Eds.) Handbook of research on educational administration (2nd ed.) (pp.45-72). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Inc.

Leithwood, K. & Jantzi, D. (1990). Transformational leadership: How principals can help reform school cultures. School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 1(1), 249-280. (Cited in Heck and Hallinger, 1999, p.151.)

Levin, B. (2000). Democracy and schools. Education Canada, 40(3), 4-7.

Li, Z. (2000). Manitoba school principals' roles prescribed in the New Directions documents. In L. Sokal and R. Bruno-Jofé (Eds.), An educational mosaic (pp. 41-58). Winnipeg, Canada: Faculty of Education, The University of Manitoba.

Lincoln, Y.S. & Guba, E.G. (1985). Natualistic inquiry. Beverly Hill, CA: Sage.

Lipham, J. M. & Hoeh, J. A. Jr. (1974). The principalship: Foundations and functions. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.

Lipham, J. M., Rankin, R. E. & Hoeh, J. A. (1985). The principalship: Concepts, competencies, and cases. New York: Longman.

Manitoba Education and Training (MET) (1994). Renewing Education: New Directions: a blueprint for action. Winnipeg, MB: The author.

Manitoba Education and Training (MET) (1995). Renewing education: New directions: The action plan. Winnipeg, MB: The author.

Manitoba Education and Training (MET) (1999). Schools in Manitoba. Winnipeg, MB: The author.

McGowan, T.M., Plugge, L., & Reynolds, V. (1986). Generating elementary school "climate for citizenship". Contemporary Education, 58(1), 25-29.

McIntosh, L. (1997). The Education Administration Act (C.C.S.M.c. E10): Education Administration Miscellaneous Provisions Regulation, amendment. The Manitoba Gazette, 126(12), pp. 592-598.

McLeod, K. (Ed.)(1989). Canada and citizenship education. Toronto, ON: Canadian Education Association.

Mertz, N.T., & McNeely, S.R. (1997). Exploring the boundaries of gender and role in administrative decision-making. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration (11th, Orlando, FL, October 1997). (ED 412 656)

Norusis, M. J. (1995). SPSS 6.1: Guide to data analysis. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Osborne, K. (1988). Educating citizens: a democratic socialist agenda for Canadian education. Toronto: Our Schools, Our Selves Education Publishing.

Osborne, K. (1994). A citizenship education checklist. The Manitoba Social Science Teacher, 21(1), 25-26.

Osborne, K. (2000). Public schooling and citizenship education in Canada. Canadian Ethnic Studies. 32(1). (Special Issue: Educating citizens for a pluralistic society.) pp. 8-37.

Perry, G.S. Jr. (1992). Designing citizenship education programs for urban secondary schools. NASSP Bulletin, 76(546), 13-18.

Remy, R.C., & Wagstaff, L.H. (1982). Principals can exert a leadership role in citizenship education. NASSP Bulletin. 66(454), 55-62.

Riehl, C., & Lee, V. E. (1996). Gender, organizations, and leadership. In K. Leithwood, J. Chapman, D. Corson, P. Hallinger and A. Hart (Eds.), International handbook of educational leadership and administration (pp.873-920). Dordrecht, The Netherland: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Sears, A.M. (1994). Social studies as citizenship education in English Canada: A review of research. Theory and Research in Social Education, 22(1), 6-43.

Sears, A. M. (1996a). "Something different to everyone": Conceptions of citizenship and citizenship education. Canadian and International Education, 25(2), 1-16.

Sears, A.M. (1996b). What research tells us about citizenship education in English Canada. Canadian Social Studies, 30(3), 121-127.

Sears, A.M., & Hughes, A.S. (1996). Citizenship education and current educational reform. Canadian Journal of Education, 21(2), 123-142.

Sears, A.M., & Perry, M. (2000). Paying attention to the contexts of citizenship education. Education Canada, 40(3), 28-31.

Sears, A.M., Clarke, G.M., & Hughes, A.S. (1998a). IEA Civic Education Project abbreviated Phase 1: National Case Study – Canada. Prepared for the International Association for the Evaluation of Education Achievement.

Sears, A.M., Clarke, G.M., & Hughes, A.S. (1998b). Learning democracy in a pluralist society: Building a research base for citizenship education in Canada. A discussion paper prepared for the Council of Ministers of Education, Canada, December 1998.

Sears, A.M., Clark, G.M., & Hughes, A.S. (1999). Canadian citizenship education: The pluralist ideal and citizenship education for a post-modern state. In J. Torney-Purta, J. Schwille, and J. Amadeo (Eds.) Twenty-four national case studies from the IEA Civic Education Project. (pp. 112-135) Amsterdam, Holland: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA).

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1987). The principalship: A reflective practice perspective. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Taylor, C. (1993). Reconciling the solitudes: Essays on Canadian federalism and nationalism. Montreal: McGill-Queens University Press. (Cited in Sears, Clarke and Hughes, 1998.)

Tucker, J. (1986). Citizenship education through the eyes of elementary school principals. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the social Science Education Consortium, Stanford University, June 19, 1986. (ED 275 574)

Ubben, G.C., Hughes, L.W., & Norris, C.J. (2001). The principal: Creative leadership for effective schools (4th ed.). Needham Heights, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Wallen, N. E., & Fraenkel, J. (2001). Educational Research: A guide to the process (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Zheng, H.Y. (1996). School contexts, principal characteristics, and instructional leadership effectiveness: A statistical analysis. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. New York, NY. April 8-12, 1996. (ED 396 408)

Appendix 1: Pilot study package (Four items)

No.1: Covering letter to participants in pilot study

(Date)

Dear (title and name),

Your name was suggested to me by _____ as someone who has the expertise to be able to assist me in the pilot study of an instrument to be used in my doctoral research.

Let me introduce myself. My name is Zhide/Judy Li; I am a Ph.D student in the Faculty of Education at the University of Manitoba. I am originally from China where people hold a strong belief that schools can influence the outcomes of educating students for citizenship. I have a strong personal interest in the roles played by schools in the formation of citizenship. To that end, I chose to conduct this study for my doctoral dissertation in the area of Educational Administration. My program advisor is Dr. John Stapleton. He can be reached by email at -----, or by phone at 474-XXXX, or by regular mail at Dr. John Stapleton (the mailing address).

The purpose of the study is to find what some Manitoba high school principals did in their administrative practices during the 1998-1999 school year towards preparing S1-S4 students for citizenship. "Preparing students for citizenship" means the development of desired characteristics of citizens who can function competently in society. I am writing to ask you to participate in *the Pilot Study stage* of my research project. Here is what I would like you to do.

1. **Assume** that you are one of the participants in the main study. Read the "Covering letter to the principals", and complete the questionnaire. Please note the amount of time you needed to complete the questionnaire.
2. Then, please go back and react to the "Covering letter" and the Questionnaire. I am particularly interested in (a) the clarity of the covering Letter, (b) the clarity of the examples provided in the Questionnaire, (c) the layout of the questions, (d) the degree of ease or difficulty that you found in answering the questions, and (e) any suggestions for change that you have for this questionnaire.
3. I will call you in a week or so to set up a brief meeting with you to discuss your response to #2 above.

You are assured that:

   1 The information you provided will be used to revise the "Principal's administrative activities towards preparing students for citizenship" questionnaire.
   2 A copy of a summary of major findings of the study will be available to you upon the completion of the study. If you are interested in having such a summary, please complete the enclosed form and return it to me.

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me by: 1) email: ------
2) telephone: (204) 261-XXXX, or 3) regular mail: Zhide(Judy) Li (the mailing address).

Thank you very much for your support of this research project.

Yours sincerely,

Zhide(Judy) Li

No.2: Form to participants in pilot study and main study about receiving a summary of the major findings of the study

(Date)
Dear (title and name),

Please accept my heart-felt thanks for your time and kindness to help me with this study. As I mentioned in the 'Covering letter', a summary of the major findings of the study will be available to you. Please indicate below if you would like to receive a copy of such summary, and the way by which you prefer to receive it.

I would like to receive a copy of the summary _____
I prefer NOT receiving a copy of the summary _____

I would like to receive the summary
    By fax _____
        Fax number:

        By email as attachment (written with Word 97) _____
        Email address:

    By regular mail _____
    Mailing address:

If you have any questions about receiving such a summary or about the summary itself, please do not hesitate to contact me by: 1) email: ----- 2) telephone: (204) 261-XXXX, or 3) regular mail: Zhide(Judy) Li (the mailing address).

Thank you again for participating in this study!

Sincerely,

Zhide(Judy) Li

No.3: Cover letter to the principals in the main study

Dear principal,

My name is Zhide/ Judy Li; I am a Ph.D student in the Faculty of Education at the University of Manitoba. I am originally from China, where people hold a strong belief that schools can influence the outcomes of educating students for citizenship. I have a strong personal interest in the roles played by schools in the formation of citizenship. To that end, I chose to conduct this study for my doctoral thesis in the area of Educational Administration. My program advisor is Dr. John Stapleton. He can be reached by phone at 474-XXXX, or by email at -----, or by regular mail at Dr. John Stapleton (the mailing address).

The purpose of the study is to find what some Manitoba high school principals did in their administrative practices during the 1998-1999 school year towards preparing S1-S4 students for citizenship. "Preparing students for citizenship" means the development of desired characteristics of citizens who can function competently in society. I am writing to ask you to participate in my research project by filling in a questionnaire. Your participation is crucial to the success of this study.

You are assured that:
1. Your participation in this study is voluntary. You do not have to answer every question.
2. The information gathered via the "Principal's administrative activities towards preparing students for citizenship" questionnaire is for research purposes only, and the results will be used by the researcher for writing a doctoral dissertation. The information may also be used in conference presentations and academic publications.
3. At no time will an individual principal or a school or a school division be identified. Whenever a name is mentioned, a pseudonym will be used.
4. A copy of a summary of major findings of the study will be available to you upon the completion of the study. If you are interested in having such a summary, please fill in the form and send it back to me together with the questionnaire.
5. It will take approximately twenty minutes to complete the questionnaire.
6. The completed questionnaires will be destroyed upon the completion of the study.

In completing the Questionnaire, you have the following options.
1. You may complete it in the same way as you write an email. As the Questionnaire is sent as body text, you can email it back to me either as forwarded mail or reply mail.
2. You may print out the Questionnaire, complete it, and mail it to me.
3. You may request a hard copy of the Questionnaire by emailing me. Then I will send you a hard copy and a return envelope.

(Insert a sentence here indicating the date when the questionnaire is to be mailed back.)

As a teacher and administrator with 17 years of working experience at high school and post-secondary levels, I am well aware of your busy schedule. I would greatly appreciate it if you could help with this research project by filling in the questionnaire.

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me by: 1) email: -----
2) telephone: (204) 261-XXXX, or 3) regular mail: Zhide (Judy) Li (the mailing address).

Thank you very much for your support of this research project.

Yours sincerely,

Zhide(Judy) Li

No.4: Questionnaire for pilot study

<p align="right">(code of the questionnaire)</p>

<div align="center">

"Principals' Administrative Activities and the Goal of Preparing
Students for Citizenship in Manitoba's High Schools"
Questionnaire
(For Pilot Study)

</div>

Dear principal,

The purpose of this questionnaire is to collect information pertaining to principal's administrative activities related to preparing students for citizenship. Please list the three most important administrative activities that you did in each of the task areas during the 1998-1999 school year to promote the goal of preparing students for citizenship in S1-S4 years. Then, please rate how effective you perceive each of these activities was towards preparing students for citizenship. Finally, please provide brief reasons for your ratings.

Thank you very much for your time and kind support of this research project.

===

The questions begin from here. In this section are some **demographic questions.**

Your gender: _____

Total years of being a principal in any school: _____

The highest academic degree you have completed:
        Bachelor's degree _____
        Master's degree_____
        Doctoral degree_____
        Other, please specify _____

The specialist certificate(s) you hold
    Level 1: Manitoba School Administrator's Certificate _____
    Level 2: Manitoba School Principal's Certificate _____
    Both _____
    None _____

School type:
    Public school _____   Private/ Independent school _____

If your school is a public school, please identify the Division/ District to which it belongs

_____.

Grade level of the school:

Senior 1 to Senior 4 only _____

Senior 2 to Senior 4 only _____

Grade 7 to Senior 4 only _____

Grade 7 to Senior 4 plus other grade levels _____

===

Administrative practice questions. In each task area, please list the three most important administrative activities that you took towards preparing students for citizenship during the 1998-1999 school year. Then, please rate how effective you feel each administrative activity was towards promoting the goal of preparing students for citizenship. Finally, please give brief reasons for your ratings. If the space provided in the boxes is insufficient, please feel free to write in the margins or on the reverse side of the paper.

The administrative activities are rated as 'very high level of effectiveness,' 'high level of effectiveness,' 'moderate level of effectiveness,' 'low level of effectiveness,' or 'very low level of effectiveness.' Codes for the ratings are:

5 = Very high level of effectiveness

4 = High level of effectiveness

3 = Moderate level of effectiveness

2 = Low level of effectiveness

1 = Very low level of effectiveness

For your convenience, attached at the head of each section is a brief illustrative list of administrative activities related to that task area.

===

A. Curriculum and instruction programs. Please list the three most important administrative activities that you took in this task area during the 1998-1999 school year towards preparing students for citizenship. Then, please rate how effective each activity was towards preparing students for citizenship, and give brief reasons for your ratings. If the space in the boxes is insufficient, you can write in the margins or on the back of the paper. (Principal's administrative work in this area may include activities regarding the development, implementation, and assessment of curricular programs; the establishment of student graduation requirements; and the evaluation of and reporting on student performance.)

Levels of Effectiveness

	Very High (5)	High (4)	Moderate (3)	Low (2)	Very Low (1)

(For example):

Administrative activity: Our school division introduced Program X to promote interpersonal understanding among the students. I strongly supported it. Interpersonal understanding is a very important competence for a good citizen today.	**Rating:** X ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ *Reasons for the rating:* This program is effective. There are many noticeable improvements in the way students speak to each other.

Administrative activity 1:	**Rating:** ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ *Reasons for the rating:*

Administrative activity 2:	**Rating:** ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ *Reasons for the rating:*

Administrative activity 3:	**Rating:** ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ *Reasons for the rating:*

B. Pupil personnel. Please list the three most important administrative activities that you took in this task area during the 1998-1999 school year towards preparing students for citizenship. Then, please rate how effective each activity was towards preparing students for citizenship, and give brief reasons for your ratings. If the space in the boxes is insufficient, you can write in the margins or on the back of the paper. (Principals' administrative work in this area may include the recruiting and admitting of students; constructing the school timetable; establishing extra-/co-curricular programs; involving students in school decision making; working with the student council; establishing policies on school discipline; and developing and implementing school attendance policies.)

Levels of Effectiveness

Very High (5)	High (4)	Moderate (3)	Low (2)	Very Low (1)

(*For example*):

Administrative activity: I encouraged the Student Council to invite input from all students when we revised our "Student Code of Conduct" last year, and we adopted many of their proposals.	**Rating:** ☐ X ☐ ☐ ☐ *Reasons for the rating:* Students in general have been observing the "Code" reasonably well.

Administrative activity 1:	**Rating:** ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ *Reasons for the rating:*

Administrative activity 2:	**Rating:** ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ *Reasons for the rating:*

Administrative activity 3:	**Rating:** ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ *Reasons for the rating:*

C. Staff personnel. Please list the three most important administrative activities that you took in this task area during the 1998-1999 school year towards preparing students for citizenship. Then, please rate how effective each activity was towards preparing students for citizenship, and give brief reasons for your ratings. If the space in the boxes is insufficient, you can write in the margins or on the back of the paper. (Principal's administrative activities in this area may include developing, implementing, and assessing policies and practices regarding the recruitment, selection, assignment, supervision, professional development, and evaluation of school personnel, plus activities that promote better staff-student relationships.)

	Levels of Effectiveness				
	Very High (5)	High (4)	Moderate (3)	Low (2)	Very Low (1)

(For example):

Administrative activity: I proposed to teachers and staff at staff meetings several times that we should pay attention to student character development and help them to become responsible citizens.	**Rating:** ☐ ☐ X ☐ ☐ *Reasons for the rating:* There were some proposals from teachers, but we need to do more work on the proposals to make them more relevant and workable.

Administrative activity 1:	**Rating:** ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ *Reasons for the rating:*

Administrative activity 2:	**Rating:** ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ *Reasons for the rating:*

Administrative activity 3:	**Rating:** ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ *Reasons for the rating:*

D. School-community relations. Please list the three most important administrative activities that you took in this task area during the 1998-1999 school year towards preparing students for citizenship. Then, please rate how effective each activity was towards preparing students for citizenship, and give brief reasons for your ratings. If the space in the boxes is insufficient, you can write in the margins or on the back of the paper. (Principal's administrative work in this area means the activities of involving parents and community members in educational matters of the school. The involvement means a process through which parents and community members contribute time, energy, expertise, and other resources to the educational matters of the school, as well as the process of solving problems and reducing conflicts among the home, the school, and the community.)

Levels of Effectiveness

Very High (5)	High (4)	Moderate (3)	Low (2)	Very Low (1)

(For example):

Administrative activity:	Rating: ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ X
I encouraged teachers to invite suggestions from parents at teacher-parent conferences about how to prepare students for citizenship.	*Reasons for the rating:* Parents did not provide much input. Some simply said they trust that the school knows what to do.

Administrative activity 1:	Rating: ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
	Reasons for the rating:

Administrative activity 2:	Rating: ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
	Reasons for the rating:

Administrative activity 3:	Rating: ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
	Reasons for the rating:

E. Financial resources. Please list the three most important administrative activities that you took in this task area during the 1998-1999 school year towards preparing students for citizenship. Then, please rate how effective each activity was towards preparing students for citizenship, and give brief reasons for your ratings. If the space in the boxes is insufficient, you can write in the margins or on the back of the paper. (Principal's administrative work in this area involves the activities of planning, acquiring, and using financial resources for educational matters of the school.)

Levels of Effectiveness

Very High (5)	High (4)	Moderate (3)	Low (2)	Very Low (1)

(For example):

Administrative activity:	Rating: ☐ ☐ X ☐ ☐
I allocated some money for a law-related education project initiated by a Social Study teacher and her Senior 3 students for learning some legal processes.	*Reasons for the rating:* About 70% of the students in the project liked the project, but half of them said the project did not really meet the said learning objectives. Most of the money was used to pay two guest speakers.

Administrative activity 1:	Rating: ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
	Reasons for the rating:

Administrative activity 2:	Rating: ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
	Reasons for the rating:

Administrative activity 3:	Rating: ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐
	Reasons for the rating:

F. Physical resources. Please list the three most important administrative activities that you took in this task area during the 1998-1999 school year towards preparing students for citizenship. Then, please rate how effective each activity was towards preparing students for citizenship, and give brief reasons for your ratings. If the space in the boxes is insufficient, you can write in the margins or on the back of the paper. (Principal's administrative work in this area involves the activities of planning, acquiring, using, and maintaining school physical resources/ facilities.)

Levels of Effectiveness

	Very High (5)	High (4)	Moderate (3)	Low (2)	Very Low (1)

(For example):

Administrative activity: I made sure that the biggest classroom was available when the Senior 2 students had their political debates, so more students were able to attend the sessions.	**Rating:** ☐ X ☐ ☐ ☐ *Reasons for the rating:* The students were interested in participating, and many attended.

Administrative activity 1:	**Rating:** ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ *Reasons for the rating:*

Administrative activity 2:	**Rating:** ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ *Reasons for the rating:*

Administrative activity 3:	**Rating:** ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ *Reasons for the rating:*

134

Thank you very much! The space below is for your comments, additional information, or whatever you wish to write about any aspect of this research project. Thanks again for your valuable information and kind help!

Appendix 2: Letter to the School

Dear Sir/ Madam,

My name is Zhide (Judy) Li; I am a Ph.D student in the Faculty of Education at the University of Manitoba. I have a deep interest in the roles played by schools in the formation of citizenship. To that end, I chose to conduct this study for my doctoral dissertation.

The purposes of the study are to find what some Manitoba high school principals undertook in their administrative practices during the 1998-1999 school year towards preparing students for citizenship, and to examine the principals' perceptions of effectiveness of their administrative practices with this respect.

I would greatly appreciate it if you would help me by passing this package to the person who was the principal of your school during the 1998-1999 school year. If that person has moved or retired, would you please forward the package to him/her, or provide me with a forwarding address.

If you have any question about this research project, please feel free to contact me by
E-mail: -----------
Phone: (204) 261-XXXX (home, message)
Fax: (204) 261-XXXX
Regular mail: Zhide(Judy) Li (the mailing address)

My program advisor is Dr. John Stapleton. He can be reached by phone at 474-XXXX, or by email at ------, or by regular mail at Dr. John Stapleton (the mailing address).

Thank you very much for your help!

Sincerely,

Zhide(Judy) Li

136

Appendix 3: Letter to the Principal

Dear principal,

My name is Zhide/ Judy Li; I am a Ph.D student in the Faculty of Education at the University of Manitoba. I am originally from China, where people hold a strong belief that schools can influence the outcome of educating students for citizenship. I have a strong personal interest in the roles played by schools in the formation of citizenship. To that end, I chose to conduct this study for my doctoral dissertation in Educational Administration.

The purposes of the study are to find what some Manitoba high school principals did in their administrative practices during the 1998-1999 school year towards preparing S1-S4 students for citizenship, and to examine the principals' perceptions of effectiveness of their administrative practices with this respect. "Preparing students for citizenship" is identified in Manitoba's school improvement initiative, the New Directions, as one of three overall goals of education for Manitoba's schools. "Preparing students for citizenship" means the development of citizens who can function competently in society. I am writing to ask you to participate in my research process by taking about 15 minutes to complete the enclosed questionnaire. **Your co-operation is crucial to my being able to carry out this study.**

As a teacher and administrator with 17 years of working experience at high school and post-secondary levels, I am well aware of your busy schedule. To my knowledge, this study is the first one of the Western democracies that examines what high school principals do in their administrative practices to prepare students for citizenship. Further, I hope that you will find that completing the questionnaire is helpful to you as you reflect upon your own administrative practices.

You are assured that:
7. Your participation in this study is voluntary. You do not have to answer every question.
8. The information gathered via the "Principal's administrative activities towards preparing students for citizenship" questionnaire is for research purposes only, and the results will be used by the researcher for writing a doctoral dissertation. The information may also be used in conference presentations and academic publications.
9. At no time will an individual principal or a school or a school division be identified. Whenever a name is mentioned, a pseudonym will be used.
10. A copy of a summary of major findings of the study will be available to you upon the completion of the study. If you are interested in having such a summary, please fill in the form and send it back to me together with the questionnaire.
11. The completed questionnaires will be destroyed upon the completion of the study.

(Over, please...)

When you have completed the Questionnaire, you may
1. Use the self-addressed and postage-paid envelope provided, and mail it to me.
2. Or fax it to me at (204) 261-XXXX.

I would appreciate it if you can mail/fax the completed questionnaire to me by
February 25, 2000.

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me. Besides regular mail, I can also be reached by:
(1) email: ------
(2) telephone: (204) 261-XXXX, and
(3) Fax: (204) 261-XXXX.

My program advisor is Dr. John Stapleton. He can be reached by phone at 474-XXXX, or by email at -----, or by regular mail at Dr. John Stapleton (the mailing address).

Thank you very much for your support of this research project.

Yours sincerely,

Zhide(Judy) Li

Appendix 4: A Form of Whether a Participant Would Like to Receive a Summary of the Major Findings of the Study

(File No.:)

<u>Would you like to receive a summary of the major findings of the study?</u>

(Date)

Dear Sir/Madam,

Please accept my heart-felt thanks for your time and kindness in helping me with this study. As I mentioned in the 'Cover Letter', a summary of the major findings of the study will be available to you. Please indicate below if you would like to receive a copy of the summary, and the way by which you prefer to receive it.

I would like to receive a copy of the summary _____

I would like to receive the summary
     By fax _____
        Fax number:

        By email (as body text) _____
        Email address:

     By regular mail _____
     Mailing address:

Thank you again for participating in this study!

Sincerely,

Zhide(Judy) Li

Appendix 5: The Questionnaire for Main Study

**"Principals' Administrative Activities and the Goal of Preparing
Students for Citizenship in Manitoba's High Schools"
Questionnaire**

Dear principal,

    The purpose of this questionnaire is to collect information pertaining to your administrative activities related to preparing S1-S4 students for citizenship. Please list **the most important** administrative activity that you did in each of the task areas during the 1998-1999 school year to promote the goal of preparing students for citizenship. Then, please rate how effective you perceive each of these activities was towards preparing students for citizenship. Finally, please provide brief reasons for your ratings.

    Thank you very much for your time and kind support of this research project.

===

Demographic questions.

Your gender: _____

Total years of being a principal in any school: _____

The highest academic degree you have completed:
    Bachelor's degree _____
    Post Baccalaureate in Education(PBCE) _____
    Master's degree _____
    Doctoral degree _____
    Other, please specify _____

The specialist certificate(s) you hold
    Level 1: Manitoba School Administrator's Certificate _____
    Level 2: Manitoba School Principal's Certificate _____

School type:
    Public school _____   Private/ Independent school _____

If your school is a public school, please identify the Division/ District to which it belongs
_____.

Grade level of the school:
    Senior grades only _____
    Grade 7 to Senior 4 only _____
    Grade 7 to Senior 4 plus other grade levels _____

===

(File No.:   )

Questions about administrative practices. In each task area, please
(1) List **the most important** administrative activity that you undertook towards preparing students for citizenship during the 1998-1999 school year;
(2) Rate how effective you feel each administrative activity was towards promoting the goal of preparing students for citizenship, and
(3) Give brief reasons for your ratings.

If the space provided in the boxes is insufficient, please feel free to write on the reverse side of the paper, or attach additional sheets of paper.

Your ratings of the administrative activities are to be coded as follows:
   5 = Very high level of effectiveness
   4 = High level of effectiveness
   3 = Moderate level of effectiveness
   2 = Low level of effectiveness
   1 = Very low level of effectiveness

For your convenience, attached at the head of each section is a brief illustrative list of administrative activities related to that task area.

(File No.:   )

A. Curriculum and instruction programs. Principal's administrative work in this area may include activities regarding the development, implementation, and assessment of curricular programs; the establishment of student graduation requirements; and the evaluation of and reporting on student performance.

Example	Levels of Effectiveness				
	Very High (5)	High (4)	Moderate (3)	Low (2)	Very Low (1)
Administrative activity: Our school division introduced Program X to promote interpersonal understanding among the students. I strongly supported it.	X *Reasons for your effectiveness rating:* This program is effective. There are many noticeable improvements in the way students speak to each other.	☐	☐	☐	☐

	Levels of Effectiveness				
	Very High (5)	High (4)	Moderate (3)	Low (2)	Very Low (1)
Administrative activity:	☐ *Reasons for your effectiveness rating:*	☐	☐	☐	☐

(File No.:   )

B. Student personnel. Principals' administrative work in this area may include the recruiting and admitting of students; constructing the school timetable; establishing extra-/co-curricular programs; involving students in school decision making; working with the student council; establishing policies on school discipline; and developing and implementing school attendance policies.

	Levels of Effectiveness				
Example	Very High (5)	High (4)	Moderate (3)	Low (2)	Very Low (1)
Administrative activity: I asked the Student Council to invite input from all students when we revised our "Student Code of Conduct" last year, and we adopted many of their proposals.	☐	X	☐	☐	☐
	Reasons for your effectiveness rating: Students in general have been observing the "Code" reasonably well.				

	Levels of Effectiveness				
	Very High (5)	High (4)	Moderate (3)	Low (2)	Very Low (1)
Administrative activity:	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	Reasons for your effectiveness rating:				

(File No.:   )

C. Staff personnel. Principal's administrative activities in this area may include developing, implementing, and assessing policies and practices regarding the recruitment, selection, assignment, supervision, professional development, and evaluation of school personnel, plus activities that promote better staff-student relationships.

Example

	Levels of Effectiveness				
	Very High (5)	High (4)	Moderate (3)	Low (2)	Very Low (1)
Administrative activity:	☐	☐	X	☐	☐
I requested at staff meetings several times that teachers and staff should pay attention to student character development and help them to become responsible citizens.	*Reasons for your effectiveness rating:* There were some proposals from teachers, but we need to do more work on the proposals to make them more relevant and workable.				

	Levels of Effectiveness				
	Very High (5)	High (4)	Moderate (3)	Low (2)	Very Low (1)
Administrative activity:	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	Reasons for your effectiveness rating:				

144

(File No.:   )

D. School-community relations. Principal's administrative work in this area means the activities of involving parents and community members in educational matters of the school. The involvement means a process through which parents and community members contribute time, energy, expertise, and other resources to the educational matters of the school, as well as the process of solving problems and reducing conflicts among the home, the school, and the community.

	Levels of Effectiveness				
Example	Very High (5)	High (4)	Moderate (3)	Low (2)	Very Low (1)
Administrative activity: I requested that teachers invite suggestions from parents at teacher-parent conferences about how to prepare students for citizenship.	☐	☐	☐	☐	X
	Reasons for your effectiveness rating: Parents did not provide much input. Some simply said they trust that the school knows what to do.				

	Levels of Effectiveness				
	Very High (5)	High (4)	Moderate (3)	Low (2)	Very Low (1)
Administrative activity:	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	Reasons for your effectiveness rating:				

145

(File No.:   )

E. Financial resources. Principal's administrative work in this area involves the activities of planning, acquiring, and using financial resources for educational matters of the school.

	Levels of Effectiveness				
Example	**Very High** **(5)**	**High** **(4)**	**Moderate** **(3)**	**Low** **(2)**	**Very Low** **(1)**
Administrative activity: I allocated money for a law-related education project initiated by a Social Study teacher and her Senior 3 students for learning legal processes.	☐	☐	X	☐	☐
	Reasons for your effectiveness rating: About 70% of the students in the project liked the project, but half of them said the project did not really meet the learning objectives.				

	Levels of Effectiveness				
	Very High **(5)**	**High** **(4)**	**Moderate** **(3)**	**Low** **(2)**	**Very Low** **(1)**
Administrative activity:	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	Reasons for your effectiveness rating:				

146

(File No.:   )

F. Physical resources. Principal's administrative work in this area involves the activities of planning, acquiring, using, and maintaining school physical resources/ facilities.

| | Levels of Effectiveness | | | | |
	Very High (5)	High (4)	Moderate (3)	Low (2)	Very Low (1)
Example					
Administrative activity: I made sure that the biggest classroom was available when the Senior 2 students had their political debates, so more students were able to attend the sessions.	☐	X	☐	☐	☐
	Reasons for your effectiveness rating: The students were interested in participating, and many attended.				

| | Levels of Effectiveness | | | | |
	Very High (5)	High (4)	Moderate (3)	Low (2)	Very Low (1)
Administrative activity:	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
	Reasons for your effectiveness rating:				

(File No.:   )

Thank you very much! The space below is for your comments, additional information, or whatever you wish to write about any aspect of this research project. Thanks again for your valuable information and kind help!

Appendix 6: Instruction to Data Raters

INSTRUCTIONS TO RATERS

All school principals surveyed were asked to supply an EXAMPLE of an important administrative activity in each of the following six task areas:

A. Curriculum and instruction programs
B. Student personnel
C. Staff personnel
D. School-community relations
E. Financial resources
F. Physical resources

Raters are asked to assign two codes to each example given in each task area. The first code indicates the rater's judgment about WHO PERFORMED THE ACTIVITY referred to in the example. (That is, who was the doer of the activity.) The second code indicates the rater's judgment about WHO WAS THE TARGET OF THE ACTIVITY. (That is, who was to receive the benefits of the activity.)

Raters are asked to code each example by writing the appropriate two-digit code to the left of the example on each principal's questionnaire. Raters are to use the following two-digit code:

WHO PERFORMED THE ACTIVITY

A. The principal answering the questionnaire
B. Someone besides the principal

WHO WAS THE TARGET OF THE ACTIVITY

1. Students (This category includes activities directly for or about the students.)
2. School-staff (This category includes activities directly for or about the staff of the school. Staff of the school includes administrators, teachers, and other employees of the school.)
3. School itself (This category includes activities directly for or about the school as an organization.)
4. Other (This category includes activities that do not fall into any of the above three categories.)

A sample coding would be "A-1" if the rater judged the example to be based primarily on an activity performed by the principal for the students.

Please note that, although there are six task areas included in the questionnaire, not all respondents supplied an example to each area. When you cannot find a response to a task area, please skip this task area and move on to the next. On the other hand, some respondents provided more than one example to a task area. When there are multiple responses, please separate each example from one another by drawing a line between them and then code each example separately, if they were not separately listed.

Appendix 7: Frequencies of gender per task area

Task Area	Category	Frequency	Percent
A	Female	14	18.2
	Male	63	81.8
	Total	77	100.0
B	Female	14	18.7
	Male	61	81.3
	Total	75	100.0
C	Female	14	18.7
	Male	61	81.3
	Total	75	100.0
D	Female	14	17.7
	Male	65	82.3
	Total	79	100.0
E	Female	12	17.9
	Male	55	82.1
	Total	67	100.0
F	Female	14	21.2
	Male	52	78.8
	Total	66	100.0

Appendix 8: Frequencies of years of service per task area

Task Area	Category	Frequency	Percent
A	1-5 years	30	39.0
	6-10 years	21	27.3
	11 years and	26	33.7
	above	77	100.0
	Total		
	1-5 years	28	37.3
B	6-10 years	21	28.0
	11 years and	26	24.7
	above	75	100.0
	Total		
	1-5 years	26	34.7
C	6-10 years	22	29.3
	11 years and	27	36.0
	above	75	100.0
	Total		
	1-5 years	30	38.0
D	6-10 years	22	27.8
	11 years and	27	34.2
	above	79	100.0
	Total		
	1-5 years	26	38.8
E	6-10 years	20	29.9
	11 years and	21	31.3
	above	67	100.0
	Total		
	1-5 years	26	39.4
F	6-10 years	19	28.8
	11 years and	21	31.8
	above	66	100.0
	Total		

Appendix 9: Frequencies of highest degree completed per task area

Task Area	Category	Frequency	Percent
A	Bachekor's	31	40.3
	PBCE	15	19.4
	Master's	31	40.3
	Total	77	100.0
B	Bachekor's	27	36.0
	PBCE	16	21.3
	Master's	32	42.7
	Total	75	100.0
C	Bachekor's	29	38.7
	PBCE	15	20.0
	Master's	31	41.3
	Total	75	100.0
D	Bachekor's	32	40.5
	PBCE	16	20.3
	Master's	31	39.2
	Total	79	100.0
E	Bachekor's	26	38.8
	PBCE	13	19.4
	Master's	28	41.8
	Total	67	100.0
F	Bachekor's	25	37.9
	PBCE	15	22.7
	Master's	26	39.4
	Total	66	100.0

Appendix 10: Frequencies of specialist certificate status per task area

Task Area	Category	Frequency	Percent
A	None	20	26.0
	Level I only	23	29.9
	Both Level I and II	34	44.1
	Total	77	100.0
B	None	18	24.0
	Level I only	22	29.3
	Both Level I and II	35	46.7
	Total	75	100.0
C	None	19	26.3
	Level I only	22	29.3
	Both Level I and II	34	44.4
	Total	75	100.0
D	None	22	27.8
	Level I only	23	29.1
	Both Level I and II	34	43.1
	Total	79	100.0
E	None	15	22.4
	Level I only	20	33.5
	Both Level I and II	32	44.1
	Total	67	100.0
F	None	14	21.2
	Level I only	20	30.3
	Both Level I and II	32	48.5
	Total	66	100.0

Appendix 11: Frequencies of school type per task area

Task Area	Category	Frequency	Percent
A	Public	66	85.7
	Private	11	14.3
	Total	77	100.0
B	Public	64	85.3
	Private	11	14.7
	Total	75	100.0
C	Public	66	88.0
	Private	9	12.0
	Total	75	100.0
D	Public	69	87.3
	Private	10	12.7
	Total	79	100.0
E	Public	57	85.1
	Private	10	14.9
	Total	67	100.0
F	Public	59	89.4
	Private	7	10.6
	Total	66	100.0

Appendix 12: Frequencies of grade levels in the school per task area

Task Area	Category	Frequency	Percent
A	Senior Grades Only	30	39.0
	Grade 7 to S4 Only	15	19.5
	G7-S4 and other Grade	32	41.5
	Total	77	100.0
B	Senior Grades Only	30	40.0
	Grade 7 to S4 Only	14	18.7
	G7-S4 and other Grade	31	41.3
	Total	75	100.0
C	Senior Grades Only	29	38.7
	Grade 7 to S4 Only	15	20.0
	G7-S4 and other Grade	31	41.3
	Total	75	100.0
D	Senior Grades Only	30	38.0
	Grade 7 to S4 Only	15	19.0
	G7-S4 and other Grade	34	43.0
	Total	79	100.0
E	Senior Grades Only	29	43.3
	Grade 7 to S4 Only	11	16.4
	G7-S4 and other Grade	27	40.3
	Total	67	100.0
F	Senior Grades Only	27	40.9
	Grade 7 to S4 Only	14	21.2
	G7-S4 and other Grade	25	37.9
	Total	66	100.0

Appendix 13: Reasons given for effectiveness level ratings in Task Area A: Curricular and Instructional Programs (67 responses)

1. Student-related activities
Doer: Principal
Effectiveness level rating: Low
- Involves students in coordinating school-wide activities as well as providing leadership skill development. The coordinating of activities still tend to be dominant and the leadership skill training and reflection component needs to grow more.
- Has been an improvement in student behaviors esp. towards faculty (e.g., holding doors, etc.).

Effectiveness level rating: Medium
- Good for teachers, students and parents.
- Positive response from parents and students.
- The community assisted in fundraising to send students out of province for a leadership seminar.
- We now have several students attempting to continue to graduation. Two young adults have even returned to school in an effort to complete graduation requirements.
- There is a high rate of satisfaction expressed in parent as well as students surveys.
- Better understanding of their families, friends. Good citizens are about having to understand people.
- Help create pool of students with aptitude & attitudes to meet industry needs. Give purpose to students learning.
- This process will hopefully assist students in developing enhanced communication skills, connecting their learning to broader life goals. It should encourage students to develop positive attitudes and behaviors including recognition of and respect for people's diversity and individual differences. It should also improve their ability to work with others --- should become more effective over time.
- These courses give a wide range of students their first experience with a world of volunteerism, working effectively with others, leadership. Many go on to careers or voluntary involvement, related to this.
- All of these involvements have been beneficial to my students in helping keep them abreast of all new developments. This has also improved my teaching and assessment techniques which benefit my students. They comment on how enjoyable the ELA programs are re: interesting reading and writing activities.

Effectiveness level rating: High
- Larger blocks of time allow for in-depth learning.
- SSS School Board approved this recommendation.
- Students like the # of options available to them.
- Very strong response from students.
- The PP provides as excellent setting for our mentally challenged young people to interact with the community. They are learning valuable skills which contribute to the development of citizenship. The community, including the rest of our student body, is learning a valuable lesson with respect to the contribution every person can

make to society. Note: In the 1999-2000 school year, we won the MM award and a $10,000 prize for innovative programming for PP!

Doer: Non-principal
Effectiveness level rating: Low

- A commendable improvement has been observed within school hours.
- Not as many students were involved as we had hoped.
- Some teachers used one or the other. Some used both methods.
- As this was part of an optional program only some students chose to take it.
- This is a new program and still needs to be system-wide accepted. It's our 2nd year. We see slow but steady improvement.

Effectiveness level rating: Medium

- Focussed parents, students and community on issue. Involved a vote of families of S1-S4 students.
- Support from community, increasing popularity of program.
- Quality and quantity of technology equipment. And staff support in acquiring tech. skills.
- It is somewhat early to determine the long term effectiveness of the Peer Tutoring and Natural Helpers programs. The initial effectiveness rating would be (3). It managed to involve student who had not been involved in organized school activities before but failed to have significant wide-spread impact. The Music program effectiveness was (4) – it developed new and broad student involvement and managed to 'book' a significant number of students into school life.
- S1-S4 students were grouped into 6 different TAGs. Students were involved in activities dealing with setting goals for their future and learning about multiple intelligence. Students and teacher advisors met together once every 2 weeks.
- Knowing history is critical to citizenship. Our action made our priorities clear.
- Enhanced student awareness of aboriginal culture. The entire student body was suddenly exposed to another culture.
- Has proven to help students make school choice with goals in mind.
- Elective course -- study municipal/provincial/federal systems.
- Giving a good cross-section of activities to students; develops team work and cooperation.
- They actually articulate Canadian citizenship.
- The program has proven to be very effective and was expanded upon during the 1999-2000 school year. The students recognized that what they were learning in class could very well be put to practical use.
- Students are now very aware of expectations. Their interactions with each other have improved.
- Staff met monthly both internally and externally to share successes/failures with new curriculum. This provided support for those who were reluctant and a chance for those who were adopting new curricula to share ideas/enthusiasm with others. The SIC promoted job-related skills, allowed students to experience other adults in our community in a supervisory role and generally improved relations between students and their community.

- Teacher had to look at their evaluation procedure and re-focus on their practices. It helped open the avenues for communication between staff and parents. Teachers placed great emphasis on successes and focused less on their failure.
- Addressing a need.
- Students evaluate the program each time and encourage it.
- Program is effective. We are going to implement a family life skill component.
- School-based implementation of ELA curriculum with in-school goals.
- Clear rationale for courses offered at our school. Student driven rather than staff interest driven.

Effectiveness level rating: High
- Students, parents and community have had authentic input into: --- program development, --- curricula development.
- Students learn to recognize the needs of others and develop patterns which overcome self interest and parochial concern.
- I see it work. Students are self-motivated, set their own goals and learn to be responsible in completing those goals. Students are proud to display their star chart showing work completed. The G/D system does not make the child feel as you are doing something to them in discipline but rather recognize they have earned what they receive.
- Students (S4s) in pairs, go to our feeder elementary and middle years schools and give presentations on "Making Healthy Life-style Choices."
- Students actively participated in producing the stipulated qualities, nominating students who demonstrated the stipulated qualities; and evaluating and proclaiming the qualities of good citizenship.
- The students who participated demonstrated a strong knowledge of how bills are passed into law.
- Educators from outside the school participated in the evaluation program. They rated the effectiveness of our process.
- Program meets local and school needs. Compels students to examine their own strengths and weaknesses visà vis community volunteer involvement and to take part in school community improvement projects.
- Gives them another means to understand the background of their culture and heritage.
- We made this mandatory for all our senior 2 students so by the time students graduate, they all will have taken the course.

2. Staff-related activities
Doer: Principal
Effectiveness level rating: Low
- Additional work for trainers.

Effectiveness level rating: Medium (no response)

Effectiveness level rating: High
- Teachers truly want the new curricula to be effective in their classrooms.

Doer: Non-principal
Effectiveness level rating: Low (no response)

Effectiveness level rating: Medium
- Teachers are up-to-date with new curriculum materials and are becoming very effective.

Effectiveness level rating: High (no response)

3. School-related activities
Doer: Principal
Effectiveness level rating: Low (no response)

Effectiveness level rating: Medium
- Was done and proved to be necessary for the student who has low-balled a program.

Effectiveness level rating: High
- Our families agree with our philosophies and goals.

Doer: Non-principal
Effectiveness level rating: Low
- Change takes time. We will continue to work together and to try to involve students.
- Too many teachers seem to "forget" to do this task, but where it has been done, the feedback is very helpful.

Effectiveness level rating: Medium
- Parents, students, teachers involved to discuss student achievement.
- Personal visit from team members to individual teachers.

Effectiveness level rating: High
- The teachers were glad to be involved in the alternation of course offerings and some said this was the first time they were involved.
- Highly effective on all fronts: --- knowledge acquisition, --- school spirit, --- behavioral change, --- common language.
- We find these programs and approaches are enjoyable, (research backed) effective and in line with new developments. If they were not effective – we would move to drop or replace.

4. Other activities
Doer: Principal
Effectiveness level rating: Low (no response)

Effectiveness level rating: Medium
- We find these programs and approaches are enjoyable, (research backed) effective and in line with new developments. If they were not effective – we would move to drop or replace.

Effectiveness level rating: High

- Huge impact on community. This area has a very high rate of adults with no formal education on beyond Gr.9 (25%). A strong society depends on a literate, well educated population.

Doer: Non-principal (no response)

Appendix 14:   Reasons given for effectiveness level ratings in Task Area B: Student Personnel (67 responses)

1. Student-related activities
Doer: Principal
Effectiveness level rating: Low

- This continues to be a concern. Parents are cautious about the friends their children made.
- Student commitment (Council members) continued to be marginal and casual. A basic understanding of democratic functioning and representation was somewhat lacking. One of my recommendations was to implement a 'Civics' course for all students. Staff commitment also needed to be stronger. A new Constitution was adapted.
- We often have a student representative on hiring committees. Our school is small enough that the input of students is easily solicited, i.e., policy. We offer options solely on the basis of student demand.
- Difficulty in completing the task due to coordination with students and other groups.

Effectiveness level rating: Medium

- Good participation and leadership. 20 hrs of volunteer time from each student.
- Initial enthusiasm was dampened as SRC faced the reality of effective lobbying and the hard work needed to research and present their case. A major change, which they initiated and successfully brought to adoption, involved the school dress code. This reinforced their participation.
- Although most students will quit school at 16, many are continuing.
- There is a sense of ownership to school policies.
- Students motivated to work on selected courses.
- Increased involvement and participation. Student advice is being followed --- projects have been developed and implemented. Students that have been involved are "proud" of the accomplishments.
- This activity promoted a discussion and greater understanding of the two different student bodies that co-exit in our building.
- Very few conduct issues in the school. Expectations seem clear to everyone.
- A wide range of students learned the basic skills of conflict resolution, listening to and effective helping of others.
- Establish guidelines and offer suggestions to Student Council members.
- Students were not reluctant to express their opinions, and Student Council executive often visited to present a perspective on school activities. When specific questions were surveyed, response was very high, and a compilation of the student responses was published internally and in the local newspaper through articles A wrote.
- Students responded well to being consulted. They still view student council as a popularity contest and we need to work on changing their perception of student governance.
- Effective because of input from students/parents/staff.
- Many students made new connections with their advisors through the program.
- Meets a need [of students to learn time management].

- Students provide input so we can meet their needs.
- We are branching out.

Effectiveness level rating: High

- Greater involvement and ownership of policies.
- Student council became active in the development of the code generally; it was well supported.
- Student leadership helped administration to become more effective in dealing with student discipline and was able to achieve a level of fairness/justice, which was perceived to be fair by the students involved and the wider student body.
- Got to know students easily; help build self-esteem in kids.
- Makes students happier with the timetable --- reduces conflicts.
- Major changes in appearance at dances.
- Learning co-operate skills req'd to manage business including delegation, accounting, ordering, customer service etc.

Doer: Non-principal
Effectiveness level rating: Low

- The school has no dropouts this year and 2 students attending S2 classes, and some intending to start S1 in fall of 2000.
- We wanted to make the school more accessible to more kids, a setting for a wide variety of students. There have been a few negative inputs, e.g., pressure on v.p. re. discipline, perception school getting too big. However, the benefit of greater inclusion diversifies the school body.
- The staff is not very hospitable toward student involvement [when student council member attend staff meeting].

Effectiveness level rating: Medium

- Promote student involvement in student governance and participation in the democratic process. Opportunities for total student body to practice citizenship throughout school and promote responsible citizenship.
- Students researched, interviewed various agencies and had the authority to grant $5,000 to various charitable organizations.
- Students responded well to staff members carrying through on a discipline policy regarding lates and attendance.
- Student discipline problems have decreased. Students are taking ownership for their own rules.
- Student conduct in one or two areas has improved. In the other areas, they were very good and that has been maintained.
- Still in use with minimal change.
- All stakeholders are involved and both projects are as a result of student, staff and parent survey results.
- Students appreciate the opportunity for input.
- Parents appreciate student views.

Effectiveness level rating: High

- We had a very strong Student Council --- many of which were tremendous role models and great examples of how Christians should act/ behave/ react!
- The number of elective courses taken by students successfully has greatly increased. One example is our rapidly growing music program.
- Student attendance and accountability have improved significantly. The dropout rate in grade 10 has decreased.
- Students are communicating regularly with each other. They are developing good problem solving and mediating skills.
- Very few discipline problems.
- A positive approach to life involves setting reasonable parameters and then arranging things inside those parameters in as cooperative, collegial and inspiring was as possible. We strive for this and the only large limitation is the individuals themselves.
- Deal with skills for citizenship.
- Students who were once somewhat cynical and disengaged are involved in our school improvement process.
- The Sr3 program is mandatory so although some students are reluctant they find a placement that they like and often overcome their objection to volunteerism.

2. Staff-related activities
Doer: Principal (no response)

Doer: Non-principal
Effectiveness level rating: Low
- This gives individual teachers an opportunity to input information themselves. This decreases office time doing the task.

Effectiveness level rating: Medium
- Students can submit constructive criticism to improve teaching

Effectiveness level rating: High (no response)

3. School-related activities
Doer: Principal
Effectiveness level rating: Low
- We are still working on follow-up. In the long run, the results should be positive.
- Students were selected and persuaded to participate rather than the impetus coming from students.

Effectiveness level rating: Medium
- Improved behavior in halls and classrooms.
- Quite satisfied with results of the policy.

Effectiveness level rating: High
- Attendance has reached close to 100% with parents' notification of the school when a child was absent increasing dramatically.

- We had an 80% return rate of student and parents surveys.

Doer: Non-principal
Effectiveness level rating: Low (no response)

Effectiveness level rating: Medium
- Student input is appreciated although they are a little reserved.
- Our B+G volunteer Society has been an outstanding success.
- As we all know students who have been part of the decision-making process are more apt to cooperate.
- The process involved got parents, students and staff to realize that compromise had to be made to make the code acceptable to all three groups. Once agreement was reached, the code was re-written and all three groups worked to observing the code. They all have ownership.
- Worked well, though not so satisfactorily as we expected. First of all, the attendance policy was developed by joint effort of administration, teachers, counselor, students, and parent advisory council. People all have a sense of ownership.
- We are making some policy changes as a result of the student survey.
- Good input from students. As a result of their response, as well as other factors, the transition to a semester system was made with the support from the students.
- Students are well motivated.

Effectiveness level rating: High
- We are very pleased with the results of this program. During the 1999-2000 school year, the Parent Council has agreed to become involved and is presently developing a DDD database that will be made available to local organization in need of volunteers.
- Students participated in community business conference with goal to learn representation skills. Students empowered to have a voice.

4. Other activities (no response)

Appendix 15: Reasons given for effectiveness level ratings in Task Area C: Staff Personnel (65 responses)

1. Student-related activities
Doer: Principal
Effectiveness level rating: Low
- "Old guard" in staff were too set in their ways and did not give teacher-advisory program a chance.
- Behavior in hallways keeps improving with each year!!

Effectiveness level rating: Medium
- We have surveyed students and staff and we are happy with their opinions on the TAG system. We need to address the issue of attendance at TAG. Some students have the attitude that if it isn't worth credit; they don't have to go. We are hoping that as relationships build, all students will recognize the value of TAG.
- Teachers respond by doing these but in using "teachable moments" to develop this area.
- New staff made a significant impact on students.
- Staff appreciated the opportunity to provide input and share concerns with each other and administration.
- Depends on individuals.
- Staff daily try to teach students to plan, organize and take responsibility for their actions.
- Meets a need.
- One of the main reasons we have students on the hiring committee is to give them the experience. They provide some good insight, but most comment about being a part of the committee is educational. Learning how to conduct interviews, plan questions, rate responses, etc.

Effectiveness level rating: High
- This is what "we" and the elders of the community expect from the students of this community.
- Nothing but praise and encouragement from the public, and enthusiasm and confidence from students. Also a sad awareness of degenerative age related syndrome was clearly evident.

Doer: Non-principal
Effectiveness level rating: Low
- Discipline tends to be a time and energy-consuming task, leaving little time to promote the positive.
- Many staff are reluctant to get personally involved with students. The TA is under constant criticism and rebuke. We're working on it.
- Not all staff have skills or desire to act as good advisors. Some feel they aren't "guidance" people. Others feel it is an extra duty. The number of these objections appears to be diminishing.

- Some positive results are seen in that more varied tools are used for assessment. However, I hope to see greater improvement in student success rate.

Effectiveness level rating: Medium
- Recent survey of students indicates a fairly substantial improvement in this area.
- Stakeholders were asked to play a more direct role in implementation of SAS (i.e., Student Advisory System).
- The whole colony (Hutterites) is aware and appreciative of the SSMM program. It is new to their Colony.
- This has created better staff-student relations.
- Most really got into competitive nature of game day and kids saw teachers in different 'light', i.e., team mate/ leader.
- Monthly reviews make staff deal honestly with the students and each other. If there are weaknesses in dealing with students, they come on the table.
- Staff have gotten to know "the whole child". Relatively easy in a small school.
- Teachers have received professional development opportunities regarding student/ teacher relationships and promoting student social skills at school.

Effectiveness level rating: High
- Both programs promote students in the school/community and an understanding of what it takes to be an effective citizen.
- Students in the committee provided helpful insight regarding the student perspective and helped shape out TTT program and activities. For teachers on the committee, it provided an opportunity to see students involved in decision-making.
- Ownership by staff. Created by staff. 14.6 marks above prov. Avg. this year in Math, 5 marks above prov. avg. in L.A.
- A positive and unified approach from staff.

2. Staff-related activities
Doer: Principal
Effectiveness level rating: Low
- Have spot this year's P.D. days on familiarizing everyone with document. Have lots of work to do over next 1-2 years.
- More professional development needed in this area. For some teachers, it is difficult to practice new methods; for other staff members, positive discipline has always been part of their teaching styles and they have no difficulty in practicing these kinds of strategies.
- Collaboration was initially perceived as greater work expectations. Teachers who were uncomfortable with this model changed schools. The school has now begun to closely examine MSIP models of change.
- Close contact is important to make sure students needs are met. I feel this happens.

Effectiveness level rating: Medium
- Plenty of opportunity for staff to learn and practice technology skills.
- They all function well. Quality of teaching is very important.

- LIONS QUEST has been an excellent tool to address inter-personal relations with our junior students.
- Had a noticeable and beneficial effect on student attentiveness. Teachers found it hard to change habits of teaching to content instead of teaching to curricular objectives.
- Effective for our purpose.

Effectiveness level rating: High
- If you allow people to learn in the way good for them, they learn effectively.
- Reduces complaints re principal's agenda.
- Staff responded by developing consensus and showing great willingness to undertake difficult changes to their working day. Students were invited to make a presentation to a staff meeting, and subsequently, to Board of Trustees meeting.
- Helps with staff building "strategic fit" of new staff.
- Allows administration to track student behavior patterns.

Doer: Non-principal
Effectiveness level rating: Low
- A macro-vision of teachers' function and the function of today's public education does not seem to be a strong component in the teaching culture. Many teachers, unfortunately, are themselves limited in the knowledge base outside their subject area (sometimes even within). To bring about changes would be a slow process that would also require changes to the current teacher supervision process.

Effectiveness level rating: Medium
- Staff evaluation of the project is great. --- There is dialogue/ collaboration between departments. --- People are expanding their teaching strategies, etc.
- Better relationships between staff and students.

Effectiveness level rating: High
- Trust building and preparation of common goals and objectives.
- Continually focusing and re-focusing on our goals.
- When new staff is selected, the existing staff have a feeling of ownership.
- The teachers no longer feel threatened or "challenged;" they feel they are being supported.
- Our students feel close to their teachers. They regularly go to them for help both academically and personally.
- Staff have created a school-networked spreadsheet that allows staff to advise and learn from other staff work around SSP (i.e., Student success Project) and curriculum mapping.

3. School-related activities
Doer: Principal
Effectiveness level rating: Low (no response)

Effectiveness level rating: Medium (no response)

Effectiveness level rating: High
- We sent a proposal to our school board. Schools have been reconfigured and all high school students will be taught in <u>one</u> school in the fall of 2000.
- Teachers were receptive to the opinions of the graduating students, and some specific changes arose from these considerations.
- Novelty.
- The people brought on staff were very good teachers in their subject areas but more than that they gave of their time after school to support the many programs available after hours.
- Teachers feel they have control.
- High degree of student/staff rapport observed in school.

Doer: Non-principal
Effectiveness level rating: Low
- Difficult progress for a small rural school; but we try to keep objectives short and manageable.
- Staff resistance to this subsided, as success became evident.

Effectiveness level rating: Medium
- This process has become a part of an expected planning cycle.
- Staff have been working together to change the school attendance policy.
- Staff feel involved.

Effectiveness level rating: High
- Make the staff more "real" to students and promotes school spirit.
- It works and people notice and comment. Organizational design must be understood and matched to the leadership design. I think this had been accomplished.

4. Other activities
Doer: Principal (no response)

Doer: Non-principal
Effectiveness level rating: Low (no response)

Effectiveness level rating: Medium
- some of the individuals who have gone through the program have been hired as administrator in our Division.

Effectiveness level rating: High (no response)

Appendix 16:   Reasons given for effectiveness level ratings in Task Area D: School-community Relations (66 responses)

1. Student-related activities
Doer: Principal
Effectiveness level rating: Low
- Scholarship announcement and the application process provided some impetus. Also scholarship day, when recipients were announced and honored in a school-wide assembly provided some emphasis.
- German teacher will spank the students. I will not. Communication between us is good.
- Several of ideas were not followed through by Parent Council (everything is going from school so people tend to lose interest).

Effectiveness level rating: Medium
- Parents do feel welcome and informed.
- Parents (and some students) often commented on being pleased to find out what was going on –and those with Internet abilities were very pleased with the view this gave of our school's progress in curricular areas, events, etc.
- Very few negative calls from parents. Rated as effective and successful by parents.

Effectiveness level rating: High
- Key element at our school for community input.
- The program has proven to be very popular both with the students and with the community members with whom they are working and learning from. As a result these has been tremendous growth and interest in the program.
- Lots of positive feedback from parents who appreciated having the chance to voice their comments –positive and negative ones.
- Advisory Council has become a very important part of the Collegiate. They consult and advise myself and staff about community issues. Have been effective in getting the school's message to the community. Student Council president is important member of advisory council.

Doer: Non-principal
Effectiveness level rating: Low (no response)

Effectiveness level rating: Medium (no response)

Effectiveness level rating: High
- Student and staff organized and planned. Tremendous success.
- Need to work some "formal" session into this. We had <u>many</u> students and parents attend.

2. Staff-related activities
Doer: Principal (no response)

Doer: Non-principal
Effectiveness level rating: Low (no response)

Effectiveness level rating: Medium
- Support from parents became more evident and participation increased.

Effectiveness level rating: High (no response)

3. School-related activities
Doer: Principal
Effectiveness level rating: Low
- The community expects this from public facilities.
- Lack of time by some parents.
- Community involvement with school activities is minimal.
- Parents appear to lack the time or energy to participate.
- Same as the example. But some suggestions from the community as a whole.
- Those parents who have stayed with us have helped us support individual students. Several parents proved to be unreliable.
- I did not count attendance problems. (This part would get a 1 or 2.)

Effectiveness level rating: Medium
- Good mutual support between parents and school.
- Good communication.
- A small group of parents were quite enthusiastic about the objective and helped move matters forward. This is an ongoing task and indications are that it is taking root.
- Parent Council appointed representatives to all school committees/working groups. We need to work on timing issues as meeting times that are convenient for teachers may not be for parents. Note: Liaison is maintained between the staff and Parent Council by the principal sitting on the Parent Council and the Parent council President sitting on the school's Steering Committee.
- We have a positive group of parents who are "on board" with all school policies and now positive parental pressure is making my staff feel easier.
- 2-3 people on Parent Council in 98-99 became 10-12 very involved parents on Parent Advisory Council in 99-2000, with several parents setting on district committees as well.
- Many more parents showed up for our 1st General PTA meeting.
- Informative newsletter; send parents on training; grade level meetings; teachers call parents often.
- These items may be of high expectations that can not be reasonably attained.
- Meets a need.
- Listening to parents and constituency support groups led to program correction and new ideas.
- Parents and staff working together have been a powerful combination.
- There is a high support for this. Parents either come to the school or I go to the home. Home and school work as a team.
- Not very high. Because we just started the process.

Effectiveness level rating: High

- We have a very good rapport with parents in [parent] council. They provide feedback and direction in regards to school programs. They are also very active in school functions, e.g., hot-dog dinner, winter fun-day, etc.
- Parents on sit are more supportive of school.
- Parent voice (good parent relation and meaningful feedback/ support for our programs).
- I could write a **book** on this area! We've received national exposure on our efforts to build our community/school. School and community are the same thing. That is the mindset we promote. We exploit community resources fully. The community makes use of their school as they need.
- More awareness to the code.
- Excellent feedback from parents; they appreciated the opportunity to speak about ed. Topics to those who are the experts and have daily contacts with their children.

Doer: Non-principal
Effectiveness level rating: Low

- Interference by superintendent to move too quickly. – Illness of leading project. – Transfer of principal.
- – Good income. – Parent/student working together. – Kids met/helped strangers (crafters) when they arrived.
- Parents do not provide much input but review and support school policies.
- Difficulty in getting a fair number of parents out to Parent Council meetings.
- Initial use in `98-`99 did not involve all teachers and students. Students involved took responsibility for the presentation of the portfolios to be presented at parent-teacher conference.

Effectiveness level rating: Medium

- Parents become better informed of our programs, our goals. – Involved in fundraising, setting goals.
- The ebb and flow to this is on sense of urgency from either arena – school or parents.
- Teachers and community are in touch on a regular basis.
- This process helped us develop strategies for improving communication with the home and community. It also had in helped review our evaluation procedures.
- .50 staff has been set aside for apprenticeship program. PAC will be working at different projects, schoolyard, and committees.
- The ACSL has contributed information and opinions. As well they have aided with problems solving.
- Parents are encouraged and encouraging.
- Parents appreciate the call but don't always offer a lot of input.
- parents were fundamental in the operation of a # of activities.
- All of the listed activities contribute to positive communication and school-community cooperation.
- Personal parental contact by teacher prior to the report. Student presentation to parents.

- Help students feel that staff care about them and their communities.

Effectiveness level rating: High
- We find that these activities make a school inviting. When invited people come in and respond accordingly, ownership is shown.
- Parental involvement always is a positive idea.
- There is no easier policy to enforce than one that has the support of the Parents Advisory Council.
- An average of 15 parents attended the Advisory meetings to be informed, offer suggestions for school improvement and support.
- High degree of parent involvement in this school in many, many areas including the classroom.
- Involved students and parents in the process of making some important decisions of the school.
- Students expose to the community.

4. Other activities
Doer: Principal (no response)

Doer: Non-principal
Effectiveness level rating: Low
- Once again teachers resisted the process. Those who took it seriously loved it and saw the benefits. Others saw it simply as extra work, extra phone calls, etc.

Effectiveness level rating: Medium (no resonse)

Effectiveness level rating: High
- Very little negative comments from our business community about educational issues.

Appendix 17: Reasons given for effectiveness level ratings in Task Area E: School Financial Resources (55 responses)

1. Student-related activities
Doer: Principal
Effectiveness level rating: Low
- Although enthusiasm was high at first, the initial energy was lost for a long period (6 months) for several reasons, but this was overcome when the concept was adopted divisonally and a change in teachers support personnel was initiated.
- Not enough funds available. Addressed on an individual, sometimes arbitrary basis.
- The meetings allowed us to focus on some retraining issues with our students engaged in that program. We remain concerned that these students are not fully engaging with respect to their mandate. We are working to get them to assume more responsibilities for their peers who are in trouble. Kids feel that getting help for someone may be "ratting".
- These were good citizenship builders for only a few students. They didn't really share much their experience with the rest of the school.

Effectiveness level rating: Medium
- The project has been well received but much broader in scope. The time-line has been extended to the year 2005 to coincide with the school's plan for EEE.
- Supported the dream of a teacher to have our students benefit from this kind of education.
- Students were given the opportunity to assimilate real life situations.
- The activities were a good educational opportunity in that students would not normally be exposed to.
- High degree of participation of students.
- Excellent program and opportunities for students.
- Students attended summer leadership camp, XYZ weekend retreat, and worked cooperatively with another high school council to promote citizenship.
- The following year, students have been actively involved in developing a "Week Against Violence" conference at the school level implementing what they have learned in terms of tolerating differences --- addressing issues such as racism, homophobia, gender difference.
- Students felt they belonged to the school.
- Our Canadian Law course is continually at fall in very high enrollments.
- In time, when many more former students are displayed, I believe they will continue to serve as positive role models.
- Our school is offering an increasing # of out-of-school learning experience for our students.
- Several of our gifted students have been identified and placed on alternate/ advanced programming.

Effectiveness level rating: High
- High quality students recruited for the program.
- Program is very successful.

- Encourages student achievement.
- Students very well receive these clinics and they gain a great deal of knowledge they retain for an extended period of their school life.
- The course is quite worthwhile for non-science-oriented students.
- There are funds set aside for all S1 and S2 students to pursue a 5 week project on: -- school plant improvement; --- 5 weeks of anything they want, as long as they can demonstrate that learning is taking place.
- More students use during noon hours and spares.

Doer: Non-principal
Effectiveness level rating: Low
- Funding lasted 1½years. Longer term unassessable. Immediate benefits in that selected students did study some courses that would lead to post-secondary. Family members acquired understanding of value of post-secondary education.
- These activities reach 100% student body. Although their topics are more closely related to overcoming personal challenges/obstacles, they do relate to citizenship.
- Small rural schools have difficulty offering small enrolment courses like Calculus. With II TV, we have been able to pool students from several schools. The IITV equipment has had many technological 'glitches,' making delivery/reception of audio or video very difficult on a consistent basis.

Effectiveness level rating: Medium
- This is an option and is always full.
- Sense of ownership.

Effectiveness level rating: High
- This is our major project --- increase the relationships and involvement of education – community.
- Commitment of staff and students. Provincial and divisional monies to do more. Meeting the goals of the plan.
- I believe we have excellent results when you take into account the social-economic area in which the school is situated.
- Lab in place – tremendous opportunity for students to advance themselves.

2. Staff-related activities
Doer: Principal
Effectiveness level rating: Low (no response)

Effectiveness level rating: Medium
- Staff input into budget validates them. They appreciate the opportunity to participate.

Effectiveness level rating: High
- Those who need finances and make a good case, I will make sure that the money is made available.

Doer: Non-principal (no response)

3. School-related activities
Doer: Principal
Effectiveness level rating: Low
- The rating is moderate because finances again are minimal but they have freed up some money for things such as resources materials.

Effectiveness level rating: Medium
- There was appropriate divisional support provided. School budges were used to "top" off where needed.
- The parents are proud of themselves, a sense of ownership.
- High and increasing enrolment in special areas, as listed on the left.
- View our students are very computer literate upon graduation.
- The budget in one year is balanced. The teachers realized that favoritism is not the order of the day. Those who benefited from the SANTA system feel very hard done by C'est la vè.
- We decided to make one major purchase / year instead of several smaller projects. The use of these funds is more identifiable.
- Feel we get good value for $.
- Hope for better return chance this year, as staff/students become more familiar with hardware/programs. Students were excited about new technologies. Staff worked to find best means of using new 'toys.'
- Students have full time librarian and resources in the library – (Internet, etc.)
- We have managed to get AA, BB, CC, DD, numerous private grants. This has enabled us to develop programs for students that are better able to meet their needs. Grants also provide collaboration time for staff.

Effectiveness level rating: High
- Direct link to the budget. The problem arises in priorities and the amount of money we have to spend – significantly less than the public system.
- Administrator's job is to make sure the school functions well and effectively. The principal has to take everything under consideration; finance is a very important thing. Last year we did well, we had surplus. We used this money to help with many programs, trips, getting speakers in, etc.
- Over 300 students are able to pursue their dancing talent in an appropriate environment. The school has been completely networked and students are benefiting from having computers in all classrooms. The industrial Arts Department has computer systems that allow them to work with the latest technologies.

Doer: Non-principal
Effectiveness level rating: Low (no response)

Effectiveness level rating: Medium
- When staff and students have direct input and ownership, the decisions are more effective.

- Everyone has input.
- Clarity about needs leads to commitment from Board, staff and wider support groups to come up to the resources to meet that need.

Effectiveness level rating: High
- We manage our funds that way we see best meet our needs. We could always use more; however, we utilize our resources within the parameters.
- Our students are increasing well prepared to function in workforce of '00s.

4. Other activities (no response)

Appendix 18: Reasons given for effectiveness level ratings in Task Area F: School Physical Resources (49 responses)

1. **Student-related activities**
   Doer: Principal
   Effectiveness level rating: Low
   - While this will create a "covering" French teacher, it will provide stability for our new Grade 4 students.
   - Younger students find 80 min to be too long but is useful on occasion.

   Effectiveness level rating: Medium
   - This room is well used and students always feel comfortable going into it. No negative connotations.
   - Students were pleased with the final arrangements.
   - They are being very responsible in how the room is used.
   - The students are involved in helping with the conversion. They take ownership for their work and find their learning environment much improved. They have also commented on how much more they are enjoying the new environments.
   - This has now become an expected routine.
   - This gives students in middle years daily access to the multi-media classroom.
   - These sites are the most successful way to provide an enrichment environment in a school with limited resources and fewer students.
   - Teachers and student response favorable.

   Effectiveness level rating: High
   - The SSS/learning center is developing into a vital area for students new to Canada. Academic and social activities are promoting the building of solid new citizens.
   - Students appreciated the time (release from class) and the resource (library with overhead and charts) which resulted in a great deal of excitement and initial energy.
   - Students responded positively to the Information Technology program.
   - About 70 students participated in badminton-during hokey season; during basketball season.
   - Much better access for all grade levels.

   Doer: Non-principal
   Effectiveness level rating: Low (no response)

   Effectiveness level rating: Medium
   - Students who worked in the store had to acquire good public speaking and customer service skills.

   Effectiveness level rating: High
   - Students always support these programs very well.
   - 95% involvement by students.

2. Staff-related activities

Doer: Principal

Effectiveness level rating: Low

- A 3-year combination is very stressful and demanding. But in our small school it works reasonably well.
- Noise is a factor, especially when students go out for recess.

Effectiveness level rating: Medium (no response)

Effectiveness level rating: High

- Reduced staff problems re: timetabling.

Doer: Non-principal (no response)

3. School-related activities

Doer: Principal

Effectiveness level rating: Low (no response)

Effectiveness level rating: Medium

- The students found the presentation very effective. It generated a great deal of positive discussion in follow-up sessions held with smaller groups.
- Increased student involvement.
- Money (or lack of it) is the main issue with regard to space allocation. If we had more money, we could plan for bigger events/ more students/ additions on buildings.
- Assemblies are well attended and student conduct is excellent.
- Students interest quite good.
- Ties up the gym for phys ed.
- Different space requirements became necessary as a result of program options/implementation. These needs were met, though not necessarily as quickly or completely as desired.
- The teachers appreciated what I am trying to do. They all, however, so used to working within an infrastructure that they are surprised that anyone would care and try to act.
- The community and students feel more comfortable in a building with good ventilation and best control. A safe, pleasant environment makes students feel more comfortable and they can concentrate on their studies.
- This is program students and staff enthusiastic.
- Teachers & students now had access to computer tech in smaller groups and in every classroom rather than limiting these events to the designated computer labs.
- All changes (outside of initial organization) have been positive.
- Students and staff are now pleased with the atmosphere.

Effectiveness level rating: High

- The community really appreciates our efforts to maintain a clean and tidy front yard.
- School looks clean. Staff work together in: ideas, maintenance, etc.

- We have created state of the art computer Labs, TSRC Labs, Info-Technology Labs, Science Labs, Digital Arts Labs, etc., which have helped to make development/ programming in those areas cutting edge. At the same time, we are working towards a similar project re: our Arts (performing & visual) programs.
- Retrofits very well received. Envy of many others came to see.
- Allows teachers and E.A.O to team up for instruction and planing within the program.

Doer: Non-principal
Effectiveness level rating: Low
- We always make do!
- Our physical resources are pathetic, so it is hard to do much here.

Effectiveness level rating: Medium
- The working together across status/group was helpful in producing togetherness and improving the level of consideration between the various groups.
- Great interest accompanied with much unrest at various times.
- This can always get better. It works well for use to this point.
- The community rate is high; it brings the school and the community together. The parents are proud of the school. The school opens to the public to 10:00pm. They can use the facilities, a sense of ownership. They can interact with the kids.

Effectiveness level rating: High
- Enrolment increases without additional facility caused us to carefully review room use.
- Provides a "presence" of community.

4. Other activities
Doer: Principal
Effectiveness level rating: Low (no response)

Effectiveness level rating: Medium
- Teachers & students are beginning to understand the value in these activities, rather than seeing them as being "outside" of the curricula.

Effectiveness level rating: High
- Directly involve kids in community activities. Our school is a micro-Cosmo of the community.

Doer: Non-principal (no response)