

**THE WORK-WORLD OF
SECONDARY SCHOOL HEADTEACHERS
IN BARBADOS**

by

EARLE H. NEWTON

A Thesis
Submitted to the University of Manitoba
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in
Educational Administration

1986

(c) EARLE H. NEWTON

Permission has been granted to the National Library of Canada to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author (copyright owner) has reserved other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her written permission.

L'autorisation a été accordée à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur (titulaire du droit d'auteur) se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation écrite.

ISBN 0-315-33837-7

THE WORK-WORLD OF SECONDARY SCHOOL
HEADTEACHERS IN BARBADOS

BY

EARLE H. NEWTON

A thesis 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

© 1986

Permission has been granted to the LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF MANITOBA to lend or sell copies of this thesis, to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film, and UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS to publish an abstract of this thesis.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank all those who have contributed to the successful completion of this study. Special thanks are due to the members of my committee, Dr. Rampaul, Dr. Riffel and above all Dr. May my advisor and Dr. Marshall my former advisor for their help and guidance. I am grateful for the help and advice I received from my colleagues and friends, especially Sandy who typed the first draft, Linda for her work on the final version, Alistair who helped with the photocopying and Avrelle, Maisie and Keith Sandiford who helped with the proofreading and offered suggestions. The study would not have been possible without the kind cooperation of those headteachers who agreed to be studied. I thank them heartily and trust I have presented them fairly and objectively.

A very special "thank you" is extended to my wife Joy and our children Alan, Estelle and Sharon, to whom I dedicate this study.

ABSTRACT

To arrive at descriptions, work patterns and understandings of the work-world of secondary school headteachers in Barbados, seven headteachers from the public section were studied during the period March to June of the academic year 1983-84. A structured random sampling method ensured that both grammar and newer secondary schools as well as "typical" and "effective" headteachers were represented in the sample. Data were collected by a variety of methods to provide answers to the four basic questions that were the focus of the study.

1. What do the headteachers think they ought to do, i.e. what are their role conceptions?
2. What do the headteachers think they do?
3. What do the headteachers actually do?
4. How are the headteachers affected by their work?

Four data-collection methods were used in the interest of corroboration and to provide depth to the study, and qualitative and quantitative approaches were used in analyzing the data. The methods were:

1. Self-accounts. The headteachers wrote a short essay on "A Typical Year in My Life as Headteacher".
2. Self-Monitoring. The headteachers were asked to put down on pro forma sheets provided, every

activity or contact in which they were involved, its nature and duration and other relevant details. This covered a five-day period.

3. Observation. Using the same pro forma sheets the researcher noted down the same information over a three-day period.
4. Structured Interview. Prepared after a preliminary examination of the other data, the structured interview with open ended items allowed useful flexibility to the researcher.

Three features stand out from the study.

1. The headship is seen and operationalized as a service position.
2. The headteachers' role in creating good interpersonal relationships and purposeful climates is seen as crucial.
3. The headteachers have a serious interest in the discipline and control of students. There was, however no evidence of their punishing harshly or without seeking to understand the cause of the misdemeanour.

There was serious discontinuity between their conceptions of their role and their performance in the role. Professing to believe that both the administrative-managerial and the educational leadership functions were

important roles for the headship, they fully engrossed themselves in the former to the almost total neglect of the latter. The headteachers experienced feelings of powerlessness and ambiguity as a result of being controlled by policies and rules from a central body. These caused some degree of frustration and elements of formalism but there was no evidence of alienation or despair.

The headteachers spent long hours on-the-job and interacted mainly with members of the school community. Their time was spent mainly in their offices and working at planned activity. They found themselves reacting to the ideas and problems presented by others or by circumstances rather than initiating action or generating ideas for action. There were no features by which those deemed "typical" could be distinguished from those deemed "effective" headteachers.

The study which was exploratory in nature has suggested a number of areas for further investigation and has generated a number of hypotheses for testing.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	ii
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	1
Basic Research Questions	4
Significance of the Study	6
Delimitations	7
Limitations	8
Research Methodology	9
Definitions	11
Organization of the Study	12
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	14
Conceptions of the Principalship	16
What Principals Do	28
The Effective Principal	42
Organizational Behaviour Across Cultures	54
Conclusion	57
III. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY	60
Theoretical Background	60
The Setting	62
The Sample	64

The Respondents	66
Research Design	69
Data Collection and Analysis	70
Self-Accounts	70
Self-Monitoring	71
Observation	72
Interviews	74
Presentation and Analysis of the Data	75
IV. PRESENTATION OF DATA ON EACH HEADTEACHER	78
Headteacher A - The Self Account	78
The Observed and Self-Monitored Phases	84
The Interview	89
Headteacher B - The Self-Account	95
The Observed and Self-Monitored Phases	100
The Interview	104
Headteacher C - The Self Account	111
The Observed and Self-Monitored Phases	114
The Interview	118
Headteacher D - The Self Account	125
The Observed and Self-Monitored Phases	129
The Interview	134
Headteacher E -	142
The Observed and Self Monitored Phases	142
The Interview	145

Headteacher F - The Self-Account	154
The Observed and Self-Monitored Phases	160
The Interview	164
Headteacher G - The Self Account	171
The Observed and Self-Monitored Phases	178
The Interview	182
V. ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF THE DATA	190
What the Headteachers Think They Ought to Do	190
Summary	195
What the Headteachers Think They Do	195
Summary	211
What the Headteachers Actually Do	212
Summary	232
How They Are Affected by Their Work	233
Summary	235
Discussion	236
General Observations	236
The Administrative-Managerial and Educational Leadership Roles	239
Three Major Concerns of the Headteachers	242
Collegiality and Delegation	244
Accountability and the Headteacher	246
Formalism, Powerlessness and Ambiguity	249
Typical and Effective Headteachers	251
The Place of Theory	253

VI. SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS	257
Summary	257
Review of Major Findings	260
Headteachers' Conceptions of Their Work	260
What the Headteachers Think They Do	262
What the Headteachers Actually Do	263
How the Headteachers are Affected	
by Their Work	264
Conclusions	265
Recommendations	267
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	273
APPENDIX	281
1. A Typical Year in my Life as a	
a Headteacher	281
2. Sample of Pro Forma Data Recording	
Sheets	282
3. Headteacher Perception and Behaviour	
Study - Interview Schedule	283
4. Explanation of Categories Used in	
Analyzing the Tasks/Activities	
of the Headteachers	290

LIST OF TABLES

<u>TABLE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
1. Distribution of Schools in the Sample	66
2. Headteacher A - Details of Tasks and Activities (Observed Phase)	85
3. Classification of Headteacher A's Work Time (Observed Phase)	86
4. Headteacher A - Details of Tasks and Activities (Self-Monitored Phase)	87
5. Classification of Headteacher A's Work Time (Self-Monitored Phase)	88
6. Headteacher B - Details of Tasks and Activities (Observed Phase)	102
7. Classification of Headteachers B's Work Time (Observed Phase)	102
8. Headteacher B - Details of Tasks and Activities (Self-Monitored Phase)	103
9. Classification of Headteacher B's Work Time (Self-Monitored Phase)	103
10. Headteacher C - Details of Tasks and Activities (Observed Phase)	114
11. Classification of Headteacher C's Work Time (Observed Phase)	116

<u>TABLE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
12. Headteacher C - Details of Tasks and Activities (Self-Monitored Phase)	117
13. Classification of Headteacher C's Work Time (Self-Monitored Phase)	117
14. Headteacher D - Details of Tasks and Activities (Observed Phase)	130
15. Classification of Headteacher D's Work Time (Observed Phase)	131
16. Headteacher D - Details of Tasks and Activities (Self-Monitored Phase)	132
17. Classification of Headteachers D's Work Time (Self-Monitored Phase)	133
18. Headteacher E - Details of Tasks and Activities (Observed Phase)	143
19. Classification of Headteacher E's Work Time (Observed Phase)	143
20. Headteacher E - Details of Tasks and Activities (Self-Monitored Phase)	144
21. Classification of Headteacher E's Work Time (Self-Monitored Phase)	145
22. Headteacher F - Details of Tasks and Activities (Observed Phase)	161
23. Classification of Headteacher F's Work Time (Observed Phase)	161

<u>TABLE</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
24. Headteacher F - Details of Tasks and Activities (Self-Monitored Phase)	163
25. Classification of Headteacher F's Work Time (Self-Monitored Phase)	163
26. Headteacher G - Details of Tasks and Activities (Observed Phase)	178
27. Classification of Headteacher G's Work Time (Observed Phase)	180
28. Headteacher G - Details of Tasks and Activities (Self-Monitored Phase)	180
29. Classification of Headteachers G's Work Time (Self-Monitored Phase)	181
30. Perceived Value - Items of Question 24	194
31. Perceived Performance on Items of Question 24	210
32. Analysis of Significant Features of the Chronological Record (Observed Phase)	213
33. Analysis of Significant Features of the Chronological Record (Self-Monitored Phase)	216
34. Type, Location and Interaction Analysis (Observed Phase).	226
35. Type, Location and Interaction Analysis (Self-Monitored Phase).	228

CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

It is generally agreed that the principal is the key person in educational administration at the school level. He is held to be the major determinant of the quality of the school. Mills (1971) sees the principal as an organizer who pulls together all aspects of the school, as a facilitator of a climate conducive or non-conducive to learning, and above all, as a catalyst for change. Hills (1982) observes that the principal has prime responsibility for the maintenance of the organization, as well as for educational leadership within it.

The work of the school principal has been guided by speculation and theories which have produced particular conceptions of the principal's task (e.g. Lipham and Hoeh, 1974; Roe and Drake, 1974; Knezevitch, 1975). What has never been ascertained Morris (1981) argues, is whether the on-the-job behaviour of the principal is at all consonant with the theories.

Only recently have studies of the principalship begun to investigate the question of what principals actually do (Wolcott, 1973; Casey, 1980; Martin, 1980). It is only gradually being recognized that improvement in the princi-

pal's craft will depend, to a large extent, on our understanding of this issue. In this approach lies, at least in part, the solution to closing the gap between theory and practice.

In the context of the developing world, the theory-practice issue is further compounded by the fact that it is "foreign" theory that is being taught in the local context--a context far removed from the situation for which it was developed, and for which, as Greenfield (1980) suggests, it may perhaps no longer be valid. In the Caribbean, for example, such texts as Lipham and Hoeh (1974) and Hoy and Miskel (1978) are standard in training courses in educational administration.

Marshall and Newton (1983:10) regret the paucity of research on school administrators in developing areas, and suggest that a

. . . research mandate for researchers in educational administration in developing areas is to learn a lesson from the developed world, and not wait for twenty years of research in the area to pass before they start looking at what school principals do, rather than engaging in conjecture on what principals should do.

Erickson (1977:ix-x) stresses the importance of practice-oriented studies in the preparation of practitioners. He suggests that:

Attention to the "real world" of educational organizers and administrators may provide an antidote to the frequent pre-occupation of schol-

ars with esoteric bypaths that have neither practical nor theoretical significance.

Bridges (1982:17) also comments on the lack of concern by scholars in the field for practical issues. He observes:

This scholarly indifference toward issues of practical significance lends palatable credibility to the reputation of academic researchers among practising administrators as being "Ivory-towerish" and out of touch with reality.

Morris (1981:13) argues that the school principalship should be the most thoroughly researched and best understood administrative position in education in view of its tremendous importance. He notes that the literature on the topic, though voluminous, tends to be prescriptive and hortatory rather than descriptive and empirical. Morris (loc. cit.) continues:

There is very little research-based knowledge about the dimensions of principal performance; there hasn't even been much attention given, until recently, to the question of what it is that school principals do during their working day.

This study represents an attempt to explore the work-world of seven headteachers in secondary schools in Barbados. Its purpose was essentially to discover and analyze the headteachers' conceptualizations, perceptions and performance of their job, and the way they felt themselves affected by it. A major emphasis was an exploration of some of the major aspects and features of the headship that research has found to be significant in contributing to school effectiveness.

Basic Research Questions

The study attempts to understand and describe the behaviour and thinking of these headteachers in terms of the following four questions.

1. What do these headteachers feel they as heads, ought to do: on what should their time and energies be spent?

There are a number of factors that make an investigation into the conceptions of headteachers a useful and necessary undertaking. As Blumberg and Greenfield (1980) point out there are numerous conceptions of the functions headteachers are expected to perform in their role as school managers and instructional leaders. How do they relate to what role incumbents themselves feel they should do?

As Casey (1980) observes, educational institutions are not noted for providing managers with specific measures against which their performance will be evaluated. Furthermore, in developing countries most heads will have been promoted through the ranks with no specialized training in educational administration. It is likely, therefore, that ambiguity and conflict will arise in the minds of administrators, and as a result leadership action can be hampered.

2. What do headteachers think they do?

Apart from what headteachers feel they ought to do,

they have a clear, albeit subjective view of what they do. They know how, on what matters, and with whom their time is spent; how their lives are organized. They are often able to enunciate the factors that inhibit their performance, that force them to behave as they do rather than how they would ideally like to.

3. How do headteachers actually behave? What do they do from day to day?

Can we fully depend on the headteachers' reports of what they do for a description of headteacher behaviour? Although direct observation and log records have their problems and limitations, they provide another perspective on administrative behaviour in schools. They can be a useful check on subjective accounts. It is to be noted, as Casey (1980) observes, that actual behaviour, as observed by social scientists, differs both from what a manager thinks it ought to be, as well as from what he actually thinks it is.

4. How do the headteachers feel affected by their work?

Blumberg and Greenfield (1980) observe that apart from government institutions, few systems sustain more attack from a wider cross section of society than the school. It is their belief that this results in what they term, "ontological insecurity" on the part of the school. In this

condition both administrators and teachers, they suggest, are constantly on their guard, distrust people not directly involved on a daily basis in the school and experience feelings of goal ambiguity.

In summary, the objective of the research was to provide descriptive, empirical data, derived from the perceptions and practice of headteachers, and thus make a contribution to an area of dearth. Three of the four basic questions have been approached from the perspectives of the head teachers. Through essays and interviews, their perceptions have been sought on the questions of how they ought to behave as heads, how they thought they behaved and how their work affected them. For the fourth question--what do headteachers actually do?--observation and self-monitoring techniques were employed.

Significance of the Study

There is copious reference in recent literature in the area of educational administration to the uncertainty of educational administration, to the uncertainty concerning what constitutes the field of educational administration and what the proper focus of research and scholarly investigation should be.

Silver (1980-81:2) argues that the "field of educational administration can and should develop a systematic,

cumulative, practice-oriented body of knowledge to inform administrative practice". And Culbertson (1980) calls for "the development of a theory of practice" and argues that those developing a theory of practice must concentrate upon the study of conditions, events, processes and problems indigenous to management and leadership in educational systems. He further points out that advances in a professional field are achieved through "the critical study and analysis" of existing practices and the projection of well-analyzed alternatives".

The present study is set against this background. The intention was to contribute to the development of a "practice-oriented body of knowledge". By carefully and systematically studying educational leaders and managers at work in their natural settings and by probing their thinking on matters in their work-environment the study has contributed to the understanding of existing practices in a small developing country. The alternatives arrived at as a result of the study should make a significant contribution to the training of educational leaders in the country. The study has suggested avenues and generated hypotheses for further investigation.

Delimitations

For an initial investigation of the principalship in Barbados, it was considered wise to select a population

that possessed as high a number of common elements as possible. It was decided, therefore to choose the secondary school and exclude the primary sector. Not only do these two stages of schooling deal with different age groups, encounter different issues, and establish different emphases, but there are also differences in the educational background and training of the headteachers.

Among the secondary schools, a further delimitation was imposed. It was felt that although there was some common ground between the government and the private schools there would be enough differences to justify separation at this stage. The population was thus restricted to the government secondary schools.

Limitations

The study consisted of four different components and there were problems associated with each component. Firstly, with respect to the headteachers' own recording of their activities, they related having problems either in remembering to put down each activity/event as soon as it occurred or being unable to capture the swift, often interlocking flow of events. They sometimes found themselves having to reconstruct an event or series of events for the record.

During the period of observation similar difficulties

were experienced by the researcher. In addition, the effect of the presence of the observer cannot truly be assessed. Although every effort was made on his part to be unnoticed and unobtrusive, yet, the possibility that his presence might have caused some modifications in behaviour on the part of the actor(s) cannot be totally discounted.

Both the interview and essay are open to the subjective reinterpretation and rationalization of the subjects. The risk of being given the 'correct' or expected response is always present.

Another difficulty lay in the interpretation of the data. As the researcher interacted with the data he exercised great care to ensure that his experiences and expectations contaminated neither the data nor their interpretation.

The major limitation, however, was the time factor. Naturalistic studies require an extended period of time if they are to accurately represent and fully understand the situation under study.

Research Methodology

Data for the study were collected by means of four research techniques. They were:

1. Self accounts. The respondents were asked to write about 4-6 pages on the topic--"A Typical

Year In My Life As Headteacher". The main purpose of this essay was to get the headteachers' perceptions of what they considered the main focus of their work. It was felt that, forced to write on such an important topic in a relatively restricted space, they would concentrate on those areas they deemed significant, for whatever reason.

The essay also contributed to other areas as well, especially that relating to how their work affected them.

2. Self-monitoring. The respondents were required to record on pro forma sheets, over a period of one week, every event/activity they did or were involved in, as soon as it was over.

3. Observation. The researcher observed each headteacher from start to finish of the school day for a period of three days, noting down on identical pro forma sheets, each activity/event in which the headteacher was involved.

The self-monitoring and observation strategies both related to the question of what the headteachers actually do on the job. They were both used in order to provide a wider focus than either one on its own could do. They served to reinforce and complement each other.

4. Interviews. The interview was the most pervasive technique in that it spanned all four areas of the study. It seemed to collect information on what the headteachers felt they ought to do, on what they felt they did, on how their work affected them, and it helped in clarifying issues from all parts of the study.

Seven secondary school headteachers (4 women and 3 men) were the respondents. They were randomly selected from two categories--effective and typical heads. The headteachers of the government secondary schools were placed in these categories by the simple expedient of asking persons with intimate knowledge of the schools to assign them to the respective categories.

Definitions

Board of Management. Every secondary school is managed by a Board of Management. The Board is appointed by the Minister for "the management, control and operation and maintenance of the school" (Education Act, 1981-25 page 16) which it is appointed to administer. Boards, in spite of the quotation above, have little power to act without reference to a higher authority.

Common Entrance Examination. Commonly referred to as the "11+", this is the selection examination for secondary

places for all in the age group. It is taken by all primary school pupils in the academic year in which they attain their eleventh birthday. Beside being a selection test, it helps to sort the children out amongst the schools, those doing well gaining places in the more prestigious schools.

Effective/Typical Headteacher. An effective head is defined as one who, in spite of problems and difficulties, makes a difference in his/her school. Through their drive, initiative, concern and leadership, effective heads create the right climate for innovation and improvement in curriculum and instruction. The typical head, on the other hand is an organization maintainer, who keeps the institution afloat, avoids crises but achieves little else.

Headteacher. Though the site level managers of Barbadian schools are normally termed headteachers (heads) following the British tradition, the term principal is also widely used. In this study, the terms are used interchangeably.

Organization of the Study

The report commences with a chapter which reviews literature relevant to the problem. Four perspectives have been used for selecting material for review. There are:

1. Conceptions of the principalship;
2. Perceptual and observational research of what

principals do;

3. Studies of effective principals;
4. Cross cultural studies of organizational behaviour.

Chapter III explains the methodology of the research. In chapter IV the data for each of the seven principals are presented, while chapter V analyzes and discusses the findings, pointing out common features and practices. A final chapter summarizes the findings, makes projections for future practice and suggests lines of further investigation.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Despite the general consensus regarding the importance of the principalship, there are still numerous gaps in our knowledge and understanding of various aspects of this important position. For example, there is a vast difference between the many conceptions of the functions of the principal and the actual work-performance of role incumbents. Principals themselves confess that what they feel they should do, is incongruous with what they actually are able to do. How can these differences be explained?

It is not yet fully understood what it is that makes the difference between School A (an effective school, i.e. one that raises student achievement beyond expectations) and School B (a typical school), where all other factors are apparently quite similar. Is the difference that between the leadership provided by an effective principal and that of one who is merely content to serve as an organizational maintainer? Is it really as Blumberg and Greenfield (1980: viii) state?

It takes a unique person to help to give a school first, an image of what it can be and, second to provide the drive, support and skills to make that image approximate reality.

If it is, are we justified in our expectations that all principals should be effective, i.e. unique? Blumberg and Greenfield (1980: 9-10) observe:

The loneliness, the conflict, the dullness of the routine, the "busy work" and the anguish that accompany having to solve complex educational and organizational problems with extremely limited resources are usually not part of teachers conceptions of the principalship. Frustrations that principals experience when their idealized conceptions of themselves as educational leaders become tarnished . . . by the mounting pressures for administrative meetings and for monitoring the growing complex of accountability procedures introduced into their schools are seldom sensed by teachers . . .

They argue that the role is ambiguous and wrought with conflict, but in spite of this, teachers continue to seek after it. Does this picture represent the reality of the principalship as incumbents experience it?

In developing countries, an important additional issue must be the question of the extent to which theories and doctrines from the developed world are importable into their settings. The following challenge is no less pertinent to the developing world than it is to the developed world. Greenfield (1975: 75) suggests:

In particular, we need to ask whether the theory and assumptions still appear to hold in the settings where they were developed before they are recommended and applied to totally new settings. Such an examination is not only appropriate but essential in the light of an alternative view which sees organizations not as structures subject to universal laws but as cultural artifacts . . .

Button (1966) contends that as the principalship evolved, different doctrines were used at different times both to justify administrators and administration to the public and staff, and to guide the administrators themselves in their work. He is critical of the doctrine of school administration as an applied behavioural science linked to a science of general administration. He looks forward to a new indigenous doctrine that will rest on a knowledge of schools and educational administration and policy. It is only then, he argues, that educational administrators will establish their own credibility.

Various efforts have been set in motion towards creating that knowledge on which this new doctrine will be based. This survey attempts to examine some of the important writing in this area. Its first focus is on textbook conceptions of the functions of the principalship. It then turns to an examination of both the normative perceptual and observational research of what principals do. The survey then concentrates on research on effective principals and effective schools, before finally looking briefly at cross-cultural literature on administration.

Conceptions of the Principalship

There are numerous conceptions of the role and function principals are expected to carry out in their business

of running schools. Various textbooks, articles and other materials have been published to inform and instruct principals and would-be principals in their work.

Griffiths, Clark, Wynn and Iannaccone (1962) argue that any difference between elementary and high school principals is only a matter of degree, rather than of kind, and therefore offer the same role description. They list four categories of functions for the principalship-- (1) improving the educational programme, (2) selecting and developing personnel, (3) working with the community, and (4) managing the school,--and discuss a set of skills necessary for the operation of each category. These skills are conceived at three levels, namely, technical, human and conceptual. Under each function, there are many duties that must be performed. The authors provide a formidable list, which according to them is merely illustrative.

They argue that the principal has the overall responsibility to provide the kind of leadership and co-ordination that will bring staff, community and students together to work towards the best school programmes they can conceive. To do this, they suggest that a climate of efficiency, co-operation, service and stimulation is essential. However, these authors are not unaware of the gap between what writers agree on and the reality of the situation. In contrast to the consensus that "the most

important role for the principal is that of "improver" of the educational program", they draw attention to the "numerous status studies which reveal that the secondary school principal . . . actually spends little time in activities . . . leading towards the improvement of the educational program" (Griffiths et al. 1962: 172). In spite of this, however, these authors (loc. cit.) maintain that

. . . in the development of a concept of the job, it is necessary to project beyond what many principals are doing, still keeping in mind what is practical for one in this position to do.

Viewing the principal as a policy maker of the highest order on whom heavy responsibility is placed, they suggest that only a fully prepared, competent administrator should be expected to handle a principalship within their conception.

Lipham and Hoeh (1974) raise the issue as to what are the basic functions that must be fulfilled by principals in providing leadership for school improvement. They argue that in spite of the tendency to disparage the functional view as being a "cookbook" or prescriptive approach to understanding the role, a principal must be aware of what is expected to be done. They list five categories of tasks for the principalship--Instructional Improvement; Staff Personnel Services; Student Personnel Services; Finance and

Facilities: and School Community Services--and provide a set of conceptual schemes for each category. These schemes are then used to generate and categorize some sixty-five competencies considered necessary for the proper carrying out of the various functions.

Lipham and Hoeh (1974) stress that knowledge of the behavioural sciences as exemplified in the following theories--General Systems, Social Systems, Values, Organization, Role Decision and Leadership Theories--will enhance the leadership qualities and performance of principals in their major areas of responsibility.

This framework is complex, wide ranging and very challenging both in terms of training and of the demands made on a principal.

Roe and Drake (1974) project a dual perspective on the principalship. In their "administrative-managerial perspective" the major functions are wide ranging. They cover such activities as record keeping, reporting, budgeting and control of finances, discipline, personnel administration, scheduling, building administration, the securing and maintenance of supplies and equipment, pupil accounting and the monitoring of programmes and instructional processes prescribed by the central office.

The functions under the second perspective, the "educational leadership emphasis" are no less demanding.

Here, the onus is on the principal to stimulate and motivate his staff to maximum performance and to develop with them a realistic and objective system of accountability for learning. He must work with his staff to develop sound assessment procedures for on-going programmes in order to identify weak areas and suggest alternatives. With the cooperation of his staff, he must develop and implement strategies and procedures for the evaluation of the staff and for evaluating and reporting student progress. It is the principal's responsibility to make provisions for the involvement of the community in the operation of the school, to encourage the continuous study of curricular and instructional innovations, and to provide leadership to students to help them design and develop a meaningful student government.

The authors accept that the wide range of management tasks the principal is expected to perform makes it nearly impossible for him to be a real instructional leader. They implore principals to recognize the importance of the educational leadership emphasis. They recognize that changed circumstances in schools have made it difficult for principals to operate within both sets of roles successfully. While most succumb to the pressures of the administrative managerial aspects of the role, few exceptional ones manage to emphasize the educational leadership aspects.

Knezevich (1975), following Dean (1960), lists some important services that the principal's office must carry out in the school. He presents the principal's office as a communication centre; a clearing house for all school business; a counselling centre for teachers, students and school patrons; a research centre for the collection, analysis and evaluation of information relating to activities and results; a repository for all school records; the planning centre for solving problems and initiating school improvements; a resource centre where creative work is nurtured; an agency for coordinating and cultivating worthwhile school-community relations, and as a total coordinating centre for the whole school enterprise.

To these, he adds other prescriptive functions. He argues that the principal can no longer be required to teach, nor ought he be overburdened with clerical work. Knezevich (1975:394-5) states

The principal in a school . . . is a counsellor of students, the school disciplinarian, the organizer of the schedule, the supervisor of the instructional program, the pupil-relations representative for the attendance area, the liaison between teachers and superintendent, the director and evaluator of teaching efforts, the manager of the school facilities, the supervisor of custodial and food services employees within the building, and a professional leader.

The complex nature of the principal's role is further advanced by Wood, Nicholson and Findley (1979) who argue

that today's changed circumstances make it imperative that principals develop expertise in community relations. A principal must be able to use the community to provide support for change and should be skilled at interpreting school policies to the community.

Wood et al (1979:25) assert:

In order to cope with the changing secondary school and its myriad problems, the student preparing for the secondary school principalship ... should develop a dynamic set of useable skills.

In order to effect the acquisition of these necessary skills they recommend study in a wide array of subject areas. They also cite the work of Nickerson (1972) who not only endorses the areas identified, but goes further and suggests additional areas. Wood et al (1979:29) conclude:

If the principalship is to survive as a viable, dynamic position in education, then it is imperative that further research be conducted on how to prepare and continually update the training of the secondary school leader.

There is an abundance of literature with specialized roles for the principal as well. Goldman (1970) sees the principal as a community relations expert establishing beneficial links with various community segments. Novotney (1967) charges him with the responsibility for organizational change to the exclusion of all else. Trump (1967) and Brieve (1972) argue he should concern himself solely with instructional progress.

Lusthaus (1983) examining the role of the Quebec principal, wonders to what extent principals can be both managers of the schools' turbulent, conflictual environment as well as instructional leaders in their own settings. He notes that in general, the expectations held for principals can be categorized under six major functions--curriculum and instruction; student life; personnel; financial resources; physical resources; and, school community relations. He points out that some 120 expected task behaviours have been identified under these six functions, and observes that if these expectations are taken literally the principal must have a high level of technical ability in instructional design and evaluation, as well as general competence in managerial skills. Lusthaus (1983:12) observes that principals are asked

. . . to take on a complex role that is ambiguous and conflictual. Essentially, the role contains multiple expectations which result in role ambiguity, conflict and overload.

Blumberg and Greenfield (1980) suggest that not enough attention has been paid in the literature to three normal responsibilities of principals--the management of conflict, the making of decisions and organizational change. They (Blumberg and Greenfield 1980:21) observe that their work with educational administrators at all levels, leads them to believe that

School principals spend much of their time on the job actively engaged in making decisions related to the management of conflict, and organizational change and frequently the mark of the effective principal from the central office perspective is that "things are calm" and "policy changes are implemented smoothly".

The British perspective on the role of the head tends to be concerned less with functions and more with the leadership qualities of the head. Bernbaum (1976:21) suggests that a number of factors have contributed to upset the traditional role of the British headteacher.

The differing tasks to be performed in the educational system increasingly occur within one school, and the differing teacher and pupil roles fall within the control of one head. The articulation of these differing roles, the differential commitment of staff and the large number of personnel involved are making it more and more difficult for heads to exercise their earlier dominance over staff and pupils.

He refers to a pamphlet from the Headteachers' Association and observes that it says nothing on the day to day running of the school or on long-term planning procedures. It conceives the role of the head in personal, charismatic terms and projects the head as the unique leader of the school community and as the representative of his school to the wider community. The pamphlet maintains that a head must know what he wants for his school, how he hopes to attain it, and must accept that the ultimate decision is his alone.

Jennings (1977:3) notes that the head is held responsible for everything that happens in his school, "both for the general standard and condition of the school and for the individual details that make it up". Thus the role of the head is to accept the responsibility for the school and for all the decisions that are taken in it. He discusses the function of the head under the following headings--teaching, public relations, scheduling, budget and control, communication and reporting to outside agencies and public examinations. Jennings (1977:6) notes:

A head's role is certainly not defined by drawing up a list of functions, of jobs in the school and then saying that any head must do all these, and that they constitute headship . . . Lists of functions, of duties, can only be the accidents, and not the essentials of headship, in logical terms.

Jennings stresses the human relations aspects of the head's work as exemplified in his ability to understand people and in his knowing how to deal with people so as to produce good results.

Barry and Tye (1972) place the responsibility of running the school squarely on the headteacher, and suggest four questions to which s/he must provide answers that will give direction and meaning to his work. These questions are: Where are you? Where are you going? How do you intend to get there? How will you know when you have got there?

It is argued that a number of factors combine to make the role complex and demanding. Barry and Tye (1972:43) suggest:

Schools now have to come to terms not only with an unprecedented rate of growth in knowledge and technology, but with fundamental changes in the structure of society as well as in current beliefs, values, standards, customs, practices and behaviours.

This survey of the expected behaviours, skills and competencies of the headship shows how complex and wide-ranging the position is perceived to be. While in North America, long lists of tasks and duties, and attendant skills and competencies are drawn up and ascribed to the principalship, in Britain such lists are considered unimportant, *infra dig*, perhaps. Yet, the situation is much the same in both places: the head is perceived as the key person in the school around whom everything revolves. He has ultimate power, and consequently, ultimate responsibility for all that happens there.

Given this picture as painted in the literature, it is no wonder that training for the position is conceived in such terms as those prescribed above (Nickerson 1972, Wood et al 1979). Essentially, the situation can be summarized in this way. The principal must provide the educational leadership and coordination in bringing together all the elements that impinge directly or indirectly on the school,

so that the best programmes can be designed and carried out in the interest and to the benefit and advantage of the children. To do this with any measure of success, the head must be a person with a certain breadth of knowledge and educational vision. He must be a highly competent, dynamic, top-class administrator who can work effectively and cooperatively with people.

But how tenable is this position? Can principals fully meet these criteria and adequately fulfill these expectations? There is little solace in this perspective from Campbell, Bridges et al (1972:276).

Whether or not the principal himself performs all the tasks associated with his office, he must organize his school in such a way that the tasks are accomplished.

For, to what extent does a principal, working in a unionized setting, in a world of constantly changing values, standards, and attitudes, possess the power, the scope, the facilities and skills to so arrange his school?

Allison (1983) observes that, as the individual school has yielded its place as the most significant element in the formal educational structure to the regional system, so too has the principal ceased to be a significant person. From the perspective of the board room or Department of Education, he is not the highest ranking member of the school, but the lowest ranked in the management hierarchy.

He further observes that principals do not use their personal philosophies of education in operating effective schools, but measures, defined by the central office.

Allison (1983:20) argues that:

The main functions revolve around the implementation of provincial policy, the application of Department and Board regulations, and the maintenance of a politically, rather than a personally acceptable set of standards. Principals are, in effect more of a tool of their hierarchical and political masters than autonomous heads of educational institutions: pawns rather than princes.

In the final analysis, however, all these various expectations are important, as they go toward determining how principals themselves see their role. And as Blumberg and Greenfield (1980:21) observe:

How principals think of their role, and the conceptions held by others of the principalship, can be a crucial determinant of their on-the-job behaviour, their frustrations and satisfactions in the role, and their failure or success as principals.

What Principals Do

Traditionally, data on what principals do have come from studies that investigate perceptions (both of principals themselves and of different members of their role set--teachers, pupils, etc.) of their work. Questionnaires, interviews and diary-studies have been the most popular means of investigation in this regard. In more

recent years, observational studies have been used to provide first-hand and hopefully, more objective information on what principals actually do. This section of the review will consider the findings of studies in both these approaches.

Graves and Stoller (1953) used the diary-format to study 25 elementary principals. They found that principals invested 30.6 percent of their time in administrative duties, 14.8 percent in instructional matters, and 13.5 percent in community relations. The principals admitted being unable to devote what they considered appropriate time to matters relating to child guidance and personnel matters. They invested in them only one-third of the time they deemed necessary. These principals averaged a ten-hour workday and their work was marked by high volume, rapid pace and high verbal interactions. Their contacts and interactions were almost entirely with members of the school community.

McAbee (1958) and Goette (1959) produced similar results. In the former, principals spent 33 percent of their time on administrative duties, 12 percent on instructional matters, 5.6 percent on community relations and 8 percent on pupil personnel. In the latter, administrative duties 43.4 percent, instructional matters 14 percent, pupil personnel 13.9 percent and community relations 9.6

percent accounted for the bulk of their time. In addition, McAbee recorded 13 percent of the time devoted to teaching, (an activity generally absent in the literature) and Goette showed 12 percent devoted to extra curricular activities.

The principals in Weitz's (1960) study claimed that large amounts of time they had to spend on administrative duties limited the time they could devote to the more creative aspects of their work, e.g. instructional improvement. By contrast, Hinrichs (1971) was able to report that his subjects invested proportionate time in those tasks they considered important. The major important tasks in their view were--the supervision of student behaviour, classroom visitation for instructional improvement, and the construction of the school's schedule.

Instructional supervision was considered the most important role for the 1300 secondary principals surveyed by Stavanage (1972). They did not attach great significance to such roles as general administration and crisis intervention and management.

Bryne, Hines and McCleary (1978) found some incongruities between the priority rankings principals gave to some role-functions and the amount of time they devoted to them. The outstanding examples were, programme and student behaviour, ranked first and seventh respectively, but placed

fifth and fourth in terms of time devoted to them. Similar incongruities were reported by Gorton and McIntyre (1978) whose subjects complained that the factors that inhibited their work in the crucial role areas were excessive paperwork, wasteful district level meetings, drop-in visitors and student behaviour problems. In an earlier study, Galante (1964) reported similar findings. He found that although principals perceived that instructional matters were of primary importance, they devoted very little time to them. On the other hand, tasks such as office chores, meetings and community relations required far more time than their perceived importance would suggest.

In an interview-study of principals, teachers and students, Williams (1971) found that neither teachers nor students perceived the principals as playing an important role in staff and instructional evaluation or improvement. Principals' visits to classrooms were brief and infrequent, and improvement-programmes were haphazard and spasmodic.

Goldhammer, Becker, et al (1971) found that principals were concerned about the imbalance of managerial and educational responsibilities inherent in the position. Many felt quite inadequate to undertake supervisory programmes in their schools.

A study of the political style (Barsky 1976) of an urban principal concludes that a principal improves his

stature by showing interest and offering help to teachers with personal problems, helping teachers with professional problems and by personally handling most of the details and paperwork necessary in the school.

Two recent studies suggest that principals are conscious of a diminution of their status and authority. Hill, Wuchitech, et al (1980) report that principals feel less in control of their schools, more governed by rules and more open to public scrutiny. Rogers (1980) confirms this finding. His principals felt more hemmed in by regulations, and caught between the layers of the school hierarchy.

Wolcott's (1973) is perhaps the best known observational study of a principal over a two-year period. This principal enjoyed close relationships with his staff and displayed a leadership cycle that was both warm and businesslike. He had a very strong interest in student welfare and was greatly involved in the community. His average work-week covered a range of 48-53 hours, and he operated in a highly personalized role, large amounts of time being spent each day in a virtually endless series of encounters.

Wolcott used three descriptive categories to analyze these encounters. His analysis shows that the principal spent about one quarter of his time in "pre-arranged meetings". Such an activity or meeting is one that

had been recorded in the principal's calendar prior to its occurrence, e.g. a conference with a parent, or a child, or a staff meeting. A further one quarter of his time was spent in "deliberate" but not pre-arranged meetings. Examples of these would be when the principal deliberately stops a teacher, or goes to his class to discuss a matter, a parent dropping in to catch a few moments of the principal's time, or a pupil sent to his office by a teacher. "Casual" or "chance" meetings are those that do not fit either of the two previous categories. These accounted for some 15 percent of his time.

The principal thus spent 65 percent of his time in face-to-face, verbal interactions. Most of the remaining time was spent alone, but it is interesting to note that only 15 percent of his time was spent alone and stationary, while 9 percent was spent on tours of the building or travelling to meetings. Most of his interaction time was spent with participants within the immediate school community--teachers, pupils and other school personnel--thus providing a strong "inside" focus.

Some noticeable features of his principalship were the absence of any significant instructional leadership role, the wide range of diversified tasks that he performed and the fact that he found himself more often than not in a responding, reacting role rather than a proactive one.

Wolcott observes (p. 177):

A principal who cannot cope effectively with the range of diversified demands described here would be ill-suited to the principalship. Some principals become meticulous about and obsessed with the details of running a school.

He also draws attention (p. 306) to the principal's authority within the school.

For the most part, the exercise of the authority of his office was parcelled out to him policy by policy and directive by directive. His freedom was to make no serious mistake.

Martin (1980) observes that managing the activities of the school (a domesticated organization) may require different executive task-behaviours than the operation of an enterprise in the competitive market. He argues that schools function to produce change in certain organization members as opposed to providing a service or a product for consumers. This may therefore constrain some aspects of a principal's role-performance, while accelerating others.

Using Mintzberg's (1973) structured observation technique, Martin studied five high school principals in the north-eastern U.S.A. Each principal was observed over a five day period and all events and activities in which he became involved were noted down and later analyzed. Martin's analysis shows that the principals' job-related work-week averaged 53.8 hours. During this time they performed thirteen separate tasks (only three of the tasks

were not performed by all of them). The activities that accounted for most of the principals' time were: desk work 16 percent of total time, scheduled meetings 17.3 percent, unscheduled meetings 27.5 percent and exchanges (defined as brief encounters between the subject and another person) 9 percent. In order to conserve time principals often performed more than one task at a time.

While Mintzberg's executives recorded a similar work-week, they only performed five separate tasks. Martin explains that new activities such as monitoring, announcing, teacher-observation and teaching which were developed as part of his study were of little importance to Mintzberg's chief executives.

Interest seemed to centre on four areas of operation, viz, organizational maintenance, the academic programme, pupil control and the extra curricular programme. Organizational maintenance tasks were most popular among the five principals, accounting for 53.9 percent of their activities and 36.5 percent of their time, 54.2 percent of their input-correspondence and 43.5 percent of output. The academic programme required 17.4 percent of their time and a comparable amount of their correspondence. Martin (1980: 243) explains:

Tasks were placed in this category when they included non-routine, curricular matters such as change in course content, implementation of new

teaching strategies, or special counselling activities. Because a mean of only 7.6 percent of the principals' tasks concerned the academic program, it was assumed that most of the responsibility for curriculum involvement was delegated to the teaching staff.

He further suggests that, from the evidence, the principals undertook those tasks that were of a higher level of complexity.

Pupil-control--dealing with deviant forms of student behaviour--was a major interest of all five principals, and required 23.8 percent of their total time. Martin points out that a more subtle and pervasive aspect of pupil-control was the routinization of student life through the organizational mechanisms that control most of their activities. Although the threat of disruption was a constant fear of the principals, the "hatchet man" stereotype did not manifest itself. In fact, quite the opposite, as Martin explains (p. 252):

The five principals, although firm with habitual offenders, demonstrated compassion and a sincere concern for student welfare in their disciplinary endeavours. They attempted to uncover and alleviate the antecedent cause of deviant behaviour rather than simply applying one selection from a recipe book of punishment strategies.

A high level of concern was exhibited in the extracurricular programme. Most direct work was delegated to staff but the principals acted as overseers, resource persons in planning, and as the final authority for approval. This

required an investment of 14.7 percent of their time.

The work of the five principals was characterized by the following features:

1. High volume and rapid pace. This typified the work of the principals who changed activity every three or four minutes. When the pace slackened they often engaged in high profile activity--touring, monitoring.
2. Variety, brevity and fragmentation. Their work included a great variety of tasks that were brief in duration, and more than half of these tasks were interrupted.
3. Verbal interaction. Face-to-face verbal interaction dominated their work. 84.8 percent of all activities involved purely verbal interaction.
4. A strong inside focus. Their attention was firmly focused on the internal network. A total of 92.6 percent of all contracts made occurred between the principals and members of their own school organization. This internal preoccupation robbed them of the opportunity of forming external liaisons. Martin wonders whether this situation arises from organizational demands or conscious choice. He suggests that the domesticated nature of the school obviates the necessity to sell the school's

services to the general public.

5. Preference for live action. The principals were always willing to be engaged in the most current and pressing situations. They were more inclined to the action components of their work, and found little time for reflective planning or thought.
6. Instructional leadership. Principals served as consultants to staff and as evaluators of their classrooms. Though there was no active involvement, they performed the maintenance functions necessary for programme articulation.
7. Focused control. They administered their schools without having full organizational control. As building managers they deferred to superintendents on the one hand, and to the technical expertise of teachers on the other.

Martin found no support for the idea of the beleaguered principal. They were varying degrees of pressure and each principal experienced some measure of tension. When problems arose principals reacted promptly to restore the situation to normalcy again.

Casey (1980) studied seven elementary and high school principals in the U.S.A. She observed each principal for two consecutive days, and then interviewed them concerning their perceptions of their job. The primary effort of the

study according to Casey was to capture the full contextual detail of the life of the different principals. The researcher analyzed and classified her findings on the basis of categories developed as the analysis proceeded. She then calculated both percentages of activities as well as of the time devoted to each category. The principals, taken as a whole had an average workday of 8.3 hours. When the high school principals are separated out, their average day is 9.7 hours long.

The role categories developed from the recorded activities are maintenance, supervision, budget development and coordination. Maintenance (75 percent of the activities and 56 percent of the time) and Coordination (15 percent of activities and 27 percent of the time) were by far the most popular roles. Not much time or activity was devoted to supervision or budget development.

When Casey considered the findings from the perspective of scheduled (recorded in the principals' diary prior to the activity) versus unscheduled (not so recorded) activities, she found that scheduled activities accounted for 25 percent of their activities and 52 percent of their time. Unscheduled activities recorded 75 percent of their activities but only 48 percent of the time. Direct, face-to-face conversations accounted for 63 percent of the principals' activities and 72 percent of the time, while

37 percent of their activities and 28 percent of their time were devoted to the indirect medium (written exchanges, telephone conversations).

Casey identified 16 categories of participants in the principals' workday. While this represented a heterogeneous group, the focus was mainly with people within or directly related to the school organization. The most frequent contact was with teachers (26 percent), personal secretaries (17 percent) and subordinate managers (12 percent). Only 21 percent of the principals' activities (20 percent of the time) was performed alone. When alone, principals tend to write, read, deal with personal matters, tour the building, or travel to district-level meetings.

Casey suggests that from the activities' perspective, the principals' workday can be characterized as oral, highly interactive, informal or unpredictable, concerned with maintaining interpersonal relationships and managing details.

From the time-frame analysis the following seven characteristics of time spent on activities were set up:

1. Conventional - the average work day is 8.3 hours.
2. Local - about 73 percent of the day is spent in the school.
3. Disjointed - the average duration per activity is about 7.1 minutes.

4. Predictable - about 52 percent of the day is scheduled and the average duration for a scheduled activity is 15.8 minutes as opposed to 4.6 for an unscheduled one.
5. Task oriented - 81 percent of the day is spent in task related activities.
6. Frequently academic - the largest amount of activities time (21 percent) is spent on programme control.
7. Social - more than 16 percent of the principals' time is spent on interpersonal relations.

Casey (1980: 183) concludes:

Principals spend most of their time in high-demanding energy-producing, task oriented, problem-solving activities, which involve direct, face-to-face conversations with one or more people...

This survey of the literature pertaining to what principals perceive themselves to do or what they are actually seen to do opens up many interesting perspectives on the principalship. Unfortunately, the wide variety of categories established for analyzing the activities performed by principals, limits the extent to which generalizations can be made and creates some difficulties for comparing the results of different studies in any precise manner. For example, the categories "administrative duties", "office

routines", "plant administration" and "desk work" used in different studies seem to cover the same territory or at least to have some overlap. Nonetheless, a number of interesting positions emerge.

A number of studies show that principals often find themselves devoting rather more time to tasks they consider less important while giving less time or even fully neglecting those they consider important. On the whole, little time is spent on instructional improvement while much is expended on such activities as meetings, office chores, community relations. Many studies confirm that the principalship is characterized by high volume of work at a rapid pace, a high degree of face-to-face verbal interaction and a strong inside focus. Incumbents undertake a wide and diversified set of tasks, their work is marked by brevity and fragmentation and they, more often than not, find themselves in a reactive rather than a proactive situation. They generally have long work hours but tend to be organizational maintainers rather than educational leaders. By and large the evidence leads to the conclusion that the position is a high-demanding, energy-consuming one.

The Effective Principal

Smyth (1982) observes that an interesting and important shift is taking place in the study of the school prin-

cipalship. He suggests (p. 1) that the "emphasis is moving noticeably in the direction of considering the impact of the principalship on learning outcomes in schools". He points out that this research is uncovering the important finding that leadership that enhances learning in the school is characterized by a "pervasive emphasis" by principals on classroom and instructional matters. In this section of the review attention is turned to a consideration of the effective principal.

An early study that set out to investigate and identify the factors that influence executive professional leaderships (EPL) in the school is Gross and Herriott (1965). They (1965:8) defined EPL as the "effects of an executive of a professionally staffed organization to conform to a definition of his role that stresses his obligation to improve the quality of staff performance". The study identified four personal characteristics that seemed highly predictive of EPL. These are:

1. A high level of academic achievement;
2. A high degree of interpersonal skills;
3. The motive of service; and
4. The commitment of off-duty time to one's work.

Gross and Herriott (1965:30) argue:

The positive relationships between EPL and teachers' morale, their professional performance, and pupils' learning justifies the staff-influence

conception of the principalship and strategies to increase the principal's professional leadership. The findings, in short offer empirical support for a leadership conception of the principal's role and they undermine a major argument for abandoning it.

In 1971, Goldhammer and his associates interviewed a national sample of elementary principals in the U.S.A. These interviews centred on six major categories--school and society, pupil personnel, instructional programme, administrative leadership, organizational texture, and finance and facilities. From the results, they set up two general types of principalship based on conditions characterizing the schools. Outstanding schools were termed "beacons of brilliance" and poor schools were labelled "potholes of pestilence". In the "beacons of brilliance" principals were charismatic leaders who instilled enthusiasm in the teachers. Teaching staff worked as teams, extending their services well beyond normal expectations because their morale was high. Teachers and principals along with parents worked constantly to appraise the effectiveness of the schools, and children's needs were emphasized. Principals were confident they could provide relevant, purposive learning for their students without being slaves to tradition.

The "potholes of pestilence" resulted from weak leadership and official neglect. The buildings were dirty,

often in disrepair and generally were unwholesome places for growth and learning. They were poorly equipped and staffed, and teacher morale was low. Instructional programmes were traditional and poorly related to students' needs.

The effective principals in the sample shared a number of features in common. The most salient of these were: a sincere faith in children, the ability to work effectively and cooperatively with people, aggressiveness in securing the recognition in appropriate places for the needs of their schools, enthusiasm for the principalship, a strong commitment to education, and the ability to distinguish long- from short-term goals. They were also all adaptable and able strategists.

Wellisch, McQueen et al (1978) studied 22 elementary schools to identify factors that related to school success in raising the achievement of children normally disadvantaged in reading and maths. Three aspects of school management and organization were identified: administrative leadership in education, coordination of instructional programmes, and policy with respect to academic standards.

Five qualitative administrator-linked factors appeared to differentiate successful from non-successful schools. In the successful schools, the principals, as rated by principals and teachers, shared the features listed below:

1. They were more concerned with instruction.
2. They communicated their views about instruction.
3. They took responsibility for decisions about instruction.
4. They coordinated instructional programmes on a school wide basis.
5. They emphasized academic standards.

The researchers suggest that the study provides clues as to how abstract findings could be translated into practical, concrete terms. It was found that where principals felt strongly about instruction they were strongly opposed to the relaxing of standards for low-achieving students, and tended to have students repeat grades. Where programmes were well coordinated they communicated their views by regularly reviewing and discussing students' and teachers' performance with teachers.

A number of studies tend to indicate that principals who are so minded can exert tremendous influence for good on the instructional process in the school and thus, indirectly, on student achievement. Shoemaker and Fraser (1981) reviewed a number of studies of successful schools and found that the principals played a key role in their success. Four themes emerged as being important in helping to determine the good school, namely:

1. Assertive, achievement-oriented leadership;

2. Orderly, purposeful and peaceful school climate;
3. High expectations for staff and pupils;
4. Well designed instructional objectives and evaluation system.

While none of the studies in their review specifically set out to study the role of the principal, their findings are all in key role-functions of the principal.

Smyth (1980) found that leadership which enhances levels of learning is characterized by a strong emphasis by principals on class-room and instructional matters. And Smyth (1982) cites a number of studies of successful schools that showed they, too, were marked by strong educational leadership. For example, Doll (1969) found that the most critical factor in successful schools in Chicago was the quality of principal leadership. Doll found that successful principals were those who:

1. Showed a willingness to move independently and decisively in matters affecting the faculty or school.
2. Had genuine empathy for the teaching staff and an ability to show this in a non-condecending manner.
3. Percieved their roles as one whose primary task is to assist teachers teach even if it meant clashing with the wishes of the administrative hierarchy.

Johnston and Sackney (1982) found that while teachers

and principals wanted more principal-involvement in the teaching-learning process, both groups felt that currently, principals were inadequate and ill-prepared for the tasks. Teachers in the study were more satisfied in those schools where principals actively undertook classroom observation and other supervisory activities. The study also revealed that while many principals stated their willingness to provide educational leadership they also managed to put off doing so for some reason or another.

Sackney (1982) deploras this attitude. He stresses the importance of the principal's role in instruction and curriculum matters, and rejects arguments based on lack of time or inadequate expertise. These, he maintains, (p. 8) are

... rationalization and admissions by principals that, they have forgotten the primary purpose for which schools exist, namely, to enhance pupil learning.

Sackney advocates a re-examination of the role of the principal. He rejects the role of manager in favour of the principal as reactor or doer. He argues that principals should possess skills and expertise in classroom analysis, and be equipped to help in the improvement of instruction.

Blumberg and Greenfield (1980) interviewed eight elementary and high school principals (selected on the basis of their reputation as effective principals) in order to

learn about their life as principals--what they valued, how they related to people, what guided them in their work, what prompted them into action, what frustrated, angered or made them feel good.

These principals portrayed the principalship as a highly ambiguous and normative affair mediated through face-to-face interpersonal interaction. Effective interpersonal skills were a critical ingredient of their successful on-the-job behaviour. Keeping themselves informed of, and responsive to, the work-world demands of their individual school-context was also considered crucial to their effectiveness. They expended a great deal of time and energy in interpersonal reactions with parents, students and teachers--people they saw as closely tied to their success as principals.

Blumberg and Greenfield noted the similarity of problems encountered across the schools and were struck by the idiosyncratic framework each principal used in the particular context of his/her situation. They point out (p. 197) that this framework "only remotely resembles the sort of highly abstract and rational conceptual frame one would find in the usual textbook on school administration".

These principals were fully aware of the danger of becoming bogged down with organizational maintenance acti-

vities. They believed, however, that their on-the-job behaviour should be determined by themselves and not be dictated by the demands of the job per se. They, therefore, found ways of ensuring that organizational maintenance tasks were successfully carried out and that they were able to get ahead with their top priority. Freed of these routine but necessary organizational chores, they pursued their commitment to an educational or organizational goal, taking the initiative and assuming a proactive stance in relation to their work.

In spite of different modus operandi, they shared a number of common features, some of which are listed below:

1. They possessed a high level of energy and displayed a willingness to work long hours on a continuous basis.
2. They all had very well-developed, interpersonal skills and the ability to communicate effectively in face-to-face interaction.
3. They laid a premium on establishing and maintaining an open and trusting relationship with teachers towards securing commitment to school programmes and participation in the decisions.
4. They were all good listeners and observers.
5. They were skilled at analyzing and determining the requirements of the school situation.

Blumberg and Greenfield (1980) admit that their study led them to recast some of their thinking about the role of the principal. They argue that the concern to make schools democratic has led to a neglect of the person whose function is to guide the process. They suggest a move from the pure process notion of leading to a concern for the character and predisposition of the principal. They conclude that there are personality and behavioural differences that distinguish principals who can lead and make a difference in their schools, and those who cannot.

Leithwood and Montgomery (1982) in an excellent and comprehensive review of the role of the elementary school principal in programme-improvement, identify a number of factors that the research shows distinguish the effective from the typical principal. Principal effectiveness is seen in relation to student-learning. As the authors explain (p. 10),

. . . principal behaviours are increasingly "effective" to the extent that they facilitate necessary teacher growth and thereby indirectly influence student-learning or impinge on other factors known to effect such learning.

They present a very comprehensive picture of the effective principal. Effective principals have, as their first priority, the happiness and academic achievement of their pupils. They perceive themselves as instructional leaders with the primary function of providing the best

programmes for their pupils. They are very clear about their goals (long and short term) for students. Their relationships with teachers are task-oriented (geared to improving the school programme), but this task-orientation does not rule out good interpersonal relations between principal and staff. Effective principals work towards balanced attention to instructional leadership, routine administration and human relations. They are prepared, however, to sacrifice smooth interpersonal relations where necessary, for the sake of a more balanced programme. They establish norms for risk-taking among staff. Continuous change in the direction of better programmes for students is considered highly desirable. High expectations for students and staff are constantly articulated, and the support of the community and parents for the school's programmes is vigorously sought out. Effective principals involve the parents in the education of their children by indicating what they can do to reinforce and extend the effects of school instruction.

If there is one salient point to emerge from the research on successful schools, it is that the critical factor is the quality of principal leadership. Although this leadership may manifest itself in different ways, certain features appear with definite regularity. One such feature is a strong concern for instructional matters, as

translated in such activities as classroom observation, the coordination of school programmes, the setting of high academic standards, the support given to staff curricular efforts and the establishing of clear objectives and evaluation systems. Another characteristic is that of placing great emphasis on creating and maintaining a good climate in the school. Effective heads insist on an orderly but not oppressive atmosphere, on good relations between the various elements of the school community, and they share their ideas and expectations with the staff. Effective principals have confidence in their ability to provide quality education in their schools and they do not allow themselves to become routinized by the demands and pressures of the job. They are prepared to define the situation for themselves rather than leave the determination of their day to fate and the ever-increasing routines of the job. This is not to say that the administrative routines are not done. Measures are set in place to ensure that the important roles as defined by themselves are fully carried out without neglecting the necessary routines.

However, in contrast to those studies that stress the role of the principal are those that question his/her importance. Kennedy (1978) showed that compensatory education programmes have been successful in urban schools with little support from the principals. Gersten, Carnine and

Green (1982) cite a number of studies of successful schools or school programmes that owed little or nothing to the principal. In fact, some programmes flourished in spite of the hostility of the principals. Their own research showed that the important variables in successful programmes were the quality of the programme itself, the utility of its teacher training, the extent to which it succeeded with difficult-to-teach children and the presence of a supportive climate. They argue that the quality of the leadership provided by the principal was not significant. They did accept, however, that the moral support of the principal was very valuable.

Gersten et al (1982) maintain that concentration on crucial function rather than leadership makes efforts at understanding education more meaningful. They submit that portraits of the few exceptional, charismatic principals may have a depressing effect on those principals who are not so fortunate and cannot perform at the same level.

Organizational Behaviour Across Cultures

To date, there is not an abundance of literature on educational administration in developing countries. There is, however, a fair amount in the areas of organizational behaviour across cultures, and public administration in developing countries. Educational administration theories

have been based almost entirely on general organization theories and thus the findings from these studies can provide useful insights and guidance for the study of educational administration.

The transfer to the developing countries of colonial educational patterns was accompanied by the necessary transfer to school administrators of those technical skills required to maintain those patterns. As the decades passed, and in the absence of any systematic training for school administrators, it was inevitable that the dependence on rules and regulations and the move to strict bureaucratic modes would become entrenched (Marshall and Newton, 1983). Riggs (1964) observes that a likely consequence of this attempt to transfer administrative practices across cultures is the phenomenon he calls formalism. Formalism is defined as the extent to which there is discrepancy between what is formally prescribed and what is actually practised. Riggs (1964) suggests that apparent subscription to imported techniques can often be a cover up for what is going on in the organization.

Lammers and Hickson (1979) after reviewing a number of cross-cultural organizational studies concluded that organizations are culture-bound, being influenced by dominant elites, members and agencies within their environment. There is abundant support for this position. From their

study of Japanese and Japanese-American organizations, Lincoln, Hanada and Olson (1981:114) observe:

This research demonstrates that cultural factors affect organizational processes in ways that render universalist statements of the effect of organizational structure on individuals seriously deficient. Organizational structures may, indeed, be loosely coupled to formal goals but they are closely tied to the social and cultural orientations of people involved in them.

Further support can be found in Kiggundu, Jorgensen and Hatsu (1983). After a review of some ninety-four articles on organizations in developing countries Kiggundu et al (p. 81) point out:

In general, each time the environment is involved the theory developed for western settings does not apply, because it assumes contingencies that may not be valid for developing countries.

Interestingly enough, however, they observe that when the focus was on technical tasks and techniques, there was no significant problem in using the conventional theory in developing countries.

Hofstede's (1980) extensive study of international differences and work-related values showed that attempts to transfer leadership skills which do not take local values into account have little chance of success. And Maggagula (1983), reviewing some of the major leadership theories, and examining studies in a cross-cultural context concluded that an effective leader in one cultural context is not necessarily so in another.

It seems quite clear that cultural environments and individuals within organizations make a difference to the way organizations function and the way in which theories can apply. The situation is succinctly summed up by Redding and Martyn-Johns (1979:104):

A starting point is the notion that to understand organizational behaviour one must eventually come to terms with the way each individual attaches himself to the system being studied.

Conclusion

Despite the rhetoric, the evidence from both perceptual and observational studies of what principals do is clear. They spend their time on organizational maintenance and student welfare and behavioural matters. They claim to place high priority on their educational leadership role, but they devote little time and energy to curricular and instructional matters and they maintain a strong "inside" focus.

There are a few exceptions to this general position. There are cases of effective principals, individuals who, by the quality of their leadership have made a difference in their schools, in terms of student outcomes.

Can this situation be reversed so that the effective principal becomes the norm rather than the exception? If typically, principals perform none, or only very few of the

roles prescribed by writers on school administration and trainers of administrators, why do we persist with these prescriptions? Why do principals themselves claim to value one thing and then do something quite different?

The complex, wide-ranging and even contradictory nature of the conception of the principalship has already been alluded to. The knowledge, skills and energy it would require for a single person to measure up, even minimally to these expectations boggle the mind. Imagine, for example, the breadth, length and quality of training programmes that would be necessary to meet the requirements suggested by Wood et al (1979) or Nickerson (1972). But, given the changed social, political and organizational reality, do principals have the status, the authority or the power to perform most of the functions prescribed for them? Do their political leaders want them to? Furthermore, to what extent will the phenomena of the developed world manifest themselves in the developing countries, and to what degree will the same approaches suffice in finding likely explanations to them?

Allison (1983) points to the bureaucratic-political constraints and limitations under which today's principals work and pleads for a more realistic approach to our expectations of them. Like Gersten et al (1982), he suggests that we must not be carried away by the talent, energy and

vision of the extraordinary few individuals who work miracles. He observes (p. 23):

If their title retained substantive semantic meaning then principals might be able to live up to the inflated expectations that are held for them. But given the organizational reality of their position as relatively low-grade administrative officers in large complex bureaucracies it is both unrealistic and unfair to expect them to perform miracles.

Can the answer really be in the research evidence that suggests that the critical factor in running successful schools is neither the leader, nor the quality of leadership provided, but simply that certain critical functions be performed? This body of research appears to be too limited for us to accept its logical implications, namely the abolition of the headship in its present form. Much more research is needed on these issues to inform our understanding of the principalship and guide us in conceptualizing and operationalizing preparation programmes for heads and future heads.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Theoretical Background

The methodology used in this study is essentially naturalistic. Naturalistic techniques have been derived from different perspectives such as phenomenology, symbolic interactionism, grounded theory, ethnomethodology. This approach is fundamentally different from the scientific approach of the structural functionalist. Owens (1982), however, argues that both approaches are necessary and should not be seen as opposed to, but rather as complementary to one another in providing necessary educational data and insights.

Glaser and Straus (1967) stress that providing insightful, descriptive data and formulating concepts that are analytic and sensitizing are highly desirable and demand considerable study of one's data. Wilson (1977:254) states that the

... underlying principle guiding this kind of research is the assumption that individuals have meaning-structures that determine much of their behaviour.

Greenfield (1980) takes a similar stand when he expresses the view that a basic problem in the study of organizations is that of understanding human intentions and meanings.

Owens (1982:7) observes that naturalistic studies seek to

...illuminate social realities, human perceptions and organizational realities untainted by the intrusion of formal measurement procedures or re-ordering of the situation to fit the preconceived notions of the investigator.

He suggests that in order to assure both himself and others that the investigation was not misled by bias or various sources of error, and that the findings can therefore be accepted as credible interpretations of reality, the investigator should use multiple data-gathering techniques. Owens identifies four salient characteristics of naturalistic studies, viz:

1. They primarily employ direct contact between investigators and actors in the situation as a means of collecting data;
2. They use emergent strategies to design the study rather than a priori specification;
3. They develop data categories from examination of the data after collection; and
4. They do not attempt to generalize the findings to a universe beyond that bounded by the study.

Every effort will be made in carrying out the study to meet the essential requirements of naturalistic enquiries.

The Setting

Barbados is a small island-nation in the Caribbean. It has an area of 166 square miles and a population of over one quarter million people. For many years a colony in the British Empire, it gained independence in 1966. It remains a member of the Commonwealth and enjoys a democratic form of government.

There is a tradition of governmental involvement in education dating back to the 1830s, and currently about one-fifth of the government's total expenditure is devoted to education. Today there is free universal education at the primary level. Although the age of compulsory education goes from five to sixteen years, there are not enough places in the public secondary schools to accommodate all the children of secondary age. As a result, there is a common entrance examination (taken in the academic year in which the child attains the age of eleven) for entry to the secondary schools. Those children who do not gain a place in the non fee-paying, state schools, must continue their education in the all-age primary schools (composite schools) or seek admission to the private assisted secondary schools, if they can afford the fees. These private schools are also given substantial assistance by the government, which also grants bursaries for students whose performance merits them.

There are twenty-one public secondary schools in the nation. Nine of these have a long history, going back to a time when secondary education was available to only a small percentage of the population. These were the traditional grammar schools. With the spread of secondary education, particularly in the 1960s and 1970s, the new schools were built to cater to those who could not gain places in the grammar schools. These new schools were known first as secondary modern schools, then as comprehensive schools and later simply as newer secondary schools. There are twelve such schools. Whereas the grammar schools were controlled by an independent governing body, the newer schools were directly controlled by the Ministry of Education. The Education Act of 1981 has removed the distinction between the schools. They are all now referred to as secondary schools and are now under the control of Boards of Management with less power than the governing bodies. However, in the eyes of the public the erstwhile grammar schools are still prestigious schools and are chosen by parents as the ones their children should attend if they perform well enough to gain a place in the school of their choice in the common entrance examination.

The Sample

In naturalistic studies, the number of respondents is not the crucial factor. As Owens (p. 10) notes,

Whereas the rationalistic methodologist might pursue confirmation through the use of data from a number of subjects, the naturalistic methodologist often seeks to confirm through the intensive study of small groups or even an individual.

Blumberg and Greenfield (1980) put forward the idea of research that allows the comparing and contrasting of effective and typical principals as a fruitful area of investigation. They suggest that while the criteria used for discriminating between the effective and typical principals could be the application of sophisticated instruments of measurement, it might be as simple as asking for nominations from such groups as central office staff, teachers, or parents.

Two persons with intimate knowledge of secondary schools in Barbados were asked, quite independently, to classify the headteachers as effective or typical after careful discussion of the definition given above. One, a senior official from the Ministry of Education works closely with these schools, while the other, a former high-ranking Ministry official who had worked closely with the schools continues that close contact in his present post. There was surprising agreement, almost unanimity between

them. The odd case of disagreement was easily resolved.

A sample of seven schools (33.3 percent) from the public sector was decided on, and furthermore it was convenient to select three of the nine grammar (33.3 percent). Of the nine grammar schools, three headteachers were excluded because they were involved in litigation with the Ministry of Education and it was felt that this would get in the way of the research. Of the six remaining schools, two effective and one typical head were randomly drawn from a hat to form the sample from the grammar schools.

From the newer secondary group three schools were also omitted. In these schools, there were acting headteachers because the incumbents had just retired. In this group, by the same random means, two effective and two typical headteachers were selected. Altogether, there were three grammar and four newer secondary schools in the sample comprising four effective and three typical heads. There were four female and three male headteachers. The distribution is shown in Table 1.

TABLE 1
DISTRIBUTION OF SCHOOLS IN THE SAMPLE

	Effective		Typical		Total Sample	Total Population	% of Population
	M	F	M	F			
	Grammar	-	2	1			
Newer Secondary	1	1	1	1	4	12	33.3
TOTAL	1	3	2	1	7	21	33.3

The Respondents

All the respondents were over 45 years at the time of the study and all had extensive teaching experience. Brief individual profiles of each respondent are given below.

Headteacher A is female and unmarried. She holds a B.A. degree, a Certificate in Educational Administration and a Certificate in Education from the local teachers' college. She began her career as a primary school teacher and has had considerable experience in this area. She held the post of Deputy Headteacher in another secondary school for some six years before being promoted to the headship in her present school. Her school is a newer secondary co-educational institution situated in a suburban district.

Founded in 1961, it has a roll of 1227 students and 65 teachers. She was deemed a "typical" principal by both assessors.

Headteacher B is a married man. He has a B.A. and M.S. degrees, and a Certificate in Education from the local teachers' college. He was a primary school teacher for many years and then became an Education Officer before taking up his present post as headteacher. His school is a rural, co-educational one with a roll of 1180 children and 61 staff members. There was some hesitation as to whether he might have been considered effective, but he was eventually placed in the typical category.

Headteacher C holds the degree of B.Sc. and a Diploma in Educational Administration. His wide experience has been at the secondary level only but he has worked in different islands in the Caribbean. He has been deputy head and a headteacher for many years, although at the time of the study, he had been in the present school for just over two years. His school is a grammar school in the city. It has a roll of 800 boys and girls, and a staff of 50.

Headteacher D is the head of an urban co-educational grammar school. She is unmarried, with a long career in secondary school teaching. She has been deputy head for many years and a headteacher for some nine years in the same school. She holds the B.A. degree and a post-graduate

Certificate in Education. This headteacher is very active in professional and civic life. The school has a roll of 800 and a staff of 43.

Headteacher E is a married woman who leads a small girls grammar school in a country town. She has had a long career in teaching, most of it at her present school where she became deputy head before assuming the headship. She has a Certificate in Education from the local teachers' college, a B.Sc. and an Advanced Diploma in Guidance Counselling. The school has a roll of 543 and 29 teachers. At the time of the study, extensions were being carried out in preparation for the introduction of boys in the following academic year.

Headteacher F has been head of this rural, co-educational school from its inception in 1971. He is married and has a B.A. degree and a Certificate in Educational Management. There are 60 teachers and 1109 pupils in the school.

Headteacher G is an unmarried female with wide teaching experience at primary and secondary levels. She was a deputy headteacher in another secondary school and became head from the inception of her present school in 1978. She holds the degree of B.A. and a post-graduate Certificate in Education from a Scottish institution. Her school has a roll of 800 boys and girls and 43 teachers. It is in the city.

Research Design

The study is descriptive and exploratory. It was conceived as what Owens (1982:15) terms an "interactive process". As data were collected and analyzed they informed the further collection of data, suggesting "what to check, when to seek confirmation and how to extend the data collection". It was recognized that there are tremendous variations in the activities, pace of professional life and the nature and frequency of encounters in the work of headteachers over time. Although all these variations could not be fully captured in a study of this nature, every effort was made to get as near as possible to the true essence and flavour of their world.

Studies that limit themselves only to very short periods of observation and nothing else have limited value as reflections of the reality of the work-world of the headteacher. Rist (1975:91) is critical of studies of schooling that "utilized a single time-frame approach, more closely resembling the description of a still-life painting, than an on-going activity".

Owens, too, stresses the importance of collecting data over a period of time because it allows the investigator to enter more fully into the situation so that s/he is able to spot what is atypical, and distinguish the significant from the passing event. Owens (p. 14) asserts:

Time is essential to permit the researcher to shift from predispositions, through early impressions to a deeper level of understanding.

The study used a variety of techniques for gathering data--self-accounts, self-monitoring, observation, and interviews.

Data Collection and Analysis

Self-Accounts

Cohen and Manion (1980) observe that we see the world differently, yet we are able to explain our experiences and behaviour so as to share them and make them intelligible to others. The ethogenic approach of accounting is based upon a view of a person as a plan-making, self-monitoring agent, aware of goals and deliberately considering the best ways to achieve them.

Each respondent was asked to write about 4-6 pages on the topic "A Typical Year in my Experience as a Head-teacher" (Appendix 1). This invited the respondents to give their perception of their work over a typical year. It required them to describe those aspects and periods of their work which require a great deal of time and energy as well as those which they find satisfying or frustrating. In composing the instructions for the topic care was taken to be as neutral and brief as possible in order to avoid

guiding the respondents in any way.

It was felt that the essay would provide useful insights into what principals felt they did in their work in the schools. As they reflect on their work to provide a perspective, they would remember and highlight those things (actual or projected) that had some significance for them. This would provide useful insights into their perception of their world.

The analysis of their writing was essentially qualitative. Categories were developed from the data and similarities and differences among the respondents explored. The results of this analysis supplied some of the areas for investigation in the interviews.

Self-Monitoring

The study recognized the need to get a fuller and a truer picture of the headship than would come from depending on the heads' perception alone. It was deemed unwise, also, to use a short period of observation as the sole support for the essay in making judgements and coming to conclusions about the work of the headship. The device of "self-monitoring" was introduced to fill the gap and supplement the data.

Each respondent was provided with self-completion forms and asked to enter under the specified headings, the

details of each activity or event however brief or trivial, as soon as it occurred. This was done over a period of one week. Based on the findings of the "observation" and "diary-format" literature on the principalship, the form was designed to have the headteachers record the time and nature of the activity as well as the other actors involved in it, whether it was scheduled or not, the medium of the interaction (i.e. phone call, face-to-face) and the place where it took place. A specimen form is given in Appendix II.

Observation

Direct observation has been gaining popularity in studies of the school headship. Many writers support it as a legitimate research technique. Rist (1975: 92) says:

I believe that direct observation can make positive contributions to the study of the control of human behavior. Granted the problem of bias or preconception may be critical to the interpretation given in the data, nevertheless there will exist an account of the behavior relatively independent of the interpretation drawn from that account.

Rist further draws attention to problems of bias due to preconceived notions and selective perception that one must try to guard against.

The structured observation technique popularized by Mintzberg's (1973) study of business executives and used by

others (Casey 1980, Martin 1980, Pitner 1979) in the study of educational settings was employed.

Mintzberg (1975: 231) discusses the operation in these terms:

Each observed event (i.e. a verbal contact or a piece of incoming or outgoing mail) is categorized by the researcher in a number of ways (for example, duration, participants, purpose) as in the diary method but with one important difference. The categories are developed during the observation and after it takes place. In his coding process, not by standing literature, or his own past experience but by the simple event taking place before him.

This was the approach of the present study as well. Martin notes that Pitner in her study separated out managerial from non-managerial behaviour. He himself rejected this separation since his study had as its central theme the nature of the principal's work. Similarly, the present study was concerned to discover how headteachers spend their time and therefore did not make this distinction.

It is stressed that the non-participant observer must maintain a neutral posture and make every effort not to have an impact upon the social system he is investigating. Martin (1980: 80) explained his own efforts in his study thus:

Every effort, short of blatant violation of social etiquette was made to adhere to the neutral role and avoid entering into an activity and thus risk structuring the very behaviours that

were the subject of the investigation.

This researcher had very similar experiences. On many occasions the respondents tried very hard to draw him into the activity. His resistance was, however, never misconstrued.

The observation covered a period of three days. It was generally carried out during the first, second and last days of the same week. Identical forms to those used for the self-monitoring stage were used in the observation as the information was collected for the same purpose. Although the analysis was informed by the findings of the literature, different categories had to be established to fit the experiences encountered.

Interviews

Cohen and Manion (1980) cite three purposes for which the interview as a distinctive research technique may be used, and each of these was applied in the present study. Firstly, it may be used as an information gathering device, providing insight into what a person knows, likes or dislikes (their values) and thinks (attitudes and beliefs). Secondly, it can be used in testing or generating hypotheses or as an explanatory device. And thirdly, it may be used with other methods or to probe more deeply into the reasons and motivations respondents have for responding as they do.

The structured interview with open-ended items was the technique employed in this final section of the research. Kerlinger (1970) has suggested that open-ended items simply supply a frame of reference for respondents' answers, but put a minimum of restraint on the answers and their expressions. The use of the open-ended questions allows some flexibility, permitting the interviewer to probe more deeply, to seek clarification as he proceeds, and so, to make a truer assessment of what the respondent really believes.

Informed by the findings of relevant literature and more particularly by an initial analysis of the data from the earlier stages of this research the researcher prepared a set of questions for all the respondents. He was able, however, to make full use of the flexibility and freedom that inhere in the technique.

The interviews were recorded on cassette tape but the researcher also made full notes on the interview schedule (Appendix II).

Presentation and Analysis of the Data

Naturalistic studies are concerned with what Geertz (1973) calls "thick description". Thick description is not merely informative or descriptive data. It represents an attempt that figuratively takes the reader there, right

into the situation with a feeling of insight and understanding of the facts, events and contacts the participants experience. It takes account of the personal and social values that influence behaviour and therefore helps to explain it.

In the interest of faithfulness to thick description, the data have been presented as fully as possible. The essays have been given completely and in their original form (except for Principal E whose submission of over fifty pages instead of the requested four to six pages was deemed unusable). Information from the interviews is presented under two major headings--part A--What a Principal Should Do, and part B--The Principalship As S/He Experiences It. Part B is further broken down into the four sub-sections, namely:

1. General Description of the Principalship;
2. Leadership and Decisions;
3. Educational Leadership Issues;
4. Reactions to the Principalship.

The data from the self-monitored and observation phases were separately analyzed by putting the activities into categories that arise out of the data themselves. For each set of activities, the total number of times it was performed and the amount and percentage of time devoted to it were calculated. It was, thus, also possible to

determine the average time per day spent on the job and the average duration of each activity the principal performed.

A further analysis of the data was carried out along three other dimensions. Firstly, the number of activities and the amount and percentage of time spent on scheduled and unscheduled activities were calculated and compared. A similar exercise was carried out for those activities performed in the office and those away from the office. Finally, the activities and times were analyzed to show when the principal was alone, and when s/he was interacting with other members of the school community or with people not directly connected with the school.

Following these individual presentations on each principal, an attempt has been made to bring together the information on the principals as a group. This analysis is done by drawing on all data-sources employed to answer the basic research question on which the study was focused.

The report is carefully documented, providing corroboration from multiple sources as a basis for its judgements and conclusions. Scrupulous care has been taken over issues of confidentiality and trust both in obtaining information and in reporting it. Thick descriptions of the respondents as well as similarities and differences have been provided. Patterns and trends in the work world of the secondary head have been discussed and avenues for further investigation have been opened up.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF DATA ON EACH HEADTEACHER

HEADTEACHER A

The Self-Account

My experience as a Headteacher is very limited since I have only had one full year as a Headteacher.

That year was a very trying one since I was not only taking up a new post but in a plant that was completely new to me.

First thing I had to do was trying to learn the Staff both teaching and non-teaching that I had to work with.

This entailed having formal introductions through a series of meetings set up very early in the year. Through these meetings the opportunity was afforded to learn of any traditions and philosophy which were established. This was further enhanced by informal meetings and chats as I move around the school compound and chatting with persons while doing so.

I too had my philosophy and it was a matter of making this known and then working out strategies whereby this philosophy could be executed.

This led to having a series of meetings and discussions regularly.

Meetings

These take up a great proportion of the year's activities. These meetings can be divided into internal meetings and external meetings.

Internal meetings are those with the Administration Staff which consist of the Deputy Head, Senior Teachers and Heads of Department who are the persons that advise me and with whom I discuss ideas and they in turn are responsible for executing these ideas and feeding back to me any ideas.

Then there are the meetings with the full teaching staff which take place once per month during each term.

Meetings are also held at least once per term with the Casual Staff and Janitorial Staff.

These meetings are usually planned and therefore everyone can be prepared for them, but there are internal ad hoc meetings which also have to be called when it is noticed that there are problems which may be the concern of a majority of persons or there may be individual problems and hence the need for having meetings with individuals from time to time.

In addition to these meetings, there are meetings with Board of Management either in full or in various committees. The committee that meets fairly frequently is that of the discipline committee. This committee handled

serious disciplinary problems of students.

Other meetings are Parent-Teacher's Association Meetings which are held every third Sunday in the month with committee meetings coming before the General Meeting.

Then there is a number of external meetings:--Meetings with the Ministry of Education on various matters, meetings of Allocations Committee for selection to Secondary School, and other association meetings of one sort or another.

As said previously these meetings take up considerable time and hence classroom visits are very minimal. Hence the opportunity is lost for really being in contact with the teacher and student in the teaching/learning situation which one may consider very vital.

Invitations

Over the course of the year a series of invitations are received for various kinds of functions:--Speech days, Graduations, Official Openings, Seminars, Lectures etc. These also are an integral part of the year's activities.

Disciplinary Problems

Students problems: Although Senior Teachers are assigned to each year group with the responsibility of assisting with students problems and discipline, yet a great many of these problems find their way to my office.

This at times leads not only to talking to the student but having to invite parents to come in and see me on some matters. In addition there are those parents who come in without previous appointments to see me on matters related to their children and I have to try to fit them into my scheme of things.

Correspondence

There are various types of correspondence which come into school that have to be read and some action to be taken or comment to be made. This correspondence comes not only from the Ministry of Education but from parents, other schools both locally and overseas and private institutions.

Then there is the Outgoing Mail either in reply to Incoming Mail or correspondence that is generated from within the institution on a number of matters.

Visits

The Headteacher finds herself having to accommodate a number of visitors to the school in addition to the parents which were mentioned previously.

The visits also may be planned or not planned. It is the unplanned visits which really can be frustrating, for then you find that your schedule may have to be readjusted

or some other things are left undone.

There are other routine things which the Headteacher also does. She conducts full assembly of students every Monday morning. This gives her the opportunity to talk to the students on a number of matters that are of concern to them or which she may be concerned about.

In addition, the Headteacher has a teaching timetable which can really be interrupted by Administrative and Managerial problems with which she may be confronted from time to time.

These things mentioned so far are ongoing throughout the whole year, but there are other things that are done during specific periods of the year.

The first term of the year which begins in September is always one of implementing new ideas and adjusting timetables which were previously done. New teachers may join the Staff and it means having an orientation period with them in a general manner before passing them on to the various Heads of Departments and Senior Teachers who will brief them in their specific areas.

New students are also coming in and they too may be having difficulty and hence teachers and students may want to have the Headteacher's opinion.

This is the term when some examination entries have to be in and educational statistics have to be done. Although

the Headteacher does not do these things personally, yet she has to see that the guidelines are there to be followed and the final signature of these things are there to be done.

The second term of the School Year is one where sports of one kind or another take place. This entails planning for disruption of the regular timetable and making alternative arrangements. The Deputy Headteacher actually does the alternative arrangements but this is done after consultation with the Headteacher.

During the third term all kinds of planning for the following school year has to be done.

This term is referred to as the examination term since external and internal examinations take place during this term.

The first examination that one is confronted with during this term is the Common Entrance Examination.

It is during this term also that planning for the new school year takes place.

Therefore there are a series of discussions which take place with Heads of Departments both collectively and individually and with senior teachers in order to get curriculum and organization for the new year prepared.

The above account as listed may seem to be very simple and one may get the idea that the life of a Headteacher is

simple, but this does not tell of the horrors and conflicts that are encountered as you are in discussion. It does not tell of the frustration when plans have been made and the implementation of these plans are thwarted in one way or another by persons whom you least expect.

There are some redeeming features though, when you see achievement in goals set or when you are complimented for some job well done.

The Observed and Self-Monitored Phases

During the three day observation period Headteacher A spent 1294 minutes (21.6 hours) on the job giving an average day of 431.3 minutes (7.2 hours). During this time, however, only 1147.5 minutes (19.1 hours) were devoted to behaviour that was observable and thus could be recorded and analyzed. This period of 1147.5 minutes was deemed "engaged" time to distinguish it from "on-the-job" time, and all calculations were based on "engaged" time.

The average working day was therefore 382.5 minutes (6.4 hours, and during this time 142 distinct activities took place. These activities were classified under sixteen different sets of tasks. Five types of tasks--administration (31.9 percent), teaching (17.2 percent), personal matters (10 percent) student disciplinary matters (9.4 percent) and staff meetings (7.8 percent)--accounted for

the major portion--76 percent of the headteacher's time. On average, each activity lasted 8 minutes. Table 2 gives the full details of the tasks and activities performed, and the time devoted to them.

TABLE 2 - HEADTEACHER A
DETAILS OF TASKS AND ACTIVITIES (OBSERVED PHASE)

TASKS	NO. OF ACTIVITIES	TIME (MINUTES)	% TIME
Administration+	66	367	32.0
Exchanges	10	21.5	1.9
Assembly	2	45	3.9
Phone	16	38.5	3.4
Teaching	4	197.5	17.2
Monitoring	7	35.5	3.1
Tour	3	35	3.1
Correspondence	6	18	1.6
Visitor	2	5	0.4
Instructional	3	11.5	1.0
Student Discipline	13	108	9.4
Personal	4	115	10.0
Staff Meeting	1	90	7.8
Planning	1	40	3.5
Ancillary	2	14	1.2
Student Welfare	2	6	0.5
16	142	1147.5	100.0
AVERAGE TIME PER ACTIVITY 8.1 MINUTES			

+ See Appendix 4 for explanation of the categories used in analyzing the data.

Table 3 shows how the headteachers' time was spent when analyzed according to type (scheduled or unscheduled), location (office vs. non-office), and interaction with the

school community, the outside world, or when she was alone.

TABLE 3 - CLASSIFICATION OF HEADTEACHER A'S WORK TIME
(OBSERVED PHASE)

	TYPE FRAME		LOCATION FRAME		INTERACTION FRAME		
	Sched- uled	Un- sched- uled	Office	Non Office	School Com- munity	Out- side	Alone
Time	740.5	407	824	323.5	675.5	61	411
%	64.5	35.5	71.8	28.2	58.9	5.3	35.8
Activ- ities	45	97	122	20	100	8	34
%	31.7	68.3	85.9	14.1	70.4	5.6	23.9
TOTAL TIME = 1147.5 MINUTES				TOTAL ACTIVITIES = 142			

It is clear that this headteacher spent more than half of her time on tasks that she had planned, even though she performed more than twice as many activities of an unscheduled nature. She spent more than 70 percent of her time in her office and found herself in an interactive situation for more than 64 percent of the time. Most of her interactions involved members of the immediate and extended school community. Contact with the outside community was limited to just 5 percent of her time.

During the self-monitored period the average daily

time on the job was recorded as 497.4 minutes. However, the analysis of the record demonstrates that the average "engaged" time was merely 344 minutes (5.7 hours). Thirteen different types of tasks were performed and these required only 93 separate activities on the headteacher's part. The average time per activity was therefore 18.5 minutes. During this period meetings and administration accounted for 67.4 percent of the headteacher's time and in addition, only instructional matters (9.7 percent), teaching (4.9 percent), student discipline (4.8 percent), and personal matters (4.7 percent) featured in any reasonable way. The full details are given in Table 4.

TABLE 4 - HEADTEACHER A

DETAILS OF TASKS AND ACTIVITIES (SELF-MONITORED PHASE)

TASKS	NO. OF ACTIVITIES	TIME (MINUTES)	% TIME
Assembly	1	37	2.2
Administration	43	497	28.9
Phone	8	28	1.6
Tour	1	37	2.2
Student Discipline	12	83	4.8
Teaching	4	84	4.9
Correspondence	3	10	0.6
Meeting	5	663	38.5
Personal	1	81	4.7
Monitoring	1	12	0.7
Ancillary	3	10	0.6
Student Welfare	1	12	0.7
Instructional	8	166	9.7
13	93	1720	100
AVERAGE TIME PER ACTIVITY 18.5 MINUTES			

While the headteacher was involved in an equal number of scheduled and unscheduled activities, over 81 percent of her time was spent on scheduled tasks. For over 70 percent of the activities and 65 percent of the time, she was located in her office and the definite inside focus shown during the observed period continued, and in fact increased as over 65 percent of her time and 72 percent of her activities centred on persons within the school community. As Table 5 shows, there is a noticeable increase in the headteacher's contact with the wider community.

TABLE 5 - CLASSIFICATION OF HEADTEACHER A'S WORK TIME
(SELF-MONITORED PHASE)

	TYPE FRAME		LOCATION FRAME		INTERACTION FRAME		
	Sched- uled	Un- sched- uled	Office	Non Office	School Com- munity	Out- side	Alone
Time	1390	330	1125	595	1132.5	372.5	215
%	80.8	19.2	65.4	34.6	65.8	21.7	12.5
Activ- ities	47	46	74	19	68	10	15
%	50.5	49.5	79.6	20.4	73.1	10.8	16.1
TOTAL TIME = 1720 MINUTES				TOTAL ACTIVITIES = 93			

The Interview

What a Headteacher Should Do (Items 1 - 4)

A headteacher must operate within both the administrative-managerial and the educational leadership dimensions of the role, without attempting to separate them or emphasize one at the expense of the other. He should have and use a philosophy of education derived from his experience, in determining how the school should be run, but not to the extent that it creates problems and conflicts. A headteacher should not be burdened with routine classroom teaching but should visit classrooms and observe teaching in order to understand and appreciate the problems teachers face.

The Headship As She Experiences It

Part I General Description (Items 5 - 15)

For her, the headship centres on directing and guiding the general body of the school, advising personnel, the disciplining and controlling of students, the supervision of staff and the management and maintenance of the building and plant. There was no substantive difference between the reality of the headship and her vision of it prior to her being a headteacher. She had anticipated that teachers would have been more resistant to ideas and pupils would have refused to accept discipline. She interacts regularly

with Senior Staff (i.e. Deputy Headteacher, Heads of Department and Year Heads), students, junior staff and ancillary staff. The tasks she finds herself having to perform on a regular basis are handling correspondence, dealing with student disciplinary matters, compiling statistics and reports for the Ministry of Education and supervising ancillary staff. It is the latter, the supervision of ancillary staff, that she would unhesitatingly give up, but could think of no new tasks she would want to take on.

Student disciplinary matters, classroom supervision, and the supervision of ancillary staff were seen as the areas that took up most of her time, and the supervision of ancillary staff was considered the least important aspect of her work. On the other hand, providing educational leadership i.e. planning and implementing ideas and suggestions so that the school could achieve satisfactorily, was perceived to be of paramount importance. Unfortunately, however, other demands on her time, lack of resources and lack of space made it very difficult to implement ideas and operate in the sphere of educational leadership.

It is precisely because of these difficulties that her planning is short-term. If long-term projections were made they would fail. Short-term planning is very necessary in the circumstances and quite a lot of it is done.

Part II - Leadership and Decision (Items 16 - 19)

She describes her leadership style as a mixture of the democratic and authoritarian. Sometimes she discusses matters with staff and sets up committees to examine issues and make suggestions; but there are also times when she makes decisions and issues orders without either discussion or explanation. Her major decisions are made in the area of organizational planning i.e. the use of limited resources, establishing priorities, the content of the school curriculum and the deployment of staff. Her minor decisions relate to forms of punishment; she has to ensure that the punishment matches the misdemeanour and that staff, student and self are satisfied that there was fair treatment. She also has to make changes in the daily schedules to meet the exigencies of the circumstances e.g. rain. Two problems that surface sufficiently frequently are student discipline problems and "teachers not presenting themselves at classes for whatever reason".

Part III - Educational Leadership Issues (Items 20 - 24)

Staff development was the concern of the Heads of Department who had the responsibility of identifying problems and helping wherever possible. Staff were also encouraged to attend meetings and seminars. The tone and general climate of the school was far from what was desired.

The children tended to be very boisterous and this was difficult to control. Though the noise level tended to fall during actual teaching, it was still too high, and especially in practical lessons.

Her expectations for her students are that they will take pride in themselves, that they will develop correct attitudes to life (work, study and play) and that each will strive to reach the goals for which she/he has the potential and aptitude. She pointed out that the students were not strong academically and that their attitudes in particular were bad. These factors made achievement of expectations a difficult task. The main forum for communicating her expectations to the school was through talks at the school assembly, but she also expected staff to pass them on as they came into contact with pupils in different spheres of activity. Judging from their attitudes and reactions, she was persuaded that she was not succeeding in making these expectations understood by the majority of students.

With respect to the staff, her hope is that they would take pride in their work and translate it into concern for the welfare of the children. Staff meetings and individual discussions were the means used for communicating these expectations to them and she felt she had succeeded with the majority of them.

To cater to the various needs of the students there is a general curriculum for all students in the first two years. After that, students choose from a wide range of subjects, those that fit into their future plans and for which they have shown some aptitude. Parents and students are given guidance by the staff in making their choices.

The responsibility of ensuring that the teaching-learning process is properly carried out is given to the Heads of Department, but there are no set structures or provisions for doing this.

Her score on the perceived importance of the fifteen items of questions 24 was 4.07 compared to that of 2.6 for the perceived emphasis she herself manages to give them in her work. In all but two instances where the rating is the same she rated her performance below the perceived importance of the item. It is interesting to observe the items she rated below 4 in importance:

5. Observing staff to learn their strengths and weaknesses for positive action;
6. Trying out ideas and suggestions put forward by others;
7. Attempting to involve parents in their children's education;
11. Actively undertaking classroom observation of lessons;

15. Promoting discussion on various teaching methods and approaches.

Part IV--Reactions to the Headship

She confidently asserted that she was able to run the school as she wanted and felt supported by a core of cooperative staff, and a Parent Teachers' Association (P.T.A.) that was working in the interest of the school. There were, however, some inhibiting factors. Many students and some staff consistently failed to meet standards of dress, work and behaviour which the school tried to set, and the home often did not back up the school. There were agencies outside the school that impinged on education and inhibited the work of the school. In this regard the Education Act was cited but no elaboration was offered.

Anything that improved the image of the school (e.g. some achievement in the field of sports, a word of praise or a thank you from a parent or student) was a source of satisfaction to her. Student failure to attempt to improve their behaviour and general standards, as well as the failure of staff to carry out decisions, caused her dissatisfaction and frustration. She pointed out that she experienced more feelings of frustration than satisfaction.

Headteacher A claims she spends on average 54 hours weekly on school and school-related matters. She felt that

she spent too much time on school matters and wondered whether this was due to bad planning or bad delegating.

HEADTEACHER B

The Self-Account

My experience is very limited, having applied for the post in 1981 early and being appointed in September, 1982. The deputy had also applied and he too was considered for appointment. He acted for over one year in the position of Headteacher of the school.

During this one year experience, the 'new' Education Act was proclaimed and new Boards of Management of nine members replaced the Governing Bodies (of varying sizes) of secondary schools.

The task which I consider of greatest importance is: the defining, teaching and evaluation of the programmes taught. This I conceive as being done in conjunction with the Heads of Departments. This presumes that these Heads have given deep and serious thought to the reasons why programmes are taught and have defined these (maybe after discussions with teachers in their subject area(s)). These discussions, too, will help in the weighting to be given to the subjects on the timetable. Obviously I believe that occasionally each school should start with a clean slate and allow Heads of Departments to justify the inclusion of

their subjects in a compulsory list or an optional list of subjects. This justification should be done in the presence of all other Heads of Departments and senior teachers. Also included in the justification should be suggestions for:

- (a) aims of programme;
- (b) methods of achieving the aims;
- (c) methods of evaluating the degree of achievement aims;
- (d) opportunity (specification) for review of programme in the light of (a) to (c) above where success/failure could be identified and the way ahead redefined.

Other areas of great importance are those which spring from the above. For instance, the Education Act 1981 under which we operate, does not specifically define the priority areas listed above as the Headteacher's domain. Hence, this cannot be done if the Board of Management is not in agreement with it. This then implies that the interpretation of duties by the Board and Headteacher as written into the Education Act is of paramount importance.

During this past year the new Board which came into existence and under a chairman who had not been chairman of the earlier governing body (though she was a member) was feeling its way forward and was not willing to give any

power which it foresaw as its own to the Headteacher. This made it necessary for the Headteacher to tread cautiously in the "grey" areas.

The areas of activity of the Board and the Headteacher must be defined by the parties for smooth working and to avoid waste of time.

Structures for the improvement of staff to realize goals set is an area too of importance which must be taken care of if functioning of the institution is to follow the lines defined earlier. This too will involve participation of Heads of Departments and senior teachers. All staff have persons who could be used as resource persons for such. Training and assistance could then be sought from other sources in the community. This of course calls for an approach which espouses the need to appreciate the skills available and maximize their use (fully well noting the skills do not necessarily reside with the senior administrators of the institution).

The time spent on activities for the year shows different emphasis from that defined as desirable. Those activities which took inordinate time are:

- (i) Meeting parents
- (ii) Disciplinary matters with students
- (iii) Administration--responding to letters,
collecting data

- (iv) Supervising ancillary staff
- (v) Encouraging teachers to do their tasks.

It may be necessary to expand on (i) - (v) above:

- (i) Meeting parents. This may be parents' request because of dissatisfaction of student progress, or student behaviour, or student interpersonal relations with staff/pupils. It may also be at the request of the school to discuss the students' progress, behaviour, attendance or other. In this school, I find teachers, senior teachers, heads of departments too unwilling to proceed to invite parents to discuss student problems. They rather would ask the head to invite the parents in to discuss a matter of which he may be totally ignorant.
- (ii) Disciplinary matters with students. As (i) above teachers are prone to send students to the office for matters which could be resolved at the teacher or senior teacher level or even Deputy level. At one stage, the deputy had to be requested NOT to send students to the office for the head to deal with them. Indeed some students have stated that the deputy is afraid to administer corporal punishment.
- (iii) When the deputy is requested to perform certain

chores he excuses himself, e.g. although he was chief person in making timetables, if a change is to be made where a teacher is to teach another period he requests the head to alert the teacher--even though this teacher may be teaching less than 30 periods a week. Some teachers when asked to reply to a request (by letter/circular) will not write the letter of reply but will jot down the data for reply. The letter then has to be written by the Head-teacher/Secretary. This is usually done as one way to involve the persons more fully in the operation of the institution.

- (iv) Supervising ancillary staff. I would wish to hand this one to the deputy or other senior teacher but before I came here these persons have been taking much time (because of their disagreements--some personal) and I do not wish to hand them over to another with this state of affairs still operative.
- (v) Encouraging teachers to do their tasks. I find that many teachers here are not alert to a higher level of operation--we see other schools as better than ours and we do not see ourselves as being responsible for this. We see the

students, parents, board, physical facilities, support staff, anyone else as being responsible for our unsatisfactory condition and performance, e.g. we agreed in staff meetings that students should stand whenever a teacher enters a room, but then two weeks later one teacher complains that apparently others have not acted on that decision and so he wonders if he should insist on this behaviour. This teacher is a trained graduate teacher of 20 years experience! I see this as a method of giving a teacher an opportunity to control his class from the time he enters the class as children tend to talk less when they stand. Again teacher reporting on students has to be very specific as it may be the only communication parents have from the school for a whole term! This is not seen as very important!

As I said at the beginning, this is the result of a very limited experience--1 year. I hope you find it useful.

The Observed and Self-Monitored Phases

This headteacher spent a total of 1470 minutes on the job in the three days of observation. However, the actual

engaged time amounted to 1356.5 minutes (22.6 hours), giving an average working day of 355.7 minutes 5.9 hours but it must be noticed that he took no personal time during the working day.

He performed 161 activities and carried out twelve different types of tasks. On average he spent 8.4 minutes on each activity. Administrative tasks accounted for 79 of the activities and required 42.2 percent of his time. Over 23 percent of the time was taken up with student disciplinary matters which also were responsible for 43 percent of the total number of activities. The third highest proportion of time was used in teaching activities, with 'touring' being a close fourth. Table 6 provides a picture of the tasks, the number of activities and the time devoted to them.

As shown in Table 7, scheduled tasks took up 66.7 percent of the headteacher's time but only just over 37 percent of his activities. By contrast, unscheduled tasks required 62 percent of his activities but only about one third of his time. Comparatively very few tasks took the headteacher away from his office. He performed 82 percent of his activities there and used up some 60 percent of his time. Most of his time was spent interacting with personnel within the school community (67.2 percent) or alone (23.7 percent), with only 9 percent with persons not connected to the school.

TABLE 6 - HEADTEACHER B

DETAILS OF TASKS AND ACTIVITIES (OBSERVED PHASE)

TASKS	NO. OF ACTIVITIES	TIME (MINUTES)	% TIME
Administration	79	572	42.2
Assembly	1	22	1.6
Student Discipline	42	313.5	23.1
Phone	12	27.5	2.0
Travel	1	50	3.7
Tour	5	104	7.7
Teaching	3	144	10.6
Instructional	3	34	2.5
Exchanges	7	10.5	0.8
Ancillary	6	33	2.4
Teacher Appraisal	1	22	1.6
Discussion	1	24	1.8
12	161	1356.5	100.0
AVERAGE TIME PER ACTIVITY 8.4 MINUTES			

TABLE 7 - CLASSIFICATION OF HEADTEACHER B'S WORK TIME

(OBSERVED PHASE)

	TYPE FRAME		LOCATION FRAME		INTERACTION FRAME		
	Sched- uled	Un- sched- uled	Office	Non Office	School Com- munity	Out- side	Alone
Time	905	451.5	825	531.5	912	122.5	322
%	66.7	33.3	60.8	39.2	67.2	9.0	23.7
Activ- ities	61	100	133	28	128	13	20
%	37.9	62.1	82.6	17.4	79.5	8.1	12.4
TOTAL TIME = 1356.5 MINUTES				TOTAL ACTIVITIES = 161			

TABLE 8 - HEADTEACHER B

DETAILS OF TASKS AND ACTIVITIES (SELF-MONITORED PHASE)

TASKS	NO. OF ACTIVITIES	TIME (MINUTES)	% TIME
Administration	19	223	12.4
Assembly	3	45	2.5
Tour	3	60	3.3
Teaching	8	273	15.2
Student Discipline	19	335	18.7
Phone	8	108	6.0
Correspondence	3	23	1.3
Ancillary	3	95	5.3
Staff Meeting	2	230	12.8
Planning	1	10	0.6
Student Welfare	4	66	3.7
Interview	2	155	8.6
Monitoring	1	17	0.9
Instructional	2	10	0.6
Teacher Appraisal	1	23	1.3
Budget	4	120	6.7
16	83	1793	99.9
AVERAGE TIME PER ACTIVITY 21.6 MINUTES			

TABLE 9 - CLASSIFICATION OF HEADTEACHER B'S WORK TIME

(SELF-MONITORED PHASE)

	TYPE FRAME		LOCATION FRAME		INTERACTION FRAME		
	Sched- uled	Un- sched- uled	Office	Non Office	School Com- munity	Out- side	Alone
Time	1171	622	1170	623	1352	190	251
%	65.3	34.7	65.2	34.7	75.4	10.6	14.0
Activ- ities	43	40	58	25	63	5	15
%	51.8	48.2	69.9	30.1	75.9	6.0	18.1
TOTAL TIME = 1793 MINUTES				TOTAL ACTIVITIES = 83			

During the self-monitoring phase Headteacher B recorded an average on-the-job day of 430 minutes and an engaged average day of 358.6 minutes. Again, there was no record of personal time. During the total engaged time of 1793 minutes he recorded 83 activities, giving an average time per activity of 21.6 minutes.

He was engaged in sixteen different types of tasks. Four of these tasks accounted for more than half of the headteacher's time. At the top of the list is student discipline, using up 18.7 percent of his time. The other three are teaching (15.2 percent), staff meetings (12.8 percent), and administration (12.4 percent). The full details are given in Table 8.

Headteacher B spent substantially more of his time on scheduled (65.3 percent) than on unscheduled (34.7 percent) activities. Similarly, some 65 percent of his time was spent in the office as contrasted with 34.7 percent in activities away from the office. Again, in this period he had very little contact with non-school personnel, the concentration being heavily internal. Table 9 gives the full details.

The Interview

What a Headteacher Should Do (Items 1 - 4)

No, the definition did not adequately cover the tasks of the headship. He felt that a headteacher should have a

large say in determining the direction his teachers should go and in molding their growth accordingly. However, taken as they are, he considered the tasks complementary and therefore that neither one should be considered for greater emphasis than the other. It goes without saying that a headteacher would have a philosophy and a set of values that would determine the way his school is organized. This, however, must be in harmony with the general position of the community and also other agencies, for example, the Ministry of Education would have inputs to make. He was definitely in favour of a headteacher teaching at set times and places on the timetable, because it was the only way of keeping in touch with reality. Heads should be required to visit and observe classroom teaching so that they can collect their own evidence for the purpose of reporting. They should visit particularly those teachers who have given cause for concern to the Heads of Departments.

The Headship As He Experiences It

Part 1 - General Description (Items 5 - 15)

He saw himself as a manager of plant and resources, whose role was essentially to coordinate these human and material resources for student growth and learning. In essence, the job in actuality is not really different from the way he had envisaged it, except that he had thought teachers would be easier to reason with. Teachers were

crucial to the teaching-learning situation and should therefore be willing to change if approached properly. He was disappointed at the lack of professional behaviour on their part. His regular interactions were with his secretary, the Deputy Head, the Heads of Departments and the Year Heads, the Secretary-Treasurer of the Board of Management, students, teachers and the ancillary staff. He interacted with parents only occasionally outside of the P.T.A. monthly meeting. These apart, he met occasionally with Ministry officials and the Board members.

Correspondence, meetings and discussions with the administrative staff, teaching, and student discipline matters were the tasks he performed on a regular basis. Correspondence and testimonials and transcripts, reports and statistics for the Ministry, letters to parents, Board, Ministry etc., re student discipline--drew exceptional reaction. The supervision of ancillary staff and the handling of trivial student matters are two functions he feels he should not have to perform. While there are no new areas he feels as headteacher he should undertake, there is a strong desire on his part to see some uncertainties in the role clarified.

Teaching, correspondence and attending meetings accounted for most of his time. It was not surprising that the supervision of ancillary staff, dealing with trivial student matters and attending most Board of Management

meetings were deemed to be the least important aspects of the job. Tasks related to student development--both instruction and training--were seen as of paramount importance to the headship. Unfortunately so much time and energy had to be expended on 'things not nearly as important' e.g. ancillary staff, trivial disciplinary matters and resolving staff conflict, that he was quite unable to devote time to this important area. Nor was it possible to find the resources either, because the plant was in such a run-down, unsanitary state and lacking in furniture and equipment that valuable funds had to be turned in this direction.

Planning tended to concentrate on the short-term because "trying to put things right requires attention on the short-term, the now".

Part II - Leadership and Decision (Items 16 - 19)

The staff would describe him as an autocratic leader, but he considers that he leaves it to them to do things their way, especially the administrative staff. He discusses issues with them but leaves matters in their hands. He however, reserves the right to question, to change decisions if he feels a position cannot be defended. Often after leaving matters to them he discovers that they have refused to make decisions, to take action and the ball is then thrown right back into his court.

His most important decisions are in the areas of staff

appointments (selecting the right person), curricular matters, allocation and use of resources and the selection of prefects. The assigning of rooms and classes, the deployment of teachers and parent counselling are among his minor decisions. The frequent problems he has to deal with are student disciplinary problems, ancillary staff problems and teacher attitudes. Matters relating to parents, the functioning of the administrative staff and problems relating to security of the plant are occasional problem areas.

Part III - Educational Leadership Issues (Items 20 - 24)

Staff development is catered for in 3 ways:

1. Some staff meetings discuss the characteristics of a good teacher
2. Teachers are observed in their teaching and help is offered as needed
3. Departments are encouraged to discuss issues and problems and set up relevant programmes to deal with them.

The school is noisy even during class time. Movement about the school between changes of periods, after morning assembly and at break times is noisy and ragged. But this is a friction area. While the head considers it a matter of grave concern about which something should be done, the staff is complacent, considering it of no importance. He wants orderly movement. He tries to get the prefects to

help but they do not get the support of the staff.

His expectations for his pupils are that they will develop as people fit to take their place in society, demanding respect by virtue of who and what they are. Acquiring academic qualifications is secondary. Through the school rules, occasional notices and reminders, talks at morning assembly and talks to groups and individuals, he tries to keep these expectations constantly before them. In his opinion the pupils have begun to understand and to respond positively.

With regard to staff he would like to see them become more professional, and more cooperative and move in the same direction in the interest of the school. He discusses these issues at staff meetings and with individuals and though some progress has been made many of them do not see the value of what he is trying to do.

The curriculum is constantly discussed and reviewed and students' desires are taken into account when options are being considered. Heads of departments are required to supply programmes for all forms in all subjects and to use common examinations in parallel forms. The head examines the end of year mark sheets and raises issues with the relevant persons.

His rating of the items on question 24 was as follows:

Perceived importance 4, Perceived performance 3.

On 6 of the items, headteacher B's perception of the importance and that of his performance were equally rated. On the other 9 his performance fell below the perceived importance. He did not value the following items very highly:

7. Attempting to involve parents in their children's education;
8. Viewing parents as possible source of help in achieving the goals of the school;
9. Seeking to create and maintain good interpersonal relations between the various elements of the school community;
10. Defining the situation, rather than leaving it to others to do so;
11. Actively undertaking classroom observation of lessons.

Part IV--Reactions to the Headship (Items 25-28)

Headteacher B was not able to run the school the way he wanted because of opposition from groups within the staff. In some cases the persons involved simply held a different perspective but in many cases, it was simple opposition to the Head.

When students react positively to what the head is trying to do, when teachers give support, when parents call

to express appreciation or the view that there have been changes for good in the school, then he experiences satisfaction. On the contrary, negative student reactions, teacher unwillingness to cooperate and carry out the rules, teacher double standards, all bring dissatisfaction and frustration.

His estimated weekly time on work and work-related activities was 48 hours.

HEADTEACHER C

The Self-Account

For the purpose of this exercise I shall start at the beginning of the first term of the academic year, the Michaelmas term.

The most important staff meeting of the year is convened at which policy for the ensuing year is discussed.

CXC and Cambridge examination results invariably arrive late in August. Staff opinions are sought so that pupils who should repeat 5th and upper 6th forms may be identified. Examination results are analyzed.

The first few weeks are devoted to ensuring, in collaboration with Senior staff and Department Heads that first Formers settle satisfactorily, that the Time Table presents no problems and that new staff find their feet. The prefect body is also monitored.

Extra-curricular activities are discussed with staff involved.

Fifth-formers and Lower 6th Formers are enjoined to be diligent.

In the Michaelmas Term, appreciable numbers of 6th formers apply for entry to Universities in the U.K., the U.S.A., and Canada. A considerable amount of time is spent in the preparation of transcripts and recommendations and there is a significant carry-over into the Hilary Term.

In the Michaelmas Term also, the financial estimates for the coming financial year must be carefully prepared in collaboration with the Secretary-Treasurer.

In the Hilary Term, trial examinations for CXC, 'O' level and 'A' level examinations must be organized. The examination entries having been completed earlier.

In the Hilary Term, the Common Entrance examination must be organized. The examination entries having been completed earlier.

In the Hilary Term, the Common Entrance examination must be organized and in the Trinity Term when results are available, interviews with prospective First Formers must be arranged.

In the Hilary and Trinity Terms planning for the following academic year must be put in hand. Staffing needs must be considered along with curriculum changes and Time

Table modifications. This planning is done in collaboration with Heads of Department.

Maintenance of the physical plant must be planned. In general throughout the year an attempt is made to ensure that the staff realize that they have support in disciplinary matters.

Children with learning disabilities and special disciplinary problems are identified and attempts made to take appropriate action often with Board of Management and Ministry of Education collaboration.

Staff meetings are held not less than twice a term and more often if it is thought necessary.

Regular meetings of the Board of Management and of its sub-committees are held.

There is at least one Speech Day and Prize-Giving ceremony.

Close liaison with parents is attempted through P.T.A. meetings and Form-level meetings. Parents are also invited to come by arrangement to discuss special problems which may arise.

A considerable amount of time is spent in preparation of information of one sort or another by the Ministry of Education.

My major frustrations arise from the poor condition of the physical plant, including inadequate facilities for girls.

I am disturbed by the time-wasting on the part of talented students some of whom are on drugs and I am planning strategies to deal with this situation.

The Observed and Self-Monitored Phases

Headteacher C showed an average engaged day of 355.7 minutes (5.9 hours) from an average on-the-job time of 396.7 minutes. As shown in Table 10, he performed a total

TABLE 10 - HEADTEACHER C

DETAILS OF TASKS AND ACTIVITIES (OBSERVED PHASE)

TASKS	NO. OF ACTIVITIES	TIME (MINUTES)	% TIME
Assembly	3	48	4.5
Student Welfare	3	50	4.7
Teaching	4	197	18.5
Administration	25	420	39.4
Phone	8	20	1.9
Monitoring	1	28	2.6
Exchanges	3	10	0.9
Student Discipline	4	41	3.8
Tour	1	30	2.8
Correspondence	1	6	0.6
Staff Meeting	1	25	2.3
Ancillary	3	11	1.0
Personal	2	80	7.5
Budget	2	39	3.7
Meeting	1	38	3.6
Instructional	1	24	2.2
16	63	1067	100.0
AVERAGE TIME PER ACTIVITY 16.9 MINUTES			

of only 63 activities over the total engaged time of 1067 minutes (17.8 hours) for an average time per activity of 16.9 minutes. His activities fell under sixteen separate task areas. More than half of his time, however, was spent on two tasks only--administration 39.4 percent and teaching 18.5 percent. It is interesting to note that time on personal matters ranked third with 7.5 percent.

During the period of observation headteacher C spent just under three-quarters (73 percent) of his time in scheduled activities and just over half (55.9 percent) in his office. He interacted with school community personnel for over 58 percent of the time, found himself alone for over 39 percent, and spent 1.7 percent in contact with people outside of the school community (See Table 11).

Recording his own activities during the self-monitoring period, this headteacher showed a total on-the-job time of 2200 minutes, but the total recorded activities account for only 1922 minutes (32 hours). This gives him an average on-the-job day of 440 minutes against an engaged day of 384.4 minutes (6.4 hours), an average difference of 56.6 minutes.

For this period a total of 92 activities were recorded giving an average time per activity of 20.9 minutes. Sixteen different tasks were carried out. Administration

(45.8 percent) and teaching (10.9 percent) again accounted for more than half of his time, but meetings and job interviews also occupied a good bit of time. These and other details are given in Table 12.

TABLE 11 - CLASSIFICATION OF HEADTEACHER C'S WORK TIME
(OBSERVED PHASE)

	TYPE FRAME		LOCATION FRAME		INTERACTION FRAME		
	Sched- uled	Un- sched- uled	Office	Non Office	School Com- munity	Out- side	Alone
Time	779	288	596	471	629	18	420
%	73.0	27.0	55.9	44.1	59.0	1.7	39.4
Activ- ities	30	33	49	14	43	4	16
%	47.6	52.4	77.8	22.2	68.3	6.3	25.4
TOTAL TIME = 1067 MINUTES				TOTAL ACTIVITIES = 63			

The trend that manifested itself in the observer's records is maintained in the analysis of the type, location, and interaction frames. As can be seen in Table 13, he spent large amounts of time in scheduled activities, in his office and interacting with members of the school community.

TABLE 12 - HEADTEACHER C

DETAILS OF TASKS AND ACTIVITIES (SELF-MONITORED PHASE)

TASKS	NO. OF ACTIVITIES	TIME (MINUTES)	% TIME
Assembly	4	75	3.9
Class Observation	1	15	0.8
Ancillary	3	33	1.7
Administration	46	881	45.8
Phone	10	79	4.1
Student Discipline	4	51	2.7
Personal	1	39	2.0
Budget	1	15	0.8
Teaching	6	210	10.9
Meeting	1	180	9.4
Student Welfare	4	54	2.8
Monitoring	2	35	1.8
Tour	3	75	3.9
Correspondence	4	75	3.9
Instructional	1	15	0.8
Interview	1	90	4.7
16	92	1922	100.0
AVERAGE TIME PER ACTIVITY 20.9 MINUTES			

TABLE 13 - CLASSIFICATION OF HEADTEACHER C'S WORK TIME

(SELF-MONITORED PHASE)

	TYPE FRAME		LOCATION FRAME		INTERACTION FRAME		
	Sched- uled	Un- sched- uled	Office	Non Office	School Com- munity	Out- side	Alone
Time	1475	447	1286	636	1230	215	477
%	76.7	23.3	66.9	33.1	64.0	11.2	24.8
Activ- ities	59	33	73	19	58	12	22
%	64.0	35.9	79.3	20.7	63.0	13.0	23.9
TOTAL TIME = 1922 MINUTES				TOTAL ACTIVITIES = 92			

The InterviewWhat a Headteacher Should Do--(Items 1-4)

He was satisfied that the definition was adequate in our context. He pointed out however, that the Secretary-Treasurer of the Board of Management was assuming greater responsibility for budgets and finances and the headteacher would gradually have less responsibility in this area. While accepting that staff evaluation should be a major responsibility of the headteacher, he observed that older members of staff resented it. He expressed the view that community involvement was a difficult and tricky matter. He could not see how the two dimensions could be separated. Both aspects were part of the headteacher's job and one had to guard against neglecting one in favour of the other. He had no hesitation in saying that a headteacher should have developed and must use his personal philosophy of education in making decisions about how to organize and run the school. He acknowledges the fact that a headteacher may be at variance with the staff and/or tradition. If this occurs the headteacher should try to persuade staff to his way of thinking. Personally, he liked teaching for itself and because it gave him the opportunity for wider dialogue within the school community. However, he feels it should not be imposed but left to the discretion of the individual head. Visiting and observing classroom teaching is a vital

part of the headteacher's role especially with new and inexperienced teachers. There should be regular visits not for the purpose of criticizing, but rather to support and help. These visits should be across the board and not only in the incumbent's area of specialization.

The Headship As He Experiences It

Part I--General Description--(Items 5-15)

For a description of his job this headteacher referred to the "projection you had me read at the beginning of this interview which covers it all pretty well". He simply singled out the importance of record-keeping and reporting on staff and students, his role in maintaining good relationships between staff and pupils in the interest of the pupils, and his part in extra-curricular bodies like the P.T.A. and the Past Scholars Association which worked for the good of the school. Having been a senior member of staff and a Deputy Headteacher for quite some time before assuming a headship, there were no surprises in the headship for him. He interacts regularly with his Deputy Headteacher, Department Heads, new inexperienced teachers who need support and guidance, House Masters, and senior prefects who have some responsibility for the tone and discipline of the school, the Secretary-Treasurer of the Board of Management, and his personal Secretary. The tasks that

are performed on a regular basis were given as:

1. Office routines--transcripts, testimonials for students, seeing students with excuses for lateness, or absence, as well as those seeking permission to leave the premises etc.;
2. Serious disciplinary matters;
3. Touring the school at least once a day to check on ancillary staff, and that certain jobs are being done;
4. Seeing staff on professional or management matters.

He feels that as headteacher he should not have to monitor the work of ancillary staff. It irks and requires a lot of time. Routine maintenance jobs to the building are also tedious and wasteful of time, and should be passed onto someone more competent to do them. There were no new tasks he could think of that a headteacher should now be seeking to undertake. His work is spread fairly well across the spectrum and there was nothing that demanded more time than any others. If pressed however, he would opt for the compilation of statistics and information for the Ministry of Education, which often asked for information that was already sent in. Again he was unable to single out any aspect of his work and relegate it to an unimportant status. On the other hand, he was quick to point out that the most important task was to get the staff

working cooperatively in order to achieve set objectives. This was not easy but it is vital that it be done in the interest of the smooth and effective running of the school. Communication between headteacher and staff should be easy.

As one gains experience the job becomes easier to manage and organize. He is therefore able to find time and energy for the task above. Resources, both human and material were more problematic however, especially at the present time of restrictions.

Long-range planning was very important especially in a VI form school and with the change over in recent years to co-education. Projections have to be made on a long-term basis. But short-term planning was also important as it facilitated dealing with problems as they arose and changes that occurred from time to time.

Part II--Leadership and Decision (Items 16-19)

'Leading from a distance was not his style'. There must be easy dialogue between leader and led. A head-teacher must be approachable and accessible to staff and students. He must be flexible but must equally be able to overrule when necessary, to lay down the law. His major decisions are in the following areas:

1. Staffing--recruiting and deployment;
2. Curricular--timetabling, and creating options;

3. Discipline, and;
4. Promotion policies.

He was particularly conscious of the need to exercise great caution in the area of punishment because of possible repercussions throughout the school. Decisions concerning requests to use the school buildings, or whether groups should be allowed to go on trips--local or abroad--are seen as minor ones.

Problems encountered on a fairly frequent basis were mainly related to staff and pupil personnel. With staff there are problems of lack of cooperation, dull teaching, absence mainly through illness and pregnancy and staff turn-over. With respect to pupils, there are difficulties of bad attitudes to work and life, bad behaviour, some drug-related problems and pupils with psychological problems. Ancillary staff also posed problems with bad work habits and bad attitudes.

At a general level, he found that selecting pupils for the VI form was a very difficult and problematic area.

Part III--Educational Leadership Issues--(Items 20-24)

There are no formal programmes or arrangements for staff development in the school. Department Heads are urged to help less experienced staff but there are no checks to see if anything is being done. The headteacher

encourages staff to attend such seminars or courses that are organized by local groups or institutes (e.g. The Ministry of Education, The Caribbean Examination Council (CXC) and the University of the West Indies (U.W.I.)

On the whole there is a serious attitude to work on the part of both students and staff. There are, of course, some teachers for whom class control is a problem but the pupils are mature and tend not to get out of hand. For pupils, his hope is that the school will prepare them for the world of work, or tertiary education and that they will do well. He hopes that staff would be happy on the job and find it rewarding, that their efforts would be rewarded and they would want to stay on. Staff meetings and face to face discussions are used as a means of communicating his expectations to staff and he feels they are understanding and responding positively. With the students the morning assembly, form meetings and the rules of the school were the means by which his expectations were communicated. By and large the messages had been understood and students were striving towards their fulfillment.

The invitation to describe the steps taken to ensure that the curriculum is adequately meeting the students' needs brought the following response: "The school is strongly academic, extremely exam-oriented and with a strong bias to the sciences and a drift-away from the

humanities, although none of this is official policy. There are a number of subjects that are useful even perhaps needed in the school but they were not offered. The school is reluctant to introduce subjects without the necessary research to show what was required. In order to ensure that the teaching-learning process is properly carried out the various departments vet the students' records and reports and the headteacher himself monitors students' reports and follows up cases as he deems necessary".

All the items on question 24 were given a high rating on both the perception of importance scale and the performance scale. The mean scores were 4.9 on the importance scale and 4.7 on the performance scale.

Part IV--Reaction to the Headship--(Items 25-28)

He was regretably unable to run the school as he would like to. There were a few unsatisfactory teachers he would have to get rid of first but unfortunately he had no power to remove them. He also felt handicapped with respect to student discipline. He was not able to remove students from the school, the power to expel having been removed by the recent Education Act. The headteacher should be given greater control over the management of the school.

Satisfaction came when the objectives set for the school are achieved. The source of dissatisfaction was the

lack of autonomy, the feeling of powerlessness that was part of the headship. The headteacher is in a secondary role to the Board of Management and can do nothing of significance without the approval of the Board. Decision-making in important areas was a function of the Board Chairman and not of the headteacher. This was irksome in a school situation.

Estimated weekly time on work and work-related activities was given as 48-50 hours.

HEADTEACHER D

The Self-Account

The work of a Headmistress is a blend of constant hard work, satisfaction, irritation and frustration, but the satisfaction in my opinion far outweighs any other effects.

It is difficult to single out any particular periods of the year that take a great deal of time and energy since a Head's job is an absorbing and ceaseless one.

The First Term is long and arduous and includes new admissions, selection of Fifth Form pupils clamouring for re-admission, deadlines for Ministry Statistics and the preparation for Speech Day.

The Second Term is long and hectic with early CXC examinations and again Ministry Statistics and never-ending Testimonials and Transcripts.

It involves teaching--albeit a limited number of periods. This, however, requires preparation.

Then there is administration--not just the daily duties such as correspondence, prayers and other routine matters, but seeing pupils, parents and members of staff--teaching, office and domestic and sometimes members of the public, and planning.

There is the constant supervision--visiting classes, monitoring the work of teachers, inspecting the building and helping to see that a high standard of work and discipline is maintained.

The incessant phone calls are another feature--calls from parents, old girls, colleagues, members of the public, business community and the Ministry. These include queries, complaints, requests for the use of the school and sometimes for help about educational matters or points of English.

Much time is devoted to counselling. Children are sent to the Office about disciplinary matters or school or home problems.

This is very time-consuming for it entails one to one sessions with the children themselves, and often sessions with their parents and sometimes friends, relatives or their peers and dialogue with doctors, social workers and occasionally clergymen.

There are frequent meetings--Staff Meetings, Departmental Meetings, Planning Sessions, Staff Seminars, Prefects Meetings, Student Council Meetings, Form Captains Meetings, P.T.A. Meetings, and meetings at the Ministry of Education--not only ex-officio but as representatives of the Heads' Association on educational committees.

In addition, there are subject Association meetings and occasionally, attendance at school extra-curricular activities.

Even in the evenings, parents may call, some apologizing (others not) for bothering you, but explaining their failure to contact you at school. Sometimes they also call on weekends or visit your home. After the Common Entrance Examination results and the Ordinary Level and CXC results the telephone calls and visits increase tremendously. However sympathetic one may be, these can be very harassing.

Children with problems--some of them past students--often get in touch with me either to talk, or seek help or advice.

The Third Term is usually the most taxing as it is short and very busy. There are many examinations--Common entrance, internal and external exams. There are promotion meetings, meetings about subject options, evaluation meetings, interviews with parents and children and finalizing of plans for the next school year.

During the vacations, especially the Summer vacation, work continues. The time table has to be done, there are several testimonials to be written and interviews conducted.

Meanwhile, one must find time to read in order to keep up with current affairs and new educational trends.

There is also intermittent communication with my deputy outside of school hours and even on weekends.

On a few occasions I have even got out of bed to jot down ideas which had come to me and which I considered would be of benefit to the school.

Questionnaires and visits by local and overseas educationalists and students have become another regular pattern of school life and include interviews which although welcome can be time consuming.

Break and lunch hours are just as full. Frequently, the school maid has to call me several times for refreshment and sometimes has to bring it to my desk and stand by while I take a drink. There are many interruptions and demands on my time during the luncheon hour, so that I only have time to eat quickly and return to my desk.

I try to arrive at school about thirty to thirty-five minutes before the first bell rings, in order to have a little time for planning and preparing for the day's activities. I also remain at school about at least an hour

after school ends. Very often it is much more because of after-school meetings. This too gives me a little respite, although there again there may be interruptions.

The Annual Speech Day and Founders' Day/Parents' Day Service to lesser extent require good organization and planning and sub-committee meetings. I have to give much thought to the planning and writing of the Speech Day Report. I also have to discuss other arrangements with my Deputy and those to whom I have delegated authority for this function. Moreover, I must view the entertainment which I would of course have been cognisant of beforehand and make sure that it is of an excellent standard.

I also assist in choosing books for prizes and this involves a number of shopping expeditions.

Since I have been asked to give a bird's eye view and since I have many other pressing matters to attend to I shall conclude this essay at this stage with the hope that I have not omitted any vital information which may have been of help to you in your research.

The Observed and Self-Monitoring Phases

Headteacher D's average on-the-job day of 492.3 minutes showed little difference from her engaged average of 467.7 minutes (7.8 hours) in the observation period. Her total engaged time was 1403 minutes (23.4 hours) and

during this time she was involved in 156 different activities. She therefore spent an average of 9 minutes on each activity. She carried out fourteen different tasks. As can be seen from Table 14, administration (40.5 percent), phone (12.1 percent), personal (10.7 percent) and meetings (9.6 percent) accounted for over 72 percent of her time. Less than 28 percent of the time was left to be shared between the other ten tasks.

TABLE 14 - HEADTEACHER D

DETAILS OF TASKS AND ACTIVITIES (OBSERVED PHASE)

TASKS	NO. OF ACTIVITIES	TIME (MINUTES)	% TIME
Student Discipline	12	79	5.6
Administration	61	568	40.5
Ancillary	12	41	2.9
Exchanges	4	8.5	0.6
Teaching	3	81	5.8
Tour	2	22	1.6
Personal	6	150	10.7
Student Welfare	6	45	3.2
Correspondence	5	38	2.7
Phone	39	169.5	12.1
Visitor	3	10	0.7
Interview	1	26	1.9
Meeting	1	134	9.6
Discussion	1	31	2.2
14	156	1403	100.1
AVERAGE TIME PER ACTIVITY = 9 MINUTES			

As shown in Table 15 Headteacher D spent over 75 percent of her time in scheduled activities and did virtually all of her activities in her office. More than one third (35.8 percent) of her engaged time was spent alone but her interaction within the school community was more than twice that of her contact with the wider community.

TABLE 15 - CLASSIFICATION OF HEADTEACHER D'S WORK TIME
(OBSERVED PHASE)

	TYPE FRAME		LOCATION FRAME		INTERACTION FRAME		
	Sched- uled	Un- sched- uled	Office	Non Office	School Com- munity	Out- side	Alone
Time	1062	341	1157	246	609.5	291.5	502
%	75.7	24.3	82.5	17.5	43.4	20.8	35.8
Activ- ities	73	83	148	8	86	31	39
%	46.8	53.2	94.9	5.1	55.1	19.9	25.0
TOTAL TIME = 1403 MINUTES				TOTAL ACTIVITIES = 156			

Again, as for the period of observation, there was little difference between the average time on the job (442.4 minutes) and the engaged time (420 minutes) as

recorded by Headteacher D herself during the self-monitoring period. As Table 16 shows, she was involved in 83 separate activities over a period of 2100 minutes at an average of 25.3 minutes per activity. Eleven separate tasks were performed with administration alone accounting for more than half of the time and just over a third of the activities. The next high-rating tasks were correspondence 8.9 percent, personal matters 6.3 percent, student discipline 5.7 percent and phone conversations 5.2 percent which required 26 percent of the headteacher's time.

TABLE 16 - HEADTEACHER D

DETAILS OF TASKS AND ACTIVITIES (SELF-MONITORED PHASE)

TASKS	NO. OF ACTIVITIES	TIME (MINUTES)	% TIME
Student Discipline	11	119	5.7
Student Welfare	1	6	0.3
Administration	29	1215	57.9
Assembly	5	94	4.5
Phone	11	110	5.2
Personal	9	132	6.3
Correspondence	8	187	8.9
Ancillary	3	31	1.5
Tour	4	81	3.9
Teaching	1	50	2.4
Planning	1	75	3.6
11	83	2100	100.2
AVERAGE TIME PER ACTIVITY 25.3 MINUTES			

In the analysis of the type, location and interaction frames the same pattern that developed in the observation phase continued to manifest itself here in the self-monitoring phase. Large proportions of time were spent in scheduled activities that took place in her office.

There was a slight increase in the proportion of time spent alone and in interaction with members of the school community at the expense of contact with the wider community. Table 17 gives the details

TABLE 17 - CLASSIFICATION OF HEADTEACHER D'S WORK TIME
(SELF-MONITORED PHASE)

	TYPE FRAME		LOCATION FRAME		INTERACTION FRAME		
	Sched- uled	Un- sched- uled	Office	Non Office	School Com- munity	Out- side	Alone
Time	1721.5	378.5	1749	351	1157	64	879
%	82.0	18.0	83.3	16.7	55.1	3.0	41.9
Activ- ities	49	34	65	18	51	6	26
%	59.0	41.0	78.3	21.7	61.4	7.2	31.3
TOTAL TIME = 2100 MINUTES				TOTAL ACTIVITIES = 83			

The Interview

What a Headteacher Should Do - (Items 1 - 4)

This headteacher felt the definition was adequate but expressed some reservation about budgets and finances. She questioned the order of priority, however, being convinced that the educational leadership role was the major one, far more demanding and important than the other. Clearly this was the one to be emphasized. With respect, a headteacher must realize that she cannot run a school alone. The philosophy on which a school is run must be a shared one. Though the headteacher must initiate and guide, she must compromise as well and ensure that all positions are considered carefully. Through teaching a headteacher gets to know the children but there are many factors in a school that will determine if a headteacher can teach or not. This should never be laid down. She, however, cannot escape observing classroom teaching for this is an "essential role of the headship". How else can she know what is going on? To rely totally on Department Heads is an abdication.

The Headship As She Experiences It

Part I - General Description - (Items 5 - 15)

For her it was a vocation, not a job, and consisted of the following important elements:

1. Ensuring that worthwhile educational objectives are set and accomplished;
2. Moral leadership--through prayers and talks at morning assembly, by the rules and the way they are enforced and above all, by example;
3. Counselling and pastoral care;
4. Setting and maintaining high standards of discipline;
5. Regular and meaningful dialogue with staff, and general administration.

As she had been a Deputy Head for many years who had also acted as Head on several occasions, the headship was not new. It offered no surprises and in this way her conception matched the reality. And yet, during her headship there was rapid expansion; the school became coeducational and this brought a completely new perspective.

In her work she interacts regularly with the Deputy Head and senior staff, the office staff, teachers generally and ancillary staff. And she regularly undertakes the following tasks or activities--correspondence, student discipline, counselling, interviewing parents and children, inspecting grounds and buildings, visiting classrooms, meeting with staff and communicating with the public mainly regarding permission to use the school for public functions.

The one task she felt she might like to give up relates to the maintenance of buildings, and there was none that she could think of wanting to add. She identified three areas that accounted for most of her time. These were, counselling students with problems, communicating with her deputy and staff generally and handling student disciplinary matters. Handling correspondence that made excuses for student lateness, absence etc. was considered the least important aspect of the job and one which could easily be handled by the Deputy Head.

Organizing and planning so that the school can run effectively and efficiently was considered the most important task for the headteacher. This required long hours of thinking and planning and much involvement and communication with senior staff and staff generally. It also required being involved in the community so that its thinking could be reflected in the planning of the school. She was able to do this through long hours of work, being a person who needed little sleep. She could only succeed in running the school the way she did by careful planning both long- and short-term. She therefore did a lot of long-term planning but always was prepared to make adjustments as circumstances demanded. Flexibility was essential to meet challenges as they arose.

Part II - Leadership and Decision - (Items 16 - 19)

She leads by example first and foremost. She believes in involving people in the affairs of the school and treats them humanely. She consults, which implies listening, modifying and compromising. Yet, when the situation requires it she is firm and strong and will no longer compromise. Her major decisions are made in the following areas:

1. The deployment of staff in the best interest of the school;
2. How much information to give staff and even parents about pupils;
3. What to leave to the discretion of staff as a whole and to individual teachers;
4. When to act and when to forebear; and
5. When to go to a higher authority rather than acting on her own initiative.

Minor decisions relate to such issues as changes in the school schedule to fit circumstances that may arise, e.g. having an early break to accommodate an event planned for the day or deciding whether a child who is not feeling well should be given permission to go home.

On the question of problems that arise, she remarked that "so many problems crop up nowadays that you don't think of them as problems but as part of the day's work".

She, however, was able to supply the following--medical problems that the school has been able to draw to parents' attention and often to offer help, children not meeting the required standards of work or behaviour, children welfare problems, accidents, and to a lesser extent pregnancies and sexual problems. Security of the plant was also a problem area with occasional thefts, break-ins and vagrants causing disruptive behaviour. There were no administrative or staff problems that came to mind.

Part III - Educational Leadership Issues - (Items 20 - 24)

In describing the provisions for staff development in the school, the headteacher was quick to point out that most of the staff had seen the need for professional training and had been given every encouragement and support in this respect. She had instituted staff seminars which were organized around topics and needs identified by staff themselves. Staff were encouraged to join such professional organizations as existed and arrangements were also made to facilitate attendance at workshops or short courses. She monitored the performance of staff with Heads of Departments and offered help and advice.

She described the tone and climate as business-like, with obvious but not undisciplined activity. Children were happy, and classes were fairly quiet, harmonious places

with activity and participation. Teachers were in control but students were not subdued. Steps were taken by both the Head and Deputy Head to ensure that both students and staff got to classes promptly and that students moved around in an orderly and business-like fashion. Clearly, there were moments of lapses but things were to her liking although there could be no room for complacency.

Her expectations for her students are that they will pass their examinations and leave school equipped to earn a living and lead a full life. They must be able to think for themselves. To achieve these things, she tries to ensure that there are things in place to foster the social, moral, cultural, intellectual and academic development. The morning assembly, the form meetings, the school rules and discussions with groups and individuals are all occasions for getting these positions over to the students. On the whole, the students seem to understand and appreciate her aims and to work towards their fulfillment.

As far as staff is concerned she would like them to find fulfillment in their job through the success of their students. She would like them to feel involved and appreciated and to gain promotion in time. Staff meetings, good interpersonal relations, and face to face discussions were her means of communicating these views to her staff. She felt, however, that though most staff were aware of her

objectives she could perhaps, do more to have them generally understood.

A number of practical steps are taken with respect to keeping the school's curriculum up-to-date and in tune with the needs of the students. The headteacher is very active in the community and is able to assess its needs and translate them wherever possible into practical action in the school. The curriculum is constantly being reviewed by herself and her staff, and the various needs and levels of students are kept in mind. Students and parents have inputs into the options pupils take, although the final word rests with the school.

In order to keep a check on the teaching-learning process, the headteacher visits classes and monitors what is going on. She uses the staff meetings to air, in a general way, issues related to teaching and learning. There are analyses and examination of all results of public examinations, and departments give accounts of themselves and their performance. The headteacher studies the reports of all children at the end of the term and seeks explanations for all dramatic changes. She uses the P.T.A. "to talk to parents and without letting it get out-of-hand you can learn quite a lot about what is going on in this area".

The average rating given to the perceived importance on the fifteen items of question 24 was 4.8 and her own

performance was rated at 4.4. Only one item (no. 5)--observing staff to learn their strengths and weaknesses for positive action--was rated below 4 on both scales. On all other items there is both a high value and a high performance.

Part IV - Reactions to the Headship - (Items 25 - 28)

She had no hesitation in affirming that she was able to run the school as she felt it should be run. Her Board, through the Chairman allowed her to use her initiative and gave her full support. Her staff and herself enjoyed good relationships; they were able to speak their minds freely and participated in the running of the school. The students too, felt involved in the school and committed to it. She was accessible to them and there was easy communication between them.

A combination of love for children and love for teaching made her happy in her work, and seeing children grow into worthwhile adults and achieving different forms of success were her sources of satisfaction in the headship. She had her causes for dissatisfaction too, but preferred not to discuss them at that moment.

Her estimated average working week was 45 - 48 hours.

Headteacher E*The Observed and Self-Monitored Phases

Headteacher E had an average on-the-job day of 513.3 minutes and an average engaged time of 481 minutes (8 hours). Over the three days of observation, she participated in 156 activities at an average rate of one activity every 9.3 minutes. Her activities ranged over eighteen separate task areas. Administration and meetings accounted for almost half of her time. There was a fairly even spread of time between teaching (6.9 percent), phone conversations (6.7 percent), personal matters (6.4 percent) tours (5.5 percent) and student discipline matters (5.4 percent) which between them required 30.9 percent of her time. Table 18 shows how this headteacher's time was spread across the various tasks undertaken.

Table 19 indicates that Headteacher E spent most of her time on planned work, even though she performed more unscheduled activities. Of the 156 activities undertaken, 133 were carried out in her office and these were responsible for over 65 percent of her time. In the interaction frame analysis, there was a fair distribution of time across the three areas although, not unreasonably, more time was devoted to contact within the school community.

*This respondent's essay did not meet the stated requirements for this study.

TABLE 18 - HEADTEACHER E
DETAILS OF TASKS AND ACTIVITIES (OBSERVED PHASE)

TASKS	NO. OF ACTIVITIES	TIME (MINUTES)	% TIME
Administration	68	425	29.5
Monitoring	2	17	1.2
Phone	32	97	6.7
Assembly	2	50	3.5
Staff Meeting	1	40	2.8
Visitor	5	60	4.2
Discussion	1	7	0.5
Tour	7	80	5.5
Ancillary	5	9	0.6
Correspondence	5	52	3.6
Student Discipline	9	78	5.4
Personal	5	92	6.4
Student Welfare	6	29	2.0
Instructional	2	11	0.8
Teaching	2	99	6.9
Exchanges	2	17	1.2
Detention	1	45	3.1
Meeting	1	235	16.3
18	156	1443	100.2
AVERAGE TIME PER ACTIVITY 9.3 MINUTES			

TABLE 19 - CLASSIFICATION OF HEADTEACHER E'S WORK TIME
(OBSERVED PHASE)

	TYPE FRAME		LOCATION FRAME		INTERACTION FRAME		
	Sched- uled	Un- sched- uled	Office	Non Office	School Com- munity	Out- side	Alone
Time	1037	406	943	500	583	359	501
%	71.9	28.1	65.3	34.7	40.4	24.9	34.7
Activ- ities	70	86	133	23	94	22	40
%	44.9	55.1	85.3	14.7	60.3	14.1	25.6
TOTAL TIME = 1443 MINUTES				TOTAL ACTIVITIES = 156			

Turning to the self-monitored phase, it is noted that Headteacher E shows very little difference between her on-the-job average time of 570 minutes and her engaged average of 536 minutes (8.9 hours). During her engaged time of 2680 minutes she carried out 187 separate activities. Her average time per activity was therefore 14.3 minutes. Here too, administration and meetings headed the list of tasks that she was engaged in, and between them, consumed over 60 percent of her time. Teaching (8.2 percent), phone calls (6.7 percent) and student discipline (4.4 percent) were again at the top of the second-ranked tasks. See Table 20 for full details. While she continued to spend substan-

TABLE 20 - HEADTEACHER E

DETAILS OF TASKS AND ACTIVITIES (SELF-MONITORED PHASE)

TASKS	NO. OF ACTIVITIES	TIME (MINUTES)	% TIME
Monitoring	7	60	2.2
Ancillary	4	37	1.4
Administration	73	771	28.8
Personal	9	57	2.1
Phone	41	180	6.7
Assembly	1	26	1.0
Correspondence	4	55	2.1
Student Discipline	12	118	4.4
Tour	7	75	2.8
Meeting	4	860	32.1
Exchanges	5	40	1.5
Student Welfare	11	74	2.8
Visitor	2	20	0.7
Teaching	5	219	8.2
Staff Meeting	1	53	2.0
Detention	1	35	1.3
16	187	2680	100.1
AVERAGE TIME PER ACTIVITY 14.3 MINUTES			

tially more time on scheduled than on unscheduled activities, there is a shift away from office to non-office time. Interestingly enough, the number of office activities continues to out-strip the non-office ones by far.

TABLE 21 - CLASSIFICATION OF HEADTEACHER E'S WORK TIME
(SELF-MONITORED PHASE)

	TYPE FRAME		LOCATION FRAME		INTERACTION FRAME		
	Sched- uled	Un- sched- uled	Office	Non Office	School Com- munity	Out- side	Alone
Time	2069	611	1248	1432	1345	746	589
%	77.2	22.8	46.6	53.4	50.2	27.8	22.0
Activ- ities	91	96	140	47	105	34	48
%	48.7	51.3	74.9	25.1	56.1	18.2	25.7
TOTAL TIME = 2680 MINUTES				TOTAL ACTIVITIES = 187			

The Interview

What a Headteacher Should Do - (Items 1 - 4)

While the definition was adequate, there was a feeling that it was somewhat overdone. These things are not always done by the headteacher alone even though they may be his

overall responsibility. Furthermore, there were two areas she had doubts about, namely the questions of community involvement and student government. In our society today, with the increase in the size of schools, the office of headteacher is almost entirely administrative--managerial and that is where the emphasis would have to be. Personnel administration alone in a big school takes up a lot of time. Ideally you should have a proper mesh of the two dimensions.

Whether a headteacher's philosophy of education should be used in running a school depends on whether it promotes growth and causes no harm. The length of experience in education and how up-to-date she has kept herself would help to determine the issue.

She would not want to see headteachers teach on a routine basis, but they should be available to give help in teaching when necessary. For example, a headteacher should take over classes in her area of competence so that teachers could be set free for other important matters from time to time.

She feels a headteacher should be free to visit classrooms and observe teaching in order to help teachers grow and develop professionally. This practice is extremely valuable for all concerned. These visits should follow a pattern, with the knowledge of the teacher and with due

warning. There must be no "barging-in" or else the students will wonder what has gone wrong to occasion the visit and the Head will be regarded as a spy. Headteachers should not be required to visit, for this implies laying down a law, telling one what to do whether one likes it or not.

The Headship As She Experiences It

Part I - General Description - (Items 5 - 15)

She hastened to make it clear she is not a one hundred percent administrator. She still regards herself as a teacher and teaches a fair bit. She interprets the headship as a role which must provide guidance and help to pupils, staff and parents. She sees it as a decision-making role, one in which decisions have to be made all the time. It is a role that stresses human relationships; a headteacher relates to people rather than things. The headship is a high-calibre job in spite of the wages paid. Indeed it is a dedication. The headteacher helps to weave the fabric of society.

She was not sure whether the job was different or whether her perspective had changed. One thing she was sure of was that she felt she could have done the job without giving up her full commitment to teaching, but she now found this not all possible. The people with whom she interacted on a regular basis were the office staff, Deputy

Head, ancillary staff, teachers, pupils and parents and the Chairman of the Board of Management. And the tasks or activities performed regularly were school assemblies, staff meetings, ancillary staff meetings, discussing student matters with parents, student welfare issues, student attendance matters, student discipline, dealing with student reports and student progress and preparing information and statistics for the Ministry of Education.

There are some aspects of accountability that bother her. For example, she does not feel a headteacher should have to look after toilet paper and other utilities. This should be handled in another way. She also dislikes reporting to the Ministry on teacher-progress.

She would like to have discretion to make judgements and take decisions without having to wait on the Ministry or the Board. She feels that little discretion is given to headteachers to do things and this is a handicap.

Handling personnel--staff, pupils, parents--takes up most of her time and the large amount of paper-work required by the Ministry of Education and the writing of a large number of testimonials and transcripts were considered the least important aspects of the job. By contrast, holding the institution together so that its major function--that of fitting the children for life--is carried out, was seen as the most important aspect. This entailed

a number of things such as planning, securing resources and above all maintaining good standards, examples and good interpersonal relationships.

The job is not a nine-to-three one; she spends a lot of time on the job and yet there is never enough time. She feels she has improved her managerial skills and techniques and yet the work is too much.

A great deal of long-range planning is done, but one has to proceed with caution. One cannot plan too long in the light of the many rapid changes in society. With the expansion in the school she had to project two to three years ahead. Short-term planning is also important to meet given situations. There has to be a mesh in the school context.

Part II - Leadership and Decision - (Items 16 - 19)

She tries to understand and accept people for what they are and use their potential and strengths to good advantage. This requires initiative, understanding of human nature and an alert mind. You must be able to sympathize with people.

The major decisions with which she is faced revolve mainly around the staff. There are important decisions to be made in the area of recruitment, deployment and the general area of the handling of the staff. A major concern

of this headteacher is to maintain and improve the image of the school and therefore any decisions that relate to this are seen as very major. Decisions relating to minor adjustments in the school time-table, to excusing children from the school assembly on religious/conscientious grounds, allowing staff some time off during the school day are among the more minor decisions.

Unpunctuality in arriving at school and tardiness in getting to classes were two very frequent problems in the school. Parental irresponsibility with all its attendant consequences, littering, and staff changes, especially the recruitment of staff, were among occasional problems.

Part III - Educational Leadership Issues - (Items 20 - 24)

The following staff development structures were identified:

1. A short orientation programme for new staff.
2. Regular departmental meetings are held to deal with professional issues and problems identified.
3. Professional staff meetings--different from routine, administrative meetings.
4. Headteacher chats with teachers from time to time about difficulties and success.
5. Staff are encouraged and facilitated in attending courses, and on returning they arrange seminars to

share information and knowledge with colleagues.

5. Staff are encouraged to keep up-to-date.

The tone and climate were considered as healthy. The children are happy, quiet and business-like. There was a low, tolerable noise level and the atmosphere was one conducive to learning and growth. Clearly the headteacher was pleased although she feared that the increase in size would change all that.

Her expectations are that her students will be well-developed adults who can hold their own in life, and that they will be proud of the school that has offered them a chance in life. Though she held no specific academic expectations she hoped there would be a blossoming in Maths and Sciences in the coming year. She communicated by example, by guidance and counselling and by character-building. She uses the school assembly to talk to the students, to highlight successes in whatever field and to commend effort. She is persuaded that the school for the most part understands and appreciates her expectations and strives to achieve them.

She hopes the staff will continue to be cooperative and that they will continue to enjoy teaching at the school, and to this end she shows her appreciation of them in many different ways.

Seeing that the curriculum was meeting the needs of

the students was not at all an easy task. She checked the responses of the classes to the curriculum, and required staff to review the syllabuses from time to time. With respect to the teaching-learning process, the first important step is to trust the staff and she had confidence in her staff.

Heads of Departments give guidance and initiate new staff and help to identify the strengths of teachers so that they can be used in the best way in the department.

All the items were given a high rating in terms of perceived importance. The average rating was 4.6. The average rating for her performance was 4.3. There was a match between perceived importance and performance on all but four items. These items are:

3. Enjoy being in charge and ensuring that tasks are performed.
6. Trying out ideas and suggestions put forward by others.
11. Actively undertaking classroom observation of lessons.
12. Ensuring that relevant personnel regularly carry out classroom observation of teachers.

Part IV - Reactions to the Headship - (Items 25 - 28)

She felt that she had no real power to do things in

her school. Policy was laid down from outside by people not necessarily competent to do so and heads were expected to carry it out. There was too much interference and head-teachers had lost the authority to make effective decisions. There was too much red tape to be gone through before action could be taken and when approval is given the momentum has already passed.

Yet, seeing children pass through different stages of development and feeling you had a part in contributing not only to this, but by so doing, to the development of the institution and the wider society, was the main source of satisfaction. Dissatisfaction and frustration were never absent, however. She was frustrated and angered by the reaction of the general public to school children. They were constantly criticising and provoking students and then complaining about them. There were constant comments and criticisms of teachers re their vacations, salaries, alleged attitudes etc.--but no serious consideration was given to the burdensomeness of the job. She was unhappy about the lack of appreciation of teachers on the part of the public.

Her estimated average working week was 45 hours.

Headteacher FThe Self-Account

As the beginning of the school year approaches, certain matters critical to my function as a headteacher become a preoccupation.

Chief among these will be the question of whether the basic philosophy of the school, the *raison d'etre* of its existence, and the resultant goals and objectives arising therefrom, are adequately reflected in the curricular and academic organization of the school and in its programmes. Of equal importance will be the matter of staffing to make sure that there is competent manpower to execute the plans and programmes successfully. All these must be neatly and economically programmed into the school's timetable in a way that reflects the most efficient use of all available resources--human and material.

Provision of a sound organizational framework, competent staff deployment and good time-tabling in an eight-form-entry co-educational school constitute a formidable, time-consuming, and exhausting exercise which usually begins months before the beginning of the school year and involves consultation of a very wide range. This task is perhaps one of the most forbidding and where the process is completely manual requires long, tiring hours over a period of months. These, however, are the major instruments

which, if well done, will make daily administration and supervision a lot simpler.

Even where the academic and curricular organization, staffing and the timetable are suitable and adequate, several other systems, structures, and strategies must be put in place to ensure the effectiveness and success of the various programmes.

The beginning of the school year happens to be a period of re-adjustment for everybody in the school community, including all pupils and teachers who are adapting to a number of new situations.

Perhaps the most significant adjustment involves the admission and orientation of 240 - 250 new pupils and their parents into the school community.

Before the school can settle down to its normal routine, several other systems and structures have to be put in place. The Pastoral System, whether on the House or Year basis, and the Guidance and Counselling Programme must be reviewed and realigned. The Prefect System, Disciplinary Process, Grading and Evaluation System as well as a vibrant Extra-Curricular Programme have got to be woven into the fabric.

When all the necessary supporting systems and services have been put in place, there remains the exacting daily task of ensuring that all systems are functioning effec-

iently and effectively. Daily administration and supervision of a large school plant require management skills of the highest order. Proper evaluation is of critical importance but in most cases evaluation involves the assessment of many variables which cannot be measured with the desired degree of precision and accuracy.

At the beginning of the school year, care has to be taken to ensure that the settling-in process is as short as necessary so that maximum use can be made of teaching time before qualifying examinations and entries for C.X.C./G.C.E. examinations at the end of the term.

The second term is almost dominated by athletic competitions not the least of which is the school's own Inter-House Championship. Care must be exercised to prevent neglect of academic pursuits and to ensure that C.X.C./G.C.E. course work progresses smoothly and satisfactorily. The focus sharpens on the third years and the non-C.X.C./G.C.E. pupils at the 4th and 5th year levels as entries for B.S.S.C. dictate certain adjustments.

The third term can hardly provide adequate opportunity for revision and examination preparation as well as planning and preparations for the new academic year before the headlong rush and mad scramble to the end of the school year is beclouded with examination scripts, corrections, and collation of all kinds of marks, statistics, and other

bits and pieces of vital information needed to complete the records.

In short, from beginning to end of the school year, there is one endless exercise of meeting deadline after deadline with scarcely any time for relaxation or ease.

The forces converging on the headteacher in the school situation tend to arrange themselves in a concentric formation within which the maintenance of a steady balance by the headteacher seems to defy all the laws pertaining to density and specific gravity. In the inner circle are the constant daily pressure of a staff of approximately seventy (70) and the student body of over one thousand (1000) adolescents, in addition to the controlling interests of Board of Management and Ministry of Education. In wider orbit are Examining Boards, P.T.A., Employers and the Job Market, and the Union.

Beyond this field lies support services like Probation, Welfare, Child Care Board, School Medical Services including dental and opthalmic, and professional organizations like the Association of principals.

Last but by no means insignificant in influence are the public at large and tradition whether established or being established.

All of these forces bear directly or indirectly on the headmaster's decision-making role in the short period of

one school day. The impact can be colossal and sustained--and when at the end of the day the headteacher feels completely worn down and out, it is because the stress of converging forces was disguised or he was too busy to observe it until the moment of relief came. but the next day will almost be the same or worse except that the different forces will combine in different degrees and formation.

The head's alertness will to a large extent influence the level of development and progress since these will determine whether the institution is a dynamic agency of change or a mere static routine- and tradition-bound organization. The head's daily evaluation of persons, systems, structures, strategies, programmes and events will lead in many cases to review, reorganization, realignment and greater effectiveness. This is a much more challenging and creative task than the writing of scores upon scores of testimonials and school records, not to speak of the drudgery of investigating and signing hundreds of progress reports of pupils at the end of each term.

The head's role in the maintenance of good tone and discipline and his public relations responsibility are ever present, and will be reflected in some measure on the red letter days of the school's calendar like Sports Day, Prize-Giving, Graduation, Open Day, Founders' Day. The

success and quality of the school can only be reflected through the success and quality of its pupils and the public image of the school will be determined to a large extent by public expectation and evaluation of such performance.

Perhaps one of the greatest needs is the time, scope and facilities for the head to intensify the professional leadership of his management staff. There is too little scope if at all for the head and administrative staff to consult educational journals and publications and discuss recent research findings and current issues or to elicit empirical data from studies within their own school. Much more of this activity is required if the problems of the particular school are to be diagnosed correctly, scientifically treated and remedied. This kind of exercise can scarcely be expected within the context of existing pupil-teacher ratios and the low level of education technology within the classroom.

Free and compulsory secondary education presupposes a very high degree of technical proficiency and professionalism. Where such is lacking as is the case in too many instances, many problems may appear insurmountable and frustration will beget cynicism. When the degree of cynicism exceeds the degree of satisfaction that comes from the success of one's initiative, creativity and ingenuity,

work becomes stressful. But patience, perhaps the teacher's greatest virtue, will often show in the end-product that none of the teacher's efforts was totally lost or in vain.

The Observed and Self-Monitored Phases

From an average on-the-job day of 443.7 minutes the researcher recorded an average engaged day of 406 minutes (6.8 hours). During the three days of observation, the Head executed 147 separate activities and these took 1218 minutes. As shown in Table 22, his work was classified under seventeen different task areas. Administration headed the list both for time and number of activities, and accounted for over 35 percent of his time. Six other tasks that feature fairly noticeably are student discipline (7.0 percent), tour (6.5 percent) and phone calls (5.1 percent). Together these used up 43.6 percent of his time.

Planned work took up most of this headteacher's time, and he was mainly confined to his office. He spent more than half of his time interacting with members of the school community but had little contact with the wider community. This is illustrated in Table 23.

TABLE 22 - HEADTEACHER F

DETAILS OF TASKS AND ACTIVITIES (OBSERVED PHASE)

TASKS	NO. OF ACTIVITIES	TIME (MINUTES)	% TIME
Administration	91	428	35.1
Student Discipline	13	86	7.1
Assembly	2	52	4.3
Tour	5	79	6.5
Phone	15	62	5.1
Student Welfare	5	112	9.2
Personal	4	112	9.2
Correspondence	1	5	0.4
Monitoring	1	15	1.2
Classroom Observation	1	40	3.3
Visitor	1	2	0.2
Instructional	1	18	1.5
Ancillary	3	24	2.0
Teacher Appraisal	1	50	4.1
Travel	1	8	0.7
Discussion	1	45	3.7
Meeting	1	80	6.6
17	147	1218	100.2
AVERAGE TIME PER ACTIVITY 8.3 MINUTES			

TABLE 23 - CLASSIFICATION OF HEADTEACHER F'S WORK TIME

(OBSERVED PHASE)

	TYPE FRAME		LOCATION FRAME		INTERACTION FRAME		
	Sched- uled	Un- sched- uled	Office	Non Office	School Com- munity	Out- side	Alone
Time	778	440	1022	196	665	170	383
%	63.9	36.1	83.9	16.1	54.6	14.0	31.4
Activ- ities	61	86	136	11	97	19	31
%	41.5	58.5	92.5	7.5	66.0	12.9	21.1
TOTAL TIME = 1218 MINUTES				TOTAL ACTIVITIES = 147			

In the self-monitored period, there is a fairly wide gap between the average on-the-job day and the engaged day. The on-the-job day averages 508.2 minutes as against the engaged average of 415.8 minutes, a difference of 92.4 minutes. In this phase, the headteacher carried out 98 activities at an average of 21.2 minutes per activity. Meetings (33.2 percent) and administration (31.8 percent) vied keenly for this time and between them accounted for some 65 percent of his engaged time. If personal time (9.3 percent) and tours (6.3 percent) are added to the above it becomes clear that little time was left for any of the other ten tasks undertaken or anything else. Table 24 gives the full picture of how the headteacher's time was spent.

The headteacher was again able to devote a substantial portion of his time to planned activities. In fact, there was little that was unplanned. Though he did not spend proportionately as much time in his office as he did during the observation period, he still managed to be there for more than half the time. He spent less time interacting with the school community than on any of the other two areas in the interaction frame. This information can be seen in Table 25.

TABLE 24 - HEADTEACHER F

DETAILS OF TASKS AND ACTIVITIES (SELF-MONITORED PHASE)

TASKS	NO. OF ACTIVITIES	TIME (MINUTES)	% TIME
Administration	47	661	31.8
Assembly	3	60	2.9
Tour	9	131	6.3
Student Welfare	2	9	0.4
Ancillary	2	9	0.4
Personal	4	193	9.3
Correspondence	6	93	4.5
Student Discipline	7	63	3.0
Phone	9	53	2.5
Discussion	1	20	1.0
Classroom Observation	2	50	2.4
Budget	2	37	1.8
Instructional	1	10	0.5
Meeting	3	690	33.2
14	98	2079	100.0
AVERAGE TIME PER ACTIVITY 21.2 MINUTES			

TABLE 25 - CLASSIFICATION OF HEADTEACHER F'S WORK TIME

(SELF-MONITORED PHASE)

	TYPE FRAME		LOCATION FRAME		INTERACTION FRAME		
	Sched- uled	Un- sched- uled	Office	Non Office	School Com- munity	Out- side	Alone
Time	1792	287	1063	1016	560	780	739
%	86.2	13.8	51.1	48.9	26.9	37.5	35.5
Activ- ities	64	34	78	20	55	11	32
%	65.3	34.7	79.6	20.4	56.1	11.2	32.7
TOTAL TIME = 2079 MINUTES				TOTAL ACTIVITIES = 98			

The InterviewWhat a Headteacher Should Do - (Items 1 - 4)

The definition was adequate but here again attention was drawn to the fact that budgets and finances had become less of a task for the headteacher, as the Boards of Management had taken over most of the responsibility for them. He did not feel that either dimension should be stressed over the other. He, however, observed that educational leadership was a paramount function of the headteacher, and while other areas--personnel management, discipline, scheduling--could be shared out among the other administrative staff, it was to the headteacher that everybody turned for definite action in educational leadership.

The extent to which a headteacher should use his personal philosophy depends on how well it coincides with the consensus from the staff and others. This should not rule out initiative and the breaking of new ground by the headteacher but he cannot run a school if he holds one position and the majority of the staff holds another. Headteachers, especially in large schools, are so often called away and find it so difficult to stick to routines that they should not be required to teach on a routine, timetabled basis. Clearly the children will suffer. He should, however, most definitely be expected to visit classes and observe teaching. How else can he speak of what is going on and suggest changes?

The Headship As He Experiences ItPart I - General Description - (Items 5 - 15)

The job has to do with managing, controlling, evaluating what is happening and attempting to find remedies or strategies to overcome those aspects that seem not to be effective. In a large organization like his, personnel management and interpersonal relationships become very important aspects of the headteacher's role as well. Delegating is important too, but in the final analysis the headteacher has to be able to assess how well the strategies, functions etc. that have been put in place are working and achieving the purposes.

His view of the headship when still a teacher was that of a teacher who simply coordinated the work of others. Now he realizes it is far more complex--he assesses, evaluates, watches trends; he develops worthwhile things, and arrests those that are not so worthwhile.

Those with whom he interacts on a regular basis are his administrative staff, Heads of Departments, Year Heads and Deputy Head, teaching staff, non-teaching staff, prefects, parents, the Board Chairman and for serious matters, the students. He pointed out that students had other channels to pass through before a matter reached him and so only a few filtered through to him.

The tasks he performs on a regular basis are those

that arise out of the organization and administration of the school and the daily clerical ones--checking on staff and pupil attendance, making arrangements to cover staff who are absent, handling personnel matters with staff and students e.g. helping students with problems. A great deal of time is spent looking after children with health, welfare and discipline problems and these encroach on his time as well as on the time of other teachers. This is a position that can and should be changed. Someone should be appointed to relieve the headteacher of some of these burdens. He could think of no additional area which he would like to see added to the functions of the headship.

Student disciplinary matters and monitoring what was going on in the school accounted for most of his time. The physical layout of the plant made it impossible for him to control and know what was going on without investing a great deal of time in the project. It was, however, clerical jobs--recording teacher attendance, preparing endless information and statistics for the Ministry of Education, keeping the log book--that were deemed the least important aspects of the job. Upgrading the performance of the students and catering to their growth, academic and general, was without doubt the most important task of the head. It was the main function of the school and he put a great deal of emphasis on it and had structures in place to look into

all aspects of it. He was, however, not in a position to say he was able to devote to it all the time, energy etc. he felt it deserved. There were far too many other demands on him from other aspects of the job.

Both long-range and short-term planning play a very important role. They both have their place for different things and neither can be ignored.

Part II - Leadership and Decision - (Items 16 - 19)

He describes his leadership style as interactive. He works closely with people and gets them to introspect, to assess and evaluate themselves and their actions. He throws out challenges to people and lets them work things out and get back to him. His major decisions fell into three broad areas; firstly, organizing children into groups for learning and determining what programmes to offer them; secondly, assessing and dealing with the attitudes of staff and students and thirdly, how to assess the effectiveness of teachers and report on them as required. He could think of no decision he would classify as minor. A set of rules and standards are laid down for dealing with certain issues and these are done without reference to the head.

Problems that come up very frequently tend to centre on the child and have to do with social and economic

matters, student welfare matters, and student discipline problems. These are numerous and have very serious repercussions in the school. Less frequent but none-the-less important are problems of conflict and cleavages within the staff. The head's concern is to have a cooperative working unit and these interpersonal problems bother him. Violent behaviour on the part of students and very uncooperative attitudes on the part of parents are issues that surface from time to time.

Part III - Educational Leadership (Items 20 - 24)

The school has established a number of structures to help staff to do their work well and to improve themselves professionally. First, there is a handbook for teachers that covers a wide area of operations and makes suggestions about things related to teaching, marking, class control etc. There are orientation programmes for new members of staff. Department meetings are held regularly, not only to plan but to examine and evaluate the full operation of the Department; relevant literature is provided and drawn to the attention to staff. Seminars are organized on a regular basis throughout the year to deal with important issues and problems that arise. Regular professional staff meetings also address issues of concern.

The school atmosphere was described as quiet and

studious during class time and the movement between classes was deemed tidy. Though children played and enjoyed themselves vigorously during recreation time they were not rowdy or boisterous. On the whole the headteacher was satisfied with the tone that prevailed, although there is always room for improvement.

The expectations for students were expressed in the motto, "Every talent to its greatest use". He wants to see students do the best they can in all areas, but the school accepted their weaknesses and tried to help them overcome them. The school rules and code of conduct issued to all, the guidance programme, the pastoral care system organized on a year group basis, talks at school assembly and follow-up from individual subject teachers were the main means of communicating these expectations to the students, and the Head was persuaded that the students understood and were working towards achieving them. It is expected that teachers will uphold the school policy and standards and be professional in all their doings. Structures are set in place to help in this regard and teachers responded well.

Some parts of the curriculum are given, determined by external agencies. Apart from this, there is much discussion with staff and the reaction of students is sought so that their needs can be assessed and catered for. The structures listed under staff development all contribute in

this respect. Over and above this, the Head observes classes and discusses his findings with the teacher in order to help. Heads of Departments and Year Heads are also expected to observe lessons and discuss strengths and weaknesses with the teacher. There is also a scheme for monitoring the scheme books which project plans and later assess performance on a weekly basis. Careful scrutiny of students' term reports also serve as a check.

All those items on question 24 were highly valued and in most cases his perceived performance matched the value he attached to the items. Only on item 6--trying out ideas and suggestions put forward by others, did he rate his performance lower than 4. His average ratings were 4.9 on perceived importance and 4.7 on perceived performance.

Part IV - Reactions to the Headship - (Items 25 - 28)

He was not free to run the school as he liked. He would like a freer hand, a bit more discretion to act. For example, there are some staff with whom he was dissatisfied because of their performance. While he would not want to have them dismissed he would like to be able to act, to do something to effect change. He would like to be able to reward people for good contribution to the work of the school in order to encourage them and others. It was the powerlessness of the post in some respects, the inability

to act without the consent of a higher authority that impeded him. Satisfaction came from the success and development of students. He was often fascinated by the progress made by some students and rejoiced that he had a hand in moulding people along the right path. On the opposite side, was the stress and depression that came from overload and frustration. There was too much to do and not enough time or resources to accomplish it. He felt surrounded by the job, totally unable to get away from it.

He estimated his working week at 50 hours and commented he had stayed too long in the same place.

Headteacher G

The Self-Account

It is extremely easy to believe that the school year is divided into three terms with certain activities occurring at a given time in each one. But in reality, sometimes what is seen as an activity in September or October of Term I really began twelve months before. But since a beginning must be found, I shall use Term I as a suitable point.

As soon as school is settled, that is, a staff meeting has been held, the staff is working according to schedules, accommodation is settled, all timetable clashes have been resolved, and all new students are beginning to look less

bewildered, the time is opportune for studying projections for the next academic year.

This exercise involves discussions first with the Deputy Head followed by meetings of the Management Team which is constituted thus: Headmistress, Deputy Head, year Heads, Departmental Heads and Teacher in Charge of Examinations. The agenda for these meetings includes: The projected intake, school leavers, Financial Estimates which must reflect the needs of specific departments and the school generally, and the Text Book Loan Scheme which must be based on the projected rolls.

Since this school is young, and is still developing organizational policies, there is the need to evaluate frequently the methods of allocation to forms, the relevance of subject groupings, the suitability of texts etc. and methods of instruction. Thus planning/discussion sessions are an important activity throughout the year, but feature very highly during the first term, since decisions and changes, if any, must be studied in preparation for the new academic year.

In the first term, when new members of staff are assigned, it is necessary to observe them at work in order to assess their performance and to give guidance where necessary.

The first form students also command attention during

this term of orientation, and much of this is done informally and unobtrusively while they interact with their form-teachers, subject teachers and school mates.

Fourth Formers, who choose their programmes at the end of the third year are in focus because this is their first year of studies for external examinations, and for them and the staff, it is a period of coping with more demanding and serious approaches to study. Parents, just a few, have second thoughts about the programme which they accepted the previous term, and this demands some consultation to sort out the problems.

The fifty Formers write qualifying examinations for entry to external examinations before the end of this term. Although the organization of this activity is the responsibility of the teachers in charge of examinations and the Departmental Heads and their subject teachers, the Headteacher is involved in the signing of individual entry forms which is very time-consuming, but which enables her to be informed of the performance of the students.

Speech Day, Christmas activities--form parties, staff parties usually add a touch of enjoyment and festivity to this long term.

Usually the first four weeks of the second term herald in a period of calm and serious study; but this is short-lived as the sporting activities begin and bring with them

excitement which tends to alter the tone of the school and the study patterns of several students. Failure to pay attention to academic studies usually produces conflict between teacher and student, thus more disciplinary problems are reported.

However, sports days are usually enjoyable and adds to the life of school.

The final term of the school year is short but packed with much activity. The first is the supervision of the Common Entrance Examination, usually taken in one day, but lasted two days this year. This day is long and tense, and the volume of work and its nature tend to make one wish it could be structured differently.

External examinations follow immediately and last for approximately two months. During the period it is necessary to remind students of the importance of revision and a serious approach to their examinations, since too many of them appear to adopt a very casual attitude to their studies, while others panic when faced with the pressures of writing examinations. Much moral support must be given at this period.

Internal examinations provide a comparatively quiet period when work in the office can be most fruitful. A list of projects started, continued or finalized are: staffing, timetable summaries, the maintenance of furni-

ture and the school building (estimates of work to be done in the vacation). It is necessary to ensure that Departmental Heads present all relevant information for the allocation of staff to each form in their subject areas, and those responsible for furniture supply relevant statistics on furniture repairs. If this is not done before the end of term, the vacation period will present problems since such persons are likely to be unavailable when such information is required.

Promotion meetings are not very relevant in our situation at the moment. At present they are seen as a forum for exchanging information on students. If the system of promotion through merit is introduced, the character of the exercise will certainly be changed.

Students' Reports are important, and in addition to the comment of the Form Teacher and Year Head, the Head or Deputy checks and signs. This provides the opportunity to note not just the grades obtained but the comments made by the individual subject teachers.

While the majority of students are preparing for an enjoyable holiday, some Fifth Formers are bidding farewell to their school. The Graduation Exercise for these students is a very special moment in their lives, and the last four weeks are spent in preparation--dancing, practising speeches, planning programmes and shopping. One cannot

avoid being involved in this activity, and the night of Graduation is usually very enjoyable.

The summer vacation must be carefully planned or every day can easily be spent interviewing new students, prospective members of staff and parents, and chatting informally with some staff members who find time to "drop in". The school timetable should be ready at the beginning of the new term. This assists immensely with the smooth and quick settling of everything that is new, since for some staff and pupils it is a new school, and for the remainder of the pupil population there are new forms, texts etc.

The making of a timetable is complex and cannot be easily done without assistance. Thus arrangements must be made in advance to assure that adequate help is available. This exercise, although very time-consuming and difficult, is one aspect of my work which brings satisfaction.

Guidance and Counselling is becoming increasingly necessary, and there can be no timetabled programme which can meet the needs of this vital area. It is imperative to deal with each problem according to its nature and circumstances. Thus, some can be settled in school between the regular hours of 9:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m., but for others, sometimes it is necessary to contact parents/guardians early in the morning, late at night and even during the week-end and holidays. It is very rewarding when

solutions to some of the problems are found. But I must state that this approach and the amount of time spent in this area is very devastating to one's health. It will be very helpful when assistance is given to each school in the form of truly devoted Guidance Officers, who are prepared to give of their best in this field.

Personally, I feel that headteachers should find time to observe students and teachers at work. Knowledge would then be first hand:--how pupils respond to oral questions; their attitude to other students; slow responses; alert students; those who appear informed; sitting and standing postures and several other points which can help with the general assessment of both students and teachers. If possible, the Head should teach for limited periods (5-6), but instruction time is so often interrupted by unscheduled but urgent business that the students tend to suffer as a result.

Activities of the school year include attendance at the monthly meetings of the Parent-Teacher Association, active participation in the annual school fair and other fund-raising and social events and attendance at Speech Days and functions organized by other educational institutions.

School administration, though complex, can be very interesting and rewarding.

The Observed and Self-Monitored Phases

There is a remarkably wide gap between the recorded on-the-job time and the engaged time of this headteacher. Her total on-the-job time for the three-day period of observation was 1640 minutes, but only during 1132 minutes of this time was there observable behaviour on her part. Her average on-the-job day was 546.7 minutes as opposed to an engaged average of 377.3 minutes (6.3 hours).

As shown in Table 26 over the three-day period, she

TABLE 26 - HEADTEACHER G

DETAILS OF TASKS AND ACTIVITIES (OBSERVED PHASE)

TASKS	NO. OF ACTIVITIES	TIME (MINUTES)	% TIME
Administration	53	379	33.5
Assembly	2	24	2.1
Student Welfare	6	69	6.1
Exchanges	4	12	1.1
Phone	17	42.5	3.8
Budget	6	167	14.8
Discussion	2	21	1.9
Planning	3	52.5	4.6
Visitor	3	5	0.4
Instructional	1	23	2.0
Personal	4	144	12.7
Student Discipline	12	34	3.0
Monitoring	3	16	1.4
Correspondence	1	14	1.2
Meeting	1	120	10.6
Tour	1	9	0.8
16	119	1132	100.0
AVERAGE TIME PER ACTIVITY 9.5 MINUTES			

performed sixteen different tasks that involved her in 119 activities. Her average time per activity was 9.5 minutes. Four of these sixteen tasks accounted for over 71 percent of her time. These areas are administration (33.5 percent), budget (14.8 percent), personal matters (12.7 percent) and meetings (10.6 percent). As can be seen from Table 26, when these areas are accounted for, there was not a great deal of time left for the other activities.

Headteacher G spent more than half her time in planned activities which were carried out for the most part, in her office. For most of her time, too, she was either interacting with members of the school community or alone, leaving only just over 3 percent for contact with members of the wider community.

There was again a wide gap between the on-the-job and the engaged time of this headteacher in the self-monitored phase. The engaged time worked out at an average of 412 minutes in contrast to the 534.6 minutes for the on-the-job day. As shown in Table 28, Headteacher G had an engaged time over the five days of 2060 minutes and did 67 activities at an average of 30.7 minutes per activity. She performed 14 sets of tasks of which administration (38 percent), meetings (16.3 percent), teaching (14.8 percent) and correspondence (10.7 percent) accounted for more than 79 percent of the time.

TABLE 27 - CLASSIFICATION OF HEADTEACHER G'S WORK TIME
(OBSERVED PHASE)

	TYPE FRAME		LOCATION FRAME		INTERACTION FRAME		
	Sched- uled	Un- sched- uled	Office	Non Office	School Com- munity	Out- side	Alone
Time	744.5	387.5	941	191	641.5	40	450.5
%	65.8	34.2	83.1	16.9	56.7	3.5	39.8
Activ- ities	38	81	107	12	79	11	29
%	31.9	68.1	89.9	10.1	66.4	9.2	24.4
TOTAL TIME = 1132 MINUTES				TOTAL ACTIVITIES = 119			

TABLE 28 - HEADTEACHER G

DETAILS OF TASKS AND ACTIVITIES (SELF-MONITORED PHASE)

TASKS	NO. OF ACTIVITIES	TIME (MINUTES)	% TIME
Administration	23	782	38.0
Correspondence	11	220	10.7
Phone	6	33	1.6
Assembly	2	30	1.5
Tour	2	20	1.0
Student Welfare	4	75	3.6
Exchanges	3	50	2.4
Student Discipline	4	95	4.6
Budget	2	40	1.9
Teaching	5	305	14.8
Detention	1	20	1.0
Monitoring	1	45	2.2
Meeting	2	335	16.3
Planning	1	10	0.5
14	67	2060	100.1
AVERAGE TIME PER ACTIVITY 30.7 MINUTES			

Planned work occupied most of this headteacher's time during both phases. The office was the location of a great deal of the activity. There was a more equitable time distribution over the three elements of the interaction frame. Table 29 gives the full details.

TABLE 29 - CLASSIFICATION OF HEADTEACHER G'S WORK TIME
(SELF-MONITORED PHASE)

	TYPE FRAME		LOCATION FRAME		INTERACTION FRAME		
	Sched- uled	Un- sched- uled	Office	Non Office	School Com- munity	Out- side	Alone
Time	1734	326	1340	720	971	419	670
%	84.2	15.8	65.0	35.0	47.1	20.3	32.5
Activ- ities	47	20	54	13	33	6	28
%	70.1	29.9	80.6	19.4	49.3	9.0	41.8
TOTAL TIME = 2060 MINUTES				TOTAL ACTIVITIES = 67			

The Interview

What a Headteacher Should Do - (Items 1 - 4)

The definition presents a very clear perspective on the headship. However, there are some missing elements, she suggested. A headteacher cannot escape the personal, and emotional involvement with the students in the local context. She often has to be mediator and referee between the adults in the home and the child. Taking the social factors in this society into account, this aspect of the role is inevitable. With respect to emphasis, there was no doubt that the educational leadership role should be the main concern but the other should not be ignored.

A headteacher should proceed with caution in terms of using her own philosophy to run the school. She should be sure that it would benefit the school, that it would not produce conflicts. For this, she should be well informed, well read. A headteacher should not be time-tabled to teach because there are too many occasions on which she will be called away, too many uncertainties and the children would suffer. However, there are many opportunities that she should use for getting into the classroom and teaching e.g. when a teacher is absent, for demonstration purposes, to set a teacher free for some useful purpose. On the other hand, there is no doubt that she should be required to visit and observe classroom teaching. It is

the one sure means of informing oneself of what is really going on in the classroom. And this should be done across the subjects, not only in the area of specialization.

The Headship As She Experiences It

Part I - General Description - (Items 5 - 15)

The definition given in the extract was referred to as an apt description. She summed up her role as "Managing the entire school i.e. the human, the physical plant and the resources". She had been in administration for so long she could hardly recall her reactions. She did observe, however, that she was surprised, on becoming a Deputy Head-teacher, at the amount of work that was involved in administering a school.

Though she interacted mainly with her senior teachers i.e. Deputy Head, Department Heads and Year Heads, she tried to have regular contact with all teachers, however junior. As far as the pupils are concerned, she keeps an open office so pupils can come and go freely. There is a lot of contact with parents, especially those with problem-students, and members of the Board of Management--especially the Chairman and the Secretary-Treasurer. Members of the public seeking permission to use the school for functions, and travel-agents promoting package tours have become quite regular visitors in recent years. The

following were given as tasks which she found herself performing or engaged in on a regular basis: disciplinary matters, communication and correspondence within and without the school, compiling statistics, reports and other information for the Ministry of Education, touring/monitoring the school to keep an eye on things, staff meetings, assemblies and dealing with parents.

There was no need in her view to require a headteacher to submit termly reports on some classes of teachers, to have her responsible for the security of the plant and for the repair of furniture etc. The first is valueless and wasteful and the others should be given to people more competent to handle them. On the other hand, there are some far more meaningful ways in which a headteacher could be involved. For example, they should be making an input in the formulation of policy and help to obivate those that are irrelevant; they should be given greater discretion in matters of discipline (spontaneous action is more effective than referring matters to Boards and higher authorities) and they could be given greater academic freedom to make decisions about public examinations and curriculum. While the time devoted to various tasks varied at different times of the year, the following were identified as taking most of her time--planning for the year and beyond, correspondence, time-tabling and staff (discipline, welfare etc.).

Compiling statistics for the Ministry seems meaningless, especially as the same information was demanded at different times, during the course of the year, and was deemed the least important aspect of the job. Motivating staff and students to reach the highest standards possible, securing necessary materials, ensuring that the methods used were sound and suitable to the school and that children were shown the value of education was the most important task of the headteacher. These required lots of time and tremendous hard work and the emotional strain of being a model at all times. She regretted not being able to do all she would like in this area. She was not always able to find the time because of the many small, but important issues that got in the way. Young teachers needed more help than time and other pressures would allow her to give.

In her view, and in her practice, there was a place for both long- and short-term planning. Both were important for different purposes.

Part II - Leadership and Decisions - (Items 16 - 19)

She describes her style as "non-authoritarian, but she prefers to lead by interaction". She allows people to grow, to show initiative and share ideas, but she "retains that which is mine".

Some of the major decisions she makes are in the area of student discipline, timetabling and the use of resources. The minor decisions she makes relate to granting students or teachers permission to leave school during the working day for good cause, and the sort of punishment to mete out to students for minor infringements.

Among her frequent problems are:

1. Discipline problems--fighting, rudeness, failure to do work;
2. Dress regulation infringement--incorrect uniform, painted nails, etc.;
3. Ancillary staff problems;
4. Lack of equipment and materials.

Occasionally, she has to deal with parents who refuse to make their children conform to the regulations of the school. There are those who encourage them to break regulations.

These problems crop up from time to time:

1. Staff recruitment problems--difficulty is in finding staff or making the wrong choice;
2. Staff absenteeism--mainly through ill-health;
3. Pupil social welfare problems.

Part III - Educational Leadership Issues - (Items 20 - 24)

She admitted that there were not very many structures or provisions for staff development in the school. She did, however, encourage staff to undertake further training and she made a point of making it possible for all those who applied for training or retraining programmes to attend. Departments are encouraged to hold meetings and relate to relevant professional issues that arise. Only occasionally does the headteacher herself organize staff seminars to deal with issues that interest the staff.

During class time, there is an air of meaningful activity. Sometimes as she moves around the school, she notices a tendency for some children to crowd the teacher while others appear to be neglected. During recreational time there tends to be a lot of noise, but the space is very limited and children have to play in a very restricted space. She is not fully satisfied with the general tone. She would like to see different approaches in the classroom and more general student involvement and participation.

Her expectations for pupils are very high but not restricted to gaining "O" levels. Her hope is for them to reach the very best of which they are capable. They should have good moral standards and be able to distinguish right from wrong. She talks to students in the general assembly and in their year groups. She highlights the achievements of those who do well.

She would like her staff to be devoted and to recognize that they have a responsibility to all students. She holds staff meetings, Department meetings and chats with staff on an individual basis. Neither the staff nor the pupils fully understand and consequently there is much room for improvement. Some pupils frustrate themselves over academic work and neglect areas for which they have potential. Staff tend to ignore the non-academic.

The curriculum is constantly changed to fit the type of child in the school. Every effort is made to assess the needs of the society and the job market. Subjects are added from time to time.

Responsibility for the teaching-learning process is delegated to the Heads of Department and followed by both the Head and the Deputy Head. They check the termly reports of students carefully and investigate where necessary. The Head and Deputy observe teaching and hold discussions with the teachers.

Her reaction to the items on Question 24 was interesting. She omitted items 6--trying out ideas and suggestions put forward by others, and 10--defining the situation, rather than leaving it to others to do so. All other items had a high rating for importance except for number 11--actively undertaking classroom observation of lessons. This was rated at three. Her perceived performance matched

the importance on six items and fell below it on six. What is noticeable on number 13 is that her own emphasis on the item was higher than the value she attached to it.

Part IV - Reactions to the Headship - (Items 25 - 28)

She was not able to run the school as she would like because there was too little freedom, and many restrictions. She felt headteachers should be free to advertise and recruit staff with the approval of the Board of Management. Heads should be able to reward staff in simple ways at least and they should be given greater discretion over discipline and other areas.

Teaching she discusses as her one and only love, and seeing children achieve and make something of their lives was a blessing to her. She also derived pleasure at seeing her staff grow professionally. She found the uncertainty and the lack of power in the job very dissatisfying and the amount of red tape involved in the job frustrating.

She averaged about 50 working hours per week.

CHAPTER V

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF THE DATA

What The Headteachers Think They Ought To Do

A paraphrased version of Roe and Drake's (1974) dual perspective on the principalship was put before the headteachers in the interview (see Appendix 3). In this, the administrative-managerial dimension charges the principal with tasks normally associated with organizational maintenance (e.g. record-keeping, discipline, personnel and building administration, the control and management of finance and resources), and which require skills and competences of a technical and human relations nature. The educational leadership dimension, on the other hand, requires among other things, that the principal motivates his staff to perform at their highest levels, that he develops with them a realistic system of accountability for learning, and procedures for assessing staff, students and on-going programmes in an effort to ensure that teaching and learning are enhanced. In this dimension are the tasks and activities from which will flow relevant and meaningful change and which are essential for effective headship and effective schools. Operating at this level demands professional, analytical and conceptual skills and competences along with the earlier technical and human relations ones.

On the whole, the headteachers agreed that this definition of the principalship adequately fitted their conception of the headship in the local context. They therefore conceded that these were the dimensions within which they ought to operate. However, there was less agreement on the question of emphasis. Five of them felt that equal attention should be paid to both aspects because they both represent the legitimate and complementary tasks of the role. The other two headteachers insisted that the educational leadership role was the more important function and should therefore be given greater emphasis.

No clear position emerged on the issue of whether the headteacher should let his/her own philosophy of education determine how the school should be organized and run. Of the three who supported this view, two maintained that where conflict arises over the matter, the headteacher ought to persuade the staff to accept his/her way and let it work. Two headteachers stressed that the headteacher must arrive at a shared position with the staff, since s/he cannot run the school alone. For them, while headteachers must use their initiative and provide the lead, they must give serious consideration to the views of their staff. The other two had no strong views, one way or the other, on the matter.

Six of the seven respondents rejected the notion that

headteachers be required to teach routinely on the timetable. Their justifications ranged from consideration for the headteacher (it's too burdensome) to considerations for the student (the child will suffer because there are too many interruptions). Two of them, however, went on to suggest that headteachers should take whatever opportunities presented themselves to get into the classroom; for example, the absence of a teacher. Only one headteacher felt very strongly that they should be required to teach because "it was the only way of keeping in touch with reality".

The classroom observation of teachers was considered a vital task of the headship. All seven of the respondents had no hesitation in strongly and unreservedly putting forward this view. Generally, the purposes advanced for classroom visits related to aiding professional growth and development in the interest of improved teaching and learning in the schools. There was also some support for the view that headteachers needed to know what was really going on in their classrooms. The major concern of one headteacher was to collect evidence for the purpose of writing his report on the individual teachers for the Ministry of Education.

Two areas of activity that are currently perceived to be consuming a great deal of their time and energy are the

supervision of ancillary staff and the maintenance of buildings and plant. There is a strong feeling amongst them that these should not be part of their duties.

The headteachers indicated on a five-point scale (5 high - 1 low) the emphasis they felt principals should attach to a set of items (See Appendix 3, Question 24) which were designed to assess their conceptions of leadership, staff development, the involvement of parents in the school and the extent to which they felt principals should exert themselves as leaders in the school. As shown in Table 30 below, these headteachers felt that these areas should be emphasized. For no area was the mean score less than four. It is their view, therefore, that headteachers ought to:

1. Practise participatory leadership in which they and their staff work cooperatively in the running of the school (Items 2, 4, 6, 9);
2. Be committed to the development of their staff and the improvement of teaching and learning (Items 5, 11, 12, 14, 15);
3. Seek to involve parents in achieving the goals of the school (Items 7, 8); and
4. Take a positive stand as educational leaders, in the interest of the school (Items 1, 3, 10, 13).

TABLE 30

SUGGESTED EMPHASES FOR SPECIFIC AREAS OF THE HEADSHIP

	HEADTEACHERS ITEM NO.	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	TOTAL	MEAN
AREA	2	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	34	4.8
LEADER- SHIP STYLE	4	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	34	4.8
	6	3	4	5	5	5	4	-	28	4.0
	9	5	4	5	5	5	5	5	34	4.8
										4.6
STAFF DEVELOPMENT	5	3	5	5	3	5	5	5	31	4.4
	11	3	3	5	4	4	5	3	27	3.9
	12	5	4	4	5	4	5	5	32	4.6
	14	4	5	5	5	5	5	5	34	4.9
	15	3	4	5	5	5	5	5	32	4.6
										4.5
PARENTAL INVOLVE- MENT	7	2	3	5	5	5	5	5	30	4.3
	8	4	3	5	5	4	5	5	31	4.4
										4.4
ASSERTIVE EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP	1	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	34	4.9
	3	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	34	4.9
	10	4	3	5	5	4	5	-	26	3.7
	13	5	4	5	5	5	5	4	33	4.7
										4.6

Note: Scores of 5 and 4 were considered high 3 average, 1 poor.

Summary

While unanimously endorsing the adequacy of the Roe and Drake's perspective to the local context, the headteachers in the sample had differing views on the emphasis to be placed on the respective dimensions within it. Five supported equal weighting, but two would give greater emphasis to educational leadership, perceived by them to be of greater importance. There was no clear-cut position regarding the headteacher running the school according to his/her own philosophy, although the tendency was to support this idea. There is no place in their conception of the headship for headteachers to teach according to a fixed schedule, but they see the classroom observation of teachers as an inescapable task for headteachers. In their conception of the headship participatory leadership, the promotion of staff development, the involvement of parents in the school and assertive educational leadership feature prominently.

What The Headteachers Think They Do

Their description of their work shows how multifaceted the role is perceived to be. It covers a wide range of duties and responsibilities and portrays the position as one of power and influence. On the whole, they see themselves as managers, directing and controlling all

that goes on in the school. While different aspects of the role have been highlighted by different respondents, certain characteristics stand out. Firstly, the headteachers see themselves as providing a service essentially to students, but also to teachers and parents. They stress the headship as a service position in which counselling and advising are essential elements. Indeed, two headteachers refuse to call it a job, preferring to describe it as a "dedication" or a "vocation". Secondly, they stress the importance of good interpersonal relationships in the school and project their role therein as pivotal. The third major feature is their concentration on the discipline and control of students.

A particularly noticeable feature is the absence of any significant element of the educational leadership dimension. In the light of its own importance and considering the importance they claim to attach to it in their role conceptions, this omission cannot be overlooked.

The main target of their interaction was persons from within the school community. There was hardly any mention of contact with persons from the wider society. All the headteachers interacted frequently with their staff, although a hierarchial pecking order--deputy head, department heads--was sometimes indicated. In some cases, junior members of staff were hardly seen. Only three headteachers

claimed they freely and unconditionally interacted with students. In other cases, interaction with students was generally restricted to prefects and students with problems, mainly, though not only, disciplinary problems. Regular contact with parents, support staff and members of the Board of Management was also mentioned.

From a wide and varied set of tasks regularly performed by the individual respondents, emerged a smaller group of common tasks. These relate to student discipline, student attendance, correspondence (including transcripts and testimonials), the preparation of information (reports, statistics etc.) for the Ministry of Education, attending meetings, interviews with parents, student or staff, and conducting or attending school assemblies. These seven common tasks all fall within the administrative-managerial dimension of the role.

Some aspects of the job were considered wasteful of their time, distasteful or outside of their competence. Though there was no general consensus on these areas, they are noteworthy in themselves. For some, the supervision of ancillary staff and the handling of student problems demanded too much time and should be removed from the head-teacher's sphere of responsibility. Others would relinquish the area of building administration and security because it did not fall within their competence. A few

find the job of reporting on teachers to the Ministry of Education distasteful. On the whole, they expressed the need for role clarification as they claimed to be experiencing some ambiguity over their discretion to make decisions in such matters as the admission of pupils, sanctions for certain types of misdemeanours, staff appointments and personnel management.

In spite of different sets of words from each headteacher, there is clear agreement that the most important tasks of the role centre around those factors that promote student learning and development and therefore fall in the educational leadership dimension. Unfortunately, however, only two of the seven headteachers felt they were able to devote the time, energy and resources they considered appropriate to this important area. The others all claimed that there was too much pressure on them from other role requirements and also that the necessary resources were not available to them. The extent to which these may be rationalizations will be discussed later. At this point, however, one cannot avoid the observation that they seem to think every duty within the headship must only be performed by themselves or not done at all. The possibility of mobilising their staff and organizing their work differently so that important roles like providing educational leadership can be tackled, does not seem to have occurred to them.

Planning strategies utilized by most of the headteachers were both long- and short-term. These headteachers recognized the need for both, according to the issue in hand, and stressed that a school cannot depend entirely on either, if it is to function properly. It was the two headteachers (A and B) whose schools, as described by themselves, seem to have many problems--conflict and lack of cooperation between staff and head, noisy, unmotivated and undisciplined students--that depend entirely on short-term planning. They believed that long-term planning would not work in their circumstances. Perhaps this perspective is related to their lack of experience in the headship.

The headteachers had their own formulae for describing the leadership style they perceived themselves to have and practise. Terms such as "interactive", "non-authoritarian", "leading by example", "not leading from a distance" and "flexible and open" were used. One could generalize their leadership style by describing it as falling nearer the participatory end on a continuum going from participatory to authoritarian. While discussing their practice of sharing and involving their staff they could not resist the desire to let one know who is in charge. Expressions such as, "can overrule when necessary", "don't give up that which is mine", were often used.

Attention is again drawn to Headteachers A and B. Headteacher A combines telling, ordering and sharing, while B, describing himself as one who shares and involves people, opines that his staff would describe him as 'autocratic'. One can only speculate on the relationship between these positions and the problems in the school. One wonders what could lead a headteacher who genuinely shares to the belief that he is seen as autocratic. In the case of Headteacher A, one wonders how much sharing is done. She expressed her disappointment at staff making decisions and then not carrying them out. One is now left to wonder to what extent staff feel they are part of the decision-making process. It has been observed that when decisions are made by an administrator without the involvement of the staff who must help to carry them out, they are seen as the administrator's decisions and there may be little commitment to them by the staff. When the desired outcomes are not forthcoming, the administrator feels he has failed and becomes frustrated (Erlandson 1976).

The areas in which the headteachers claim to make their major decisions appear to cover a disparate field, embracing such areas as allocating resources, selecting staff, timetabling, discipline and managing staff. Closer examination reveals, however, that by and large, they lie in three main domains, namely, curriculum management,

personnel management and pupil order and control.

Curriculum management is more heavily subscribed than the other two, and subsumes the following: allocating resources, determining curriculum, timetabling, promotion policies, deploying staff, organizing learning groups, and assessing teacher-effectiveness. The decisions under personnel management relate to the recruitment of staff, assessing and dealing with staff and student attitudes, delegating and deciding what information to communicate to staff. Fewer decisions are made in the area of pupil order and control than in either of the other two areas.

The headteachers evidently found it much more difficult to think of decisions they consider minor. After much hesitation they came up with a curious collection. One could think of no decisions he would consider minor decisions from others. For example, staff deployment was seen as a minor decision-making area by one headteacher but as major by three or four. Similarly, counselling parents was dismissed as minor by another. This would be quite alien to the two or three who consider it of great importance.

The problems that have been sufficiently significant to imprint themselves on the minds of the headteachers have serious implications for the proper functioning of schools and for what goes on in them. At the student level, discipline problems have been named by six headteachers, and is

clearly a thorn in their flesh. Social and welfare problems and attitudinal problems--bad attitudes to work, to duties and to the rules of the school--constitute the remaining problem area from the student body.

But, as if these problems were not already serious enough, they are compounded by equally bothersome staff problems. Delinquency (failure to carry out duties, e.g. not showing up to teach a class), rapid staff changes, and absenteeism were the major and frequent problems identified, but conflict among staff, dull teaching and lack of cooperation were also cited. Problems with ancillary staff were also frequently mentioned.

How widespread are these problems both among the staff and the student body? To what extent do they permeate the staff and student bodies of our school? These questions can fruitfully be the subject of further study, but they must be considered as serious ones in the light of other practices and experiences arising out of the study. For example, with respect to the issues and problems relating to staff, one may ask what is being done. Staff development and staff evaluation are generally accepted as part of the role responsibility of the principalship. The implications of this responsibility are clearly enunciated in the extract paraphrased from Roe and Drake and endorsed by them. But what is the practice in their own operation?

It is learnt that very little is being done in this important area. It is learnt that generally, this matter is the responsibility of the heads of departments but there are no provisions or structures laid down, no frameworks established for their guidance. If anything positive is to happen in this situation, it will depend on the drive, the professionalism and competence of the individual head of department. And there is no guarantee that if one department is functioning properly, the others will, because there are no communication links established between heads of departments or between them and the headteacher in this area.

Where provisions for staff development were claimed to exist, their description was couched in vague terms and elaborations were hardly ever forthcoming. For example, "professional staff meetings" were cited as a means of staff development but it proved difficult to find out what these were, what was done in them, or even how often they were held. What aspect of "performance" was "monitored" with heads of departments and how, and what "help" was offered also found no clear explanation. "Staff are encouraged to keep up-to-date" was also proffered as evidence of staff development provisions, yet there was no indication of the availability of professional journals or texts in the schools to make this possible.

Only one school could offer a careful and meaningful description of an attempt at an articulated programme for staff development. There is a well-prepared handbook given to all staff, that covers the objectives and operations of the school. It contains suggestions supported by relevant extracts, about teaching methods, class control and other pertinent educational issues, and it explains certain practices and policies within the school. It is much used and the heads of departments as well as the headteacher and deputy headteacher often refer teachers to it, even discussing sections of it with them. The orientation for new staff is carefully planned and carried out. Classroom visits and follow-up appraisal sessions with senior personnel are regularly undertaken. Training sessions and seminars are regularly arranged by the school to constantly upgrade the staff. These involve not only senior members of the school itself, but also personnel from other institutions in the country. During the observation period, discussed later, this researcher was privileged to sit in on an excellently conducted appraisal session following a classroom observation visit undertaken by the headteacher.

Although, as pointed out earlier, discipline and order seem to be a major concern of the headteachers, they were, on the whole (five instances out of seven), able to describe the tone and general climate of their schools as

healthy and generally satisfactory. Whereas "tardiness" and "unpunctuality" were earlier mentioned as student problems with which the headteachers had to cope frequently, terms like "business-like", "orderly", and "tidy" are now being used to describe the atmosphere of the school. Only two schools were described as unsatisfactory in such terms as "noisy", "boisterous" or "ragged".

The expectations held by the headteachers for both staff and students are generally wide and imprecise, and tend to be unrealistic in the context of the schools in question. The headteachers could not explain in a convincing manner any means by which these expectations could be met. Expressions such as "that they will develop as people fit for society", "that they will be adults who can face life" may sound quite grand, but what do they mean? And more importantly, how does a school attempt to translate the wish into meaningful reality? Only two schools had among their general notions some specific expectations and were able to show how these might be realized. These two schools held cognitive or academic expectations in contrast to most of the others which specifically stated that academic expectations were unrealistic in their schools, or simply bypassed them in the belief that general expectations are more acceptable educationally.

Only one headteacher held expectations for his staff

that could be considered realizable and assessable in the context of the school. He expected them to uphold policies and standards of the school and the profession. Since these issues are clearly spelled out in the school's handbook and regularly followed up, these expectations appear realistic. In the main, the headteachers seemed to be merely expressing pious hopes, as attested by these examples: "that they will have pride in their work and show concern for the pupils", "that they will be more professional and cooperative", "that they will recognize their responsibility to the children". Generally, talks at the morning assembly and staff meetings were the means used to communicate their expectations. But more concretely, the school rules and good interpersonal relationships were among the means mentioned.

Research has fairly well established that there is a relationship between expectations and performance (Rosenthal and Jacobsen, 1968). And Leithwood's (1983) survey has shown that effective principals constantly articulate high expectations for both pupils and teachers. Where expectations are held by those in authority-positions for those under their direction or guidance one should reasonably expect to find concrete structures for ensuring that these expectations have a reasonable chance of being met. Furthermore, there should be tangible, realistic

means of communicating these expectations to those at whom they are directed. In the cases under discussion, it cannot be affirmed that these conditions are being satisfied.

The evidence from this research suggests that the curriculum in the schools is somewhat static in that subjects are hardly dropped or added except where there is national demand or pressure. Curriculum change, it appears, very rarely originates from within the school. Such change as is brought about is normally in response to changes in the syllabuses of the relevant public examination boards.

The curriculum tends to be organized around core subjects and options. The core subjects are normally fixed for all students, while the options are used to accommodate the needs, interests and abilities of the individual student. The schools generally provide students and parents with guidance in the choices relative to projected careers and present achievement. Apart from this general picture, one or two positions stand out. Two headteachers claimed that their curriculum was regularly reviewed and changed in the light of the society's changing needs and the interests and levels of their students. They were able to produce supporting evidence to justify their claims. One headteacher admitted that the curriculum in his school was very "academic" and in need of change. He pointed out, however, that he could not introduce new subjects without

the relevant research to show if they were necessary and viable. A strange comment in a society that has no tradition of research before the formulation and implementation of policy!

A major concern of all involved in education--parents, teachers, children, tax payers--must be that of how to ensure that what is supposed to go on in the classroom is, in fact, what is going on. The responsibility of running the school is given to the principals and the onus is therefore on them to ascertain that the schools' purposes are being properly carried out. It was, therefore, disconcerting to discover how little, to all appearances, is being done in this area. Here again, this matter was generally left to the department heads and the headteachers were equally unable to describe any provisions or guidelines that were to be followed. Nor could they tell of any method by which the heads of department communicated with them so that they were kept informed about what was going on. One headteacher seriously commented that she trusted her staff and left it up to them to do their work. Yet, in some of the very schools in the project, as reported by the headteachers themselves, there were cases of teachers not turning up to classes, not marking exercises done by the students and not following the syllabuses for the public examinations for which they were supposed to be preparing the students.

The review of students' reports is taken very seriously by the headteachers. They claim that they scrutinize the students' reports carefully and ask questions where necessary. One wonders how useful this exercise is, what it can tell them about the quality of teaching that goes on in the classroom, especially where the teacher is setting and marking his own assignments. Another device used to monitor the teaching-learning process is the careful analysis and examination of the results of public examinations, but is this not being wise after the event?

Apart from assessing the values the headteachers attached to the items of question 24 on the interview schedule (See Appendix 3) as discussed above, it was considered useful to see how they would rate their own performance on the said items. As can be seen in Table 31 where the details are given, their performance in the four areas is rated as high or firmly average. The headteachers may therefore be regarded as assertive school leaders who practise a participatory approach to leadership involving their staff in the running of the school. Though their performance with respect to staff development and the involvement of parents in the school is commendable, there is room for greater effort.

TABLE 31

PERCEIVED PERFORMANCE IN SPECIFIC AREAS OF THE HEADSHIP

	HEADTEACHERS ITEM NO.	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	TOTAL	MEAN
AREA	2	3	3	5	5	5	5	5	31	4.4
LEADER- SHIP STYLE	4	3	4	5	4	5	5	5	31	4.4
	6	3	3	4	4	4	3	-	21	3.0
	9	3	4	5	5	5	5	5	32	4.6
										4.1
STAFF DEVELOPMENT	5	2	3	5	3	5	5	4	27	3.9
	11	2	2	4	4	3	4	3	22	3.1
	12	2	4	4	4	3	4	4	25	3.6
	14	2	4	5	4	5	5	3	28	4.0
	15	3	2	5	4	5	5	4	28	4.0
										3.7
PARENTAL INVOLVE- MENT	7	1	3	5	4	5	5	4	27	3.9
	8	2	2	5	5	4	5	4	27	3.9
										3.9
ASSERTIVE EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP	1	3	3	5	5	4	5	5	30	4.3
	3	3	4	5	5	3	5	5	30	4.3
	10	3	3	4	5	4	5	-	24	3.4
	13	4	4	5	5	5	5	5	33	4.7
										4.2

Note: Scores of 5 and 4 were considered high 3 average, 2 and 1 poor.

Summary

1. Four features stand out from the headteachers description of their work, namely:
 - (a) The headship is portrayed as a service role;
 - (b) The headteacher's role in creating and maintaining good interpersonal relations, so vital in the school, is strongly stressed;
 - (c) The omission of major elements of educational leadership.
2. The headteachers' contact is mainly with staff, students, parents and members of the Board of Management. Their interaction thus, has a strong inward focus, a position found by researchers elsewhere (Casey 1980, Martin 1980).
3. The tasks they find themselves performing on a regular basis and which account for a good deal of their time, all fall within the administrative-managerial role dimension. This finds general support in the literature too (Wolcott 1973), the exceptions being those effective principals who find ways of breaking out of this confinement (Blumberg and Greenfield 1980).
4. While the headteachers saw the importance of their educational leadership role, they could claim no positive action therein. They claim that pressure of work in the administrative-managerial area made it difficult to do anything else.

5. Curriculum management, personnel management and pupil order and control were their major areas of decision-making. Curriculum change hardly ever originates in the school.
6. The major problems they encounter relate to student discipline and control, student social and welfare problems, general attitudes and to staff delinquency and absenteeism.
7. The expectations held by the headteachers for both their staff and students seem vague and unrealistic and furthermore are not followed up by strategies and structures that could aid their realization.

What The Headteachers Actually Do

The data presented in Tables 32 and 33 represent the significant features of the chronological records of the seven headteachers in the observed and self-monitored phases respectively. The difference between "being on the job" and "working on the job" is immediately noticeable from the tables. In the case of each headteacher and in both phases there were periods of time for which no account was given. In the observed phase, as seen in Table 32, this amount ranges from the relatively low figure of seventy-four minutes (1.2 hours) recorded by Headteacher D over the three-day period to the rather high figure of 508

TABLE 32 - ANALYSIS OF SIGNIFICANT FEATURES OF THE CHRONOLOGICAL RECORD

OBSERVED PHASE - DURATION THREE DAYS

HEADTEACHERS									
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	TOTAL	MEAN
ON-THE-JOB TIME (Hours)	1294 (21.6)	1470 (24.5)	1190 (19.8)	1477 (24.6)	1540 (25.7)	1331 (22.2)	1640 (27.3)	9942 (165.7)	1420.3 (23.7)
ENGAGED TIME (Hours)	1147.5 (19.1)	1356.5 (22.6)	1067 (17.8)	1403 (23.4)	1443 (24.1)	1218 (20.3)	1132 (18.9)	8767 (146.1)	1252.4 (20.9)
DIFFERENCE (Hours)	146.5 (2.4)	113.5 (1.9)	123 (2.1)	74 (1.2)	97 (1.6)	113 (1.9)	508 (8.5)	1175 (19.6)	167.9 (2.8)
MEAN DAILY DIFFERENCE (Hours)	48.8	37.8	41	24.7	32.3	37.7	169.3 (2.8)	391.6 (6.5)	55.9
DAILY MEAN ENGAGED TIME (Hours)	382.5 (6.4)	452.2 (7.5)	355.7 (5.9)	467.7 (7.8)	481 (8.0)	406 (6.8)	377.3 (6.3)	2922.4 (48.7)	417.5 (7.0)
ACTIVITY TOTAL	142	161	63	156	156	147	119	944	134.9
DAILY AVERAGE ACTIVITIES	47.3	53.7	21	52	52	49	39.7	314.7	45.0
<u>ADMINISTRATION</u> SESSIONS	66	79	25	61	68	91	53	443	63.3
TOTAL TIME	367	572	420	568	425	428	379	159	451.3
AVERAGE DURATION	5.6	7.2	16.8	9.3	6.3	4.7	7.2	-	7.1
% TIME	32	42.2	39.4	40.5	29.5	35.1	33.5	-	36.0
<u>ASSEMBLY</u> SESSIONS	2	1	3	-	2	2	2	12	1.7
TOTAL TIME	45	22	48	-	50	52	24	241	34.4
AVERAGE DURATION	22.5	22	16	-	25	26	12	-	20.1
% TIME	3.9	1.6	4.5	-	3.5	4.3	2.1	-	2.7

TABLE 32 - ANALYSIS OF SIGNIFICANT FEATURES OF THE CHRONOLOGICAL RECORD CONT'D

OBSERVED PHASE - DURATION THREE DAYS

HEADTEACHERS									
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	TOTAL	MEAN
<u>PERSONAL</u> SESSIONS	4	-	2	6	5	4	4	25	3.6
TOTAL TIME	115	-	80	150	92	112	144	693	99
AVERAGE DURATION	28.8	-	40	25	18.4	28	36	-	27.7
% TIME	10.0	-	7.5	10.7	6.4	9.2	12.7	-	7.9
<u>STUDENT</u> <u>DISCIPLINE</u> SESSIONS	13	42	4	12	9	13	12	105	15
TOTAL TIME	108	313.5	41	79	78	86	34	739.5	105.6
AVERAGE DURATION	8.3	7.5	10.3	6.6	8.7	6.6	2.8	-	7.0
% TIME	9.4	23.1	3.8	5.6	5.4	7.1	3	-	8.4
<u>PHONE</u> SESSIONS	16	12	8	39	32	15	17	139	19.9
TOTAL TIME	38.5	27.5	20	169.5	97	62	42.5	457	65.3
AVERAGE DURATION	2.4	2.3	2.5	4.3	3.0	4.1	2.5	-	3.3
% TIME	3.4	2.0	1.9	12.1	6.7	5.1	3.8	-	5.2
<u>TEACHING</u> SESSIONS	4	3	4	3	2	-	-	16	2.3
TOTAL TIME	197.5	144	197	81	99	-	-	718.5	102.6
AVERAGE DURATION	49.4	48	49.3	27	49.5	-	-	-	44.9
% TIME	17.2	10.6	18.5	5.8	6.9	-	-	-	8.2

TABLE 32 - ANALYSIS OF SIGNIFICANT FEATURES OF THE CHRONOLOGICAL RECORD CONT'D

OBSERVED PHASE - DURATION THREE DAYS

HEADTEACHERS									
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	TOTAL	MEAN
<u>TOUR</u> SESSIONS	3	5	1	2	7	5	1	24	3.4
TOTAL TIME	35	104	30	22	80	79	9	359	51.3
AVERAGE DURATION	11.6	20.8	30	11	11.4	15.8	9	-	15.0
% TIME	3.1	7.7	2.8	1.6	5.5	6.5	0.8	-	4.1
<u>STUDENT</u> <u>WELFARE</u> SESSIONS	2	-	3	6	6	5	6	28	4
TOTAL TIME	6	-	50	45	29	112	69	311	44.4
AVERAGE DURATION	3	-	16.7	7.5	4.8	22.4	11.5	-	11.1
% TIME	0.5	-	4.7	3.2	2.0	9.2	6.1	-	3.5
<u>BUDGET</u> SESSIONS	-	-	2	-	-	-	6	8	1.1
TOTAL TIME	-	-	39	-	-	-	167	206	29.4
AVERAGE DURATION	-	-	19.5	-	-	-	27.8	-	25.8
% TIME	-	-	3.7	-	-	-	14.8	-	2.8
<u>MEETING</u> SESSIONS	-	-	1	1	1	1	1	5	0.7
TOTAL TIME	-	-	38	134	235	80	120	607	86.7
AVERAGE DURATION	-	-	38	134	235	80	120	-	121.4
% TIME	-	-	3.6	9.6	16.3	6.6	10.6	-	6.9

All times calculated in Minutes except where otherwise stated

TABLE 33 - ANALYSIS OF SIGNIFICANT FEATURES OF THE CHRONOLOGICAL RECORD

SELF-MONITORED PHASE - DURATION FIVE DAYS

HEADTEACHERS									
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	TOTAL	MEAN
ON-THE-JOB TIME (Hours)	2487 (41.5)	2150 (35.8)	2200 (36.7)	2212 (36.9)	2850 (47.5)	2541 (42.4)	2673 (44.6)	17113 (285.2)	2444.7 (40.7)
ENGAGED TIME (Hours)	1720 (28.7)	1793 (29.9)	1922 (32.0)	2100 (35.0)	2680 (44.7)	2079 (34.7)	2060 (34.3)	14354 (239.2)	2050 (34.2)
DIFFERENCE (Hours)	767 (12.8)	357 (6.0)	276 (4.6)	112 (1.9)	170 (2.8)	462 (7.7)	613 (10.2)	2757 (46)	393.9 (6.6)
MEAN DAILY DIFFERENCE (Hours)	153.4 (2.6)	71.4 (1.2)	55.2 (.9)	22.4 (.4)	3.4 (.6)	92.4 (1.5)	122.6 (2.0)	551.4 (9.2)	78.8 (1.3)
DAILY MEAN ENGAGED TIME (Hours)	344 (5.7)	358.6 (6.0)	384.4 (6.4)	420 (7.0)	536 (8.9)	415.8 (6.9)	412 (6.9)	2870.9 (47.8)	410.1 (6.8)
ACTIVITY TOTAL	93	83	92	83	187	98	67	703	100.4
DAILY AVERAGE ACTIVITIES	18.6	16.6	18.4	16.6	37.4	19.6	13.4	140.1	20.1
<u>ADMINISTRATION</u> SESSIONS	43	19	46	29	73	47	23	280	40
TOTAL TIME	497	223	881	1215	771	661	782	5030	718.6
AVERAGE DURATION	11.6	11.7	19.2	41.8	10.6	14.1	34	-	18
% TIME	28.9	12.4	45.8	57.9	28.8	31.8	38	-	35.0
<u>ASSEMBLY</u> SESSIONS	1	3	4	5	1	3	2	19	2.7
TOTAL TIME	37	45	75	94	26	60	30	367	52.4
AVERAGE DURATION	37	15	18.8	18.8	26	20	15	-	19.3
% TIME	2.2	2.5	3.9	4.5	1.0	2.9	1.5	-	2.6

TABLE 33 - ANALYSIS OF SIGNIFICANT FEATURES OF THE CHRONOLOGICAL RECORD CONT'D

SELF-MONITORED PHASE - DURATION FIVE DAYS

HEADTEACHERS									
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	TOTAL	MEAN
<u>PERSONAL</u> SESSIONS	1	-	1	9	9	4	-	24	3.4
TOTAL TIME	81	-	39	132	57	193	-	503	71.7
AVERAGE DURATION	81	-	39	14.6	6.3	48.3	-	-	20.9
% TIME	4.7	-	2.0	6.3	2.1	9.3	-	-	3.5
<u>STAFF MEETING</u> SESSIONS	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	3	0.4
TOTAL TIME	-	230	-	-	53	-	-	283	40.4
AVERAGE DURATION	-	115	-	-	53	-	-	-	94.3
% TIME	-	12.8	-	-	2.0	-	-	-	2.0
<u>CORRESPONDENCE</u> SESSIONS	3	3	4	8	4	6	11	39	5.6
TOTAL TIME	10	23	75	187	55	93	220	663	94.7
AVERAGE DURATION	3.3	7.7	18.8	23.4	13.8	15.5	20	-	17
% TIME	0.6	1.3	3.9	8.9	2.1	4.5	10.7	-	4.6
<u>STUDENT</u> <u>DISCIPLINE</u> SESSIONS	12	19	4	11	12	7	4	69	9.9
TOTAL TIME	83	335	51	119	118	63	95	864	123
AVERAGE DURATION	6.9	17.6	12.8	10.8	9.8	9	23.8	-	12.5
% TIME	4.8	18.7	2.7	5.7	4.4	3.0	4.6	-	6.0

TABLE 33 - ANALYSIS OF SIGNIFICANT FEATURES OF THE CHRONOLOGICAL RECORD CONT'D

SELF-MONITORED PHASE - DURATION FIVE DAYS

HEADTEACHERS									
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	TOTAL	MEAN
<u>PHONE</u> SESSIONS	10	8	10	11	41	9	6	95	13.6
TOTAL TIME	28	108	79	110	180	53	33	591	84.4
AVERAGE DURATION	2.8	13.5	7.9	10	4.4	5.9	5.5	-	6.2
% TIME	1.6	6.0	4.1	5.2	6.7	2.6	1.6	-	4.1
<u>TEACHING</u> SESSIONS	4	8	6	1	5	-	5	29	4.1
TOTAL TIME	84	273	210	50	219	-	305	1141	163
AVERAGE DURATION	21	34.1	35	50	43.8	-	61	-	39.3
% TIME	4.9	15.2	10.9	2.4	8.1	-	14.8	-	7.9
<u>STUDENT WELFARE</u> SESSIONS	1	4	4	1	11	2	4	27	3.9
TOTAL TIME	12	66	54	6	74	9	75	296	42.3
AVERAGE DURATION	12	16.5	13.5	6	6.7	4.5	18.8	-	11.0
% TIME	0.7	3.7	2.8	0.3	2.8	0.4	3.6	-	2.1
<u>MEETING</u> SESSIONS	5	-	1	-	4	3	2	15	2.1
TOTAL TIME	663	-	180	-	860	690	335	2728	389.7
AVERAGE DURATION	132.6	-	180	-	215	230	167.5	-	181.9
% TIME	38	-	9.3	-	320	33.2	16.3	-	19.0

TABLE 33 - ANALYSIS OF SIGNIFICANT FEATURES OF THE CHRONOLOGICAL RECORD CONT'D

SELF-MONITORED PHASE - DURATION FIVE DAYS

	HEADTEACHERS							TOTAL	MEAN
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G		
TOUR SESSIONS	1	3	3	4	7	9	2	29	4.1
TOTAL TIME	37	60	75	81	75	131	20	479	68.4
AVERAGE DURATION	37	20	25	20.3	10.7	14.6	10	-	16.5
% TIME	2.2	3.4	3.9	2.8	2.8	6.3	1.0	-	3.3

All times calculated in minutes except where otherwise stated.

minutes (8.4 hours) by G. In the five day self-monitored period as Table 33 shows, the difference is more marked and the range even more dramatic. Headteacher D again shows the lowest difference of 112 minutes (1.9 hours) and A the highest of 767 minutes (12.8 hours). It is interesting to note that A and B who have the widest gaps in both phases are both unmarried females. They may therefore find themselves spending long hours at school not doing anything in particular. Headteacher D, with the narrowest gap in both phases is also an unmarried female. She, however is so heavily involved in civic and community activities that she may be forced to make more judicious use of time.

In the interview, the headteachers appeared quite

unaware of these gaps that were devoid of activity and were thus unable to explain them. This is a very important observation because studies often depend on the principals' estimates of the time they spend on the job and conclusions are drawn from them. It is strongly recommended that estimates be used very sparingly and with the greatest of caution.

The daily mean engaged time of 417.5 minutes (7 hours approximately) set up during the observed phase is very similar to that of 410.1 minutes (6.8 hours) in the self-monitored phase. In the observed phase, the headteachers had engaged times that were relatively close to the mean and which ranged from 355.7 minutes (5.9 hours) for Headteacher C to 481 minutes (8 hours) for E. A similar pattern of closeness to the mean continued into the self-monitored phase but with a slightly wider range. In the observation period, C spent both less time on the job and less time engaged in work than any other headteacher. Although G spent more time on the job than any of her colleagues, her engaged time was higher only to C's. Clearly long hours on the job must not be equated with productive activity.

The difference between the number of activities performed in the three-day observation period and the five-day self-monitored period is striking. In the former 944

activities were performed as compared with 703 in the latter period. This disparity may be due, in part at least, to the approach the principals adopted in recording their own activities. Clearly an uninvolved observer is better able to write down the interruptions and the various shifts from one activity to another more faithfully than the actor himself. Nonetheless, it seems quite clear that the headteachers' approach was not as meticulous as could be expected or as was indeed requested. Headteacher E alone seems to have made a serious effort to capture in her records the pace of her work.

A daily average of forty-five activities in the period of observation and twenty in the other phase were carried out. In the former phase, everyone except C whose twenty-one activities were outstandingly different, had performances near the mean. In the latter, the mean activities were again fairly even except for the two extremities of 13.4 for G and 37.4 by E. Taking the observed records of the researcher as more representative of the headteachers' work-pattern, their forty-five daily activities still fall far short of that recorded by Martin (1980). His principals had an average of 149.2 activities and changed activities every three minutes. By dividing the daily engaged time of 417.5 minutes by 45, the daily mean activities (Table 32), it will be seen that each activity lasted for 9.3 minutes.

Tables 32 and 33 also highlight those tasks carried out by the headteachers which required two or more percent of their total time in each phase. Ten categories of tasks met this criterion in the observed phase and eleven in the self-monitored phase. Of these, there were nine that were common to both phases and for the most part required roughly similar proportions of time. Together they accounted for about eighty-three percent of the total time and total activities in each phase. These nine areas[†] are "administration", "assembly", "personal", "phone", "teaching", "tours", "student welfare", "student discipline", and "meetings". Of these only "personal" and "meetings" show noticeably different time requirements in the two phases. In the observed phase "personal" required 27.7 minutes as compared with 71.7 minutes in the self-monitored phase, and "meetings" accounted for 121.4 minutes in the former and 181.9 minutes in the latter. All but two of the headteachers performed these activities in one or both of the relevant periods. The exceptions are B who recorded no personal time in either phase and was not involved in any meetings, and F who explained that he does not teach on a time-tabled basis. Headteacher D who lays great emphasis on the morning assembly was unable to take part in this activity

[†]See Appendix 4 for explanations of the categories used in analyzing the data.

because the hall was out of commission during the observed phase.

The three remaining areas which are not common are "Budget" in the observed phase, and "Correspondence", and "Staff Meetings" in the self-monitored period. As can be seen from the tables all of these just failed to meet the criterion in the corresponding phase. It is perhaps not surprising that "Budget" does not figure much since as the headteachers explained, the control of finances is being taken over by the Secretary-Treasurer of the Boards of Management. What is surprising is that "correspondence" does not feature more prominently. It is named by the headteachers as one of the areas that take up a great deal of time and is done on a regular basis. One possible explanation for its lack of prominence may be the way the data were analyzed. Testimonials and transcripts which some principals tend to term as correspondence were classified under administration.

Apart from the activities given in Tables 32 and 33 as discussed above, twelve other activities were identified in the research. These are "Monitoring", "Exchanges", "Planning" "Ancillary", "Visitor", "Instructional", "Interview", "Detention", "Classroom Observation", "Travel", "Teacher Appraisal" and "Discussion". Of these, all but "Classroom Observation" and "Travel" occurred in both phases. Al-

though these twelve activities did not constitute an important part of the headteachers' work at this time, some of them merit further examination.

The supervision of ancillary staff featured frequently and unfavourably both in the essays and in the interviews with the headteachers. It was, therefore, remarkable how little contact they had with the ancillary staff in a study that represented fifty-six headteacher-days. Mention was made by more than one headteacher of the interruptions caused by drop-in visitors. The research found little evidence of visitors, planned or drop-in.

The virtual non-existence of classroom observation, teacher appraisal and matters relating to instruction and curriculum was, however, the greatest disappointment of the research. There was no evidence of any serious attempt being made to concretize the views expressed in the interview relative to these areas. "Classroom observation" which did not feature in the self-monitored period only required .5 percent of the time in the observed phase and was carried out by one headteacher only. "Teacher appraisal" featured in both phases but was responsible for only .8 and .2 percent of the time, while "instructional" accounted for 1.4 and 1.6 percent respectively of the time in the two periods. These tasks that impinge on the effectiveness of the institution and have clear implications for

the educational leadership dimension of the headship were given little attention.

The data of the study were analyzed to investigate certain trends which manifested themselves in the literature reviewed. For example Martin (1980) and Casey (1980) found that their principals displayed a strong "inside focus" in that they spent most of their interaction time with persons within the school community. Casey (1980) found her principals predictable in so far as more than half of their time was spent on planned activities. Wolcott (1973) reported that his lone subject performed many of his tasks in places other than his office.

Following these directions arising from the literature, the data in the observation and self-monitored periods of the study were analyzed firstly to discover the nature of the headteachers' activities. To the extent that their day could be deemed predictable in that they were involved in largely scheduled activities, they would be deemed to be in control of the situation. Secondly, the focus of their activities was monitored and finally the analysis was concerned with the interactive focus of these activities to see how they were divided between persons within the school community, persons not connected to the school, or to what extent the headteachers were alone.

Tables 34 and 35 show the results of these analyses

TABLE 34 - TYPE, LOCATION AND INTERACTION ANALYSIS (OBSERVED PHASE)

		HEADTEACHERS							TOTAL	MEAN WEEKLY	MEAN DAILY
		A	B	C	D	E	F	G			
TYPE ANALYSIS	SCHEDULED TOTAL TIME	740.5	905	779	1062	1037	778	744.5	6046 (100.8 hrs)	863.7 (14.4 hrs)	287.9 (4.8 hrs)
	% TIME	64.5	66.7	73.0	75.7	71.9	63.9	65.8	481.5	68.8	-
	ACTIVITY TOTAL	45	61	30	73	70	61	38	378	54	18
	% ACTIVITY	31.7	37.9	47.6	46.8	44.9	41.5	31.9	282.3	40.3	-
	UNSCHEDULED TOTAL TIME	407	451.5	288	341	406	440	387.5	2721 (45.4 hrs)	388.7 (6.5 hrs)	129.5 (2.2 hrs)
	% TIME	35.5	33.3	27.0	24.3	28.1	36.1	34.2	218.5	31.2	-
	ACTIVITY TOTAL	97	100	33	83	86	86	81	566	80.9	26.9
	% ACTIVITY	68.3	62.1	52.4	53.2	55.1	58.5	68.1	417.7	59.7	-
LOCATION ANALYSIS	OFFICE TOTAL TIME	824	825	596	1157	943	1022	941	6308 (105.1 hrs)	901.1 (15 hrs)	300.4 (5 hrs)
	% TIME	71.8	60.8	55.9	82.5	65.4	83.9	83.1	503.4	71.9	-
	ACTIVITY TOTAL	122	133	49	148	133	136	107	828	118.3	39.4
	% ACTIVITY	85.9	82.6	77.8	94.9	82.3	92.5	89.9	605.9	86.6	-
	NON-OFFICE TOTAL TIME	323.5	531.5	471	246	500	196	191	2459 (41 hrs)	351.3 (5.9 hrs)	117.1 (2 hrs)
	% TIME	28.2	39.2	44.1	17.5	34.7	16.1	16.9	196.9	28.1	-
	ACTIVITY TOTAL	20	28	14	8	23	11	12	116	16.6	5.5
	% ACTIVITY	14.1	17.4	22.2	5.1	14.7	7.5	10.1	91.1	13.0	-

TABLE 34 - TYPE, LOCATION AND INTERACTION ANALYSIS (OBSERVED PHASE) (CONT'D)

	HEADTEACHERS							TOTAL	MEAN WEEKLY	MEAN DAILY
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G			
<u>SCHOOL COMMUNITY</u>										
TOTAL TIME	675.5	912	629	609.5	583	665	641.5	4715.5 (78.6 hrs)	673.6 (11.2 hrs)	224.6 (3.7 hrs)
% TIME	58.9	67.2	58.9	43.4	40.4	54.6	56.7	380.1	54.3	-
ACTIVITY TOTAL	100	128	43	86	94	97	79	627	89.6	29.9
% ACTIVITY	70.4	79.5	68.3	55.1	60.3	66.0	66.4	466	66.6	-
<u>OUTSIDE</u>										
TOTAL TIME	61	122.5	18	291.5	359	170	40	1062 (17.7 hrs)	151.7 (2.5 hrs)	50.6 (.8 hrs)
% TIME	5.3	9.0	1.7	20.8	24.9	14	3.5	79.2	11.3	-
ACTIVITY TOTAL	8	13	4	31	22	19	11	108	15.4	5.1
% ACTIVITY	5.6	8.1	6.4	19.9	14.1	12.9	9.2	762	10.92	-
<u>ALONE</u>										
TOTAL TIME	411	322	420	502	501	383	450.5	2989.5 (49.8 hrs)	427.1 (7.1 hrs)	142.4 (2.4 hrs)
% TIME	35.8	23.7	39.4	35.8	34.7	31.4	39.8	240.6	34.4	-
ACTIVITY TOTAL	34	20	16	39	40	31	29	209	29.9	10.0
% ACTIVITY	23.9	12.4	25.4	25.0	25.6	21.1	24.4	157.8	22.5	-

INTERACTION ANALYSIS

TABLE 35 - TYPE, LOCATION AND INTERACTION ANALYSIS (SELF-MONITORED PHASE)

	HEADTEACHERS							TOTAL	MEAN WEEKLY	MEAN DAILY	
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G				
TYPE ANALYSIS	<u>SCHEDULED</u>										
	TOTAL TIME	1390	1171	1475	1721.5	2069	1792	1734	11352.5 (189.2 hrs)	1621.8 (27.0 hrs)	324.4 (5.4 hrs)
	% TIME	81.7	65.3	76.7	82.0	77.2	86.2	84.2	553.3	79.0	-
	ACTIVITY TOTAL	47	43	59	49	91	64	47	400	57.1	11.4
	% ACTIVITY	50.5	51.8	64.1	59.0	48.7	65.3	70.2	409.6	58.5	-
LOCATION ANALYSIS	<u>UNCHEDULED</u>										
	TOTAL TIME	330	622	447	378.5	611	287	326	3001.5 (50 hrs)	428.8 (71.1 hrs)	85.8 (1.4 hrs)
	% TIME	19.2	34.7	23.3	18.0	22.8	13.8	15.8	147.6	21.0	-
	ACTIVITY TOTAL	46	40	33	34	96	34	20	303	43.3	8.7
	% ACTIVITY	49.5	48.2	35.9	41	51.3	34.7	29.9	290.5	41.5	-
	<u>OFFICE</u>										
	TOTAL TIME	1125	1170	1286	1749	1248	1063	1340	8981 (149.7 hrs)	128.3 (21.4 hrs)	256.6 (4.3 hrs)
	% TIME	65.4	65.3	66.9	83.9	46.6	51.1	65.1	443.3	63.5	-
	ACTIVITY TOTAL	74	58	73	65	140	78	54	542	77.4	15.5
	% ACTIVITY	79.6	69.9	79.4	78.3	74.9	79.6	80.6	542.3	77.5	-
	<u>NON-OFFICE</u>										
	TOTAL TIME	595	623	636	381	1432	1016	720	5373 (89.6 hrs)	767.7 (12.8 hrs)	153.5 (2.6 hrs)
	% TIME	34.6	34.8	33.1	16.7	53.4	48.9	35	256.5	36.6	-
	ACTIVITY TOTAL	19	25	19	18	47	20	13	161	23	4.6
	% ACTIVITY	20.4	30.1	20.7	21.7	25.1	20.4	19.4	157.8	22.5	-

TABLE 35 - TYPE, LOCATION AND INTERACTION ANALYSIS (SELF-MONITORED PHASE (CONT'D))

	HEADTEACHERS							TOTAL	MEAN WEEKLY	MEAN DAILY
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G			
<u>SCHOOL COMMUNITY</u>										
TOTAL TIME	1132.5	1352	1230	1157	1345	560	971	7747.5 (129 hrs)	1106.8 (18.4 hrs)	221.4 (3.7 hrs)
% TIME	65.8	75.4	64	55.1	50.2	26.9	47.1	384.5	54.9	-
ACTIVITY TOTAL	68	63	58	51	105	55	33	433	61.9	12.4
% ACTIVITY	73.1	75.9	63.0	61.5	56.2	56.1	49.3	435.1	62.2	-
<u>OUTSIDE</u>										
TOTAL TIME	372.5	190	215	64	746	780	419	2786.5 (46.4 hrs)	398.1 (6.6 hrs)	79.6 (1.3 hrs)
% TIME	21.7	10.6	11.2	3.1	27.8	37.5	20.3	132.2	18.9	-
ACTIVITY TOTAL	10	5	12	6	34	11	6	84	12	2.4
% ACTIVITY	10.7	6.0	13.0	7.2	18.2	11.2	9.0	75.3	10.8	-
<u>ALONE</u>										
TOTAL TIME	215	251	477	879	589	739	670	3820 (63.7 hrs)	545.7 (9.1 hrs)	109.1 (1.8 hrs)
% TIME	12.5	14.0	24.8	41.9	22	35.6	32.5	183.3	26.2	-
ACTIVITY TOTAL	15	15	22	26	48	32	28	186	26.6	5.3
% ACTIVITY	16.1	18.1	23.9	31.3	25.7	32.7	41.8	189.6	27.1	-

INTERACTION ANALYSIS

for the observed and self-monitored phases respectively. Scheduled activities accounted for 68 percent of the headteachers' time in the observed and 79 percent in the self-monitored period. In all cases the headteachers had performances near the mean except for B who fell somewhat below in the self-monitored phase. However, whereas in the observed phase only 40 percent of their activities were scheduled, in the self-monitored phase scheduled activities rose to 58 percent. Since on average, well over two-thirds of their day is spent on planned activities, it can be concluded that the headteachers have control over the use of their time and should thus be able to do some of the things they consider valuable and essential in the school.

Unlike the subject in Wolcott's (1973) study these headteachers are clearly office-bound. Most of their time and most of their activities were performed in their offices. As shown in Table 34, 71.9 percent of their time and 86.6 percent of their activities took place in their offices in the observed period. In the self-monitored phase the situation changed only slightly, with 63.5 percent of the time and 77.5 percent of the activities being done in their offices.

The inside focus suggested in the research literature found support in this study. In both phases, the headteachers spent 54 percent of their time and over 60 percent

of their activities interacting with members of the school community, mainly students, teachers and office staff but occasionally parents and others. They spent a fair amount of time alone but their contact with people not directly connected with the school was fairly minimal. This contact consisted mainly of salesmen travel agents promoting tours and members of the public making complaints about students or seeking permission to use the school buildings or grounds.

Principals often claim that various pressures and demands on their time make it difficult if not impossible for them to do what they consider important in the job. They have a concept of the job to be done but the harsh reality prevents them from bringing this concept into actual realisation. The headteachers in this study were no exception. Yet, the results of this analysis must cause serious questions to be asked in this regard. They are seen in apparent control of the situation, engaged in the activities they planned, spending long periods of time in their office, a fair bit of it alone. This seems to suggest the correct setting for directing their attention to what is seen to be of greatest importance. One can only wonder at this stage why this is not done.

Summary

1. The headteachers spend long hours on-the-job but are not engaged in work all the time.
2. Their average working day is seven hours.
3. If one accepts the observer's record as being more reliable in this particular circumstance, they performed on average forty-five activities per day and changed activities every nine minutes.
4. Nine activities common to both the observed and self-monitored phases accounted for some 83 percent of their time and can thus be regarded as constituting their major role performance. There are "administration", "assembly", "personal", "phone", "teaching", "tours", "Student welfare", "student discipline" and "meetings". It will be noticed that except for "teaching" they are all within the administrative-managerial realm of activity.
5. About two-thirds of their time is spent on planned activity.
6. About two-thirds of the time is spent in their offices.
7. About one-half of their time is spent in contact with members of the school community, about one third alone and about one sixth in contact with members of the wider community.

4. How They Are Affected By Their Work

Only two of the seven headteachers felt satisfied that they were free to run their schools in their way without being constrained by problems, rules or undue interference from higher authorities. These two cases make an interesting contrast. One, considered a typical headteacher, has been expressing negative feelings about the school throughout the project. She has made critical, at times even harsh comments on the attitudes and behaviour of staff and students, yet she is able to make this positive claim. She cites the support of a core of cooperative staff and a Parent-Teacher Association that is dedicated to the school. The other head, by contrast, widely acclaimed as a highly effective head, has been very positive in her comments and reactions to her school throughout the study. She boasted of the total support of her Board of Management which gives her a free hand to use her initiative and run the school. She spoke of the excellent interpersonal relations which existed amongst her staff and between herself and staff. She praised a cooperative and dedicated staff and a committed student body.

The general position, however, is quite negative. The five remaining headteachers were quite adamant that they could not run the school in the way they thought best. They felt they could do nothing without reference to a

higher authority. They complained of interference from the central body in the running of the school and of bad policy being laid down for them to follow. They resented having to tolerate lazy and indifferent staff and indolent, badly behaved students who were a bad influence on the school and tarnished its reputation. It irked them that they had no power to reward those staff members who did more than was expected of them, or to appoint staff as required rather than having to wait endlessly for appointments to be made by the central body.

This powerlessness, this lack of autonomy as professional persons, this feeling of being caught between the restrictions of a higher authority on the one hand, and the pressure and demands from the school on the other, is the major and more general source of their concern. These headteachers have a certain conception of how schools ought to be run but are not given the scope and professional autonomy to put it into practice. Their position is exactly that as described by Allison (1983); they are pawns in the game of school management. They operate the policies of a central body rather than using their own philosophies in running the school.

Yet the frustration these headteachers claim to suffer does not appear to have reached debilitating proportions. There was no question in their minds of giving up and

throwing in the towel. They felt a commitment to their students, an obligation to do the best they could for their development and a responsibility to society as a whole. Indeed, it was this, that kept them going. Their main source of satisfaction was derived from watching the growth and development of their students, sharing in whatever success came to them and feeling that they had contributed to it. They were delighted at any positive reaction on the part of students, parents, or the general public to what they were trying to do in the school.

Summary

On the whole, the headteachers feel they are not given the power or autonomy to run the school as they would like. They feel bound by the rules and authority of a higher body, and this leads to their inability to fit their practices to their ideals. The frustration they experience at this state of affairs, however, is tempered by their sense of commitment and obligation as professional persons of their students and to society. Their satisfaction in the job came from watching the development of their students and sharing in whatever success comes to them.

Discussion

1. General Observations

Though this research was not concerned with focusing on minutiae with a view to providing a detailed description of the headteachers' day, showing how it evolved, yet aspects of this unfolding were inescapable during the period of observation. The inevitable variety of tasks undertaken, the brevity of these tasks, the constant and often unnecessary, even inexplicable interruptions that led to fragmentation and in many cases to tasks not being resumed and completed were much in evidence. These observations find support in much of the growing observational research on principals, (Casey 1980, O'Dempsey 1976, Martin 1980, Willis 1980).

The headteachers created the impression of wanting to be involved in everything all the time, not finding it possible either to let others handle some of the routine matters or to postpone some matters while handling others that they consider important and perhaps even urgent. Many examples of this occurred, but two illustrations will suffice to demonstrate the point.

One headteacher, together with a couple of his senior staff, is in conference with the parents of two students who were involved in a serious fight in which one boy suffered an injury. One parent is irate, threatening to

take the matter before the law courts. The door of the office is closed, an indication of the seriousness of the matter, but no instructions have been issued to the secretary to suggest that the headteacher is not to be disturbed. The conference is often interrupted by phone calls put through by the Secretary, by students opening the door to report late, to ask permission to leave school before the scheduled end, to borrow money from a fund kept by the Secretary, and by teachers reporting some trivial matter. None of the matters for which this serious conference was constantly disturbed could be considered urgent or of a nature that could not be handled at a different level.

Another headteacher is having a serious conference with a teacher, a young female who has been frustrated by the bad behaviour of a particular group of children in one of her classes. Today, she is particularly upset because their bad behaviour has taken a personal twist. They are hurling insults at her and spreading rumours of a vicious kind about her. The headteacher is apparently very concerned and interested. His office door is closed and he is listening intently, offering advice, probing. Yet, here again, there is no hint to the Secretary that he is not to be disturbed, and the predictable interruptions follow--phone calls, visits by teachers and students--all breaking into the interview. Does one have to wonder at the message

that is conveyed to this teacher in the given situation? Mulford (1984:21) quotes an Australian study by Campbell in which teachers questioned not so much the goodwill of their principals but rather their priorities. The teachers felt that their principals were so taken up with administrative matters and other problems that they had no time for educational matters and personal interaction that teachers considered important.

Like Martin's (1980), this study found no evidence of the beleaguered principal. The pace of their work on the contrary appeared leisurely with no real sense of urgency or harassment. Work hours might have been long but they were not exactly full of activity.

The most common features among the headteachers were their propensity for internal interaction, for working at planned activity and their tendency to remain office-bound. The scene would appear set for planned activity of a nature and significance commensurate with their conception of the principalship. Nevertheless, they made no effort to translate their concepts into reasonable reality. They were apparently, quite content simply to let the organization go. They displayed no urgency about their work, they set no priorities but were content to act as organization maintainers.

2. The Administrative-Managerial And Educational Leadership Roles

Their endorsement of the Roe and Drake (1974) role definition suggests, that they hold conventional conceptions of the headship. There is clearly some ambivalence, however, on their part, with respect to the importance they attach to the two dimensions--the administrative-managerial and the educational leadership--of the role. In discussing their conceptions at the start of the interviews, they strongly argued for equal importance and therefore, balance in operational emphasis. Yet, elsewhere in the study, it emerges that they do consider the educational leadership dimension to be of greater importance. Furthermore, they express a strong commitment to various aspects of the latter dimension, for example, staff development, the classroom observation of teachers, assertive leadership.

The more striking feature, however, is the discontinuity between their conceptions and values, and their role performance. Whether one looks for their implied emphasis on educational leadership, or simply their stated balance between the two dimensions, there is only disappointment. There is very little evidence within the study to suggest any attempt at educational leadership. Consider the tasks the headteachers themselves listed as those they did frequently and which accounted for most of their time--

"student discipline", "student attendance", "correspondence", "meetings", "school assemblies", "interviews". With these compare the nine common tasks of the self-monitored and observed parts of the study--"administration", "school assemblies", "personal", "phone", "tours", "student welfare", "student discipline", "meetings" and "teaching". "Teaching" is the only activity that does not belong in the administrative-managerial domain.

The stark reality is that they operate within the administrative-managerial dimension, as if they were unaware of anything else. This position, however, cannot be upheld, far apart from their own identification of the educational leadership dimension as an important role, the Education Regulations (1982) under which they work define tasks in this area as well.

In their defence, the headteachers claim that while they know what they should do, they are forced by circumstances to do otherwise. They blame their neglect of this area on the demands on their time and the pressure of work. But it is curious that all the neglect should be borne by the educational leadership sphere of their role. It is extremely difficult to accept that headteachers who believe educational leadership to be of great importance would spend their time almost totally on matters unrelated to it. On what grounds can they justify performing tasks that they

consider are of lesser importance at the neglect of those deemed very important? In part, their behaviour may stem from their own ambivalence concerning their role. But, in addition, they may find it comfortable to do the routine tasks. It may be titillating to be where the action is. Tasks in the administrative-managerial dimension may be a drain on the physical resources of the headteachers, but they make less demands on their intellectual and conceptual skills. Principals seem to be partial towards quick-action, high visibility jobs (Casey 1980), and by contrast with tasks in the administrative-managerial area, educational leadership tasks are not. Mulford (1984:5) observes:

It is not difficult for the principal to convince him or herself that resolving crises, being involved in a whirling carnival of activity, is what the top man or woman in a school is paid to do.

He continues to suggest that while this kind of behaviour may keep boredom away, it certainly is not enough to make a difference in the school.

Many studies have concluded that principals hardly assume educational leadership functions (Weitz 1960, Wolcott 1973, Sackney 1982). But studies of effective schools have found that their principals paid particular attention to educational leadership (Goldhammer et al 1971, Shoemaker and Franser 1981, Leithwood 1983). This is a crucial area of the headship that touches directly on

student outcomes. It is therefore, a vital area for further investigation.

3. Three Major Concerns of the Headteachers

In describing their work, as shown above, three major areas were stressed, namely, their service orientation, their role in interpersonal relations and their concern with pupil control, discipline and order. These features are quite compatible with the traditional societal expectations of the schools, and the headteachers may have been socialized or conditioned into accepting them from their earliest days as teachers. The traditional role of the school in West Indian Society was to train, as well as teach the child, that is, to educate and socialize him (Figueroa 1971). Schools were and still are expected to instil good standards of behaviour and strict discipline into students and teach them to get on with those around them. In addition, in small West Indian slave societies where the church and the school provided the only educated persons easily accessible to the masses, a tradition of service evolved around the school. These expectations persist today and it is, perhaps these, more so than anything else, that have influenced the headteachers in this aspect of their work.

Among these major concerns, that of pupil control and

discipline stand out. Student discipline appears to have become a preoccupation, almost an obsession with them. They recognized it as a task they perform regularly, and one that consumes a good deal of their time, and this was confirmed in the observed and self-monitored phases of the study. In addition, a major purpose of their touring and monitoring activities relates to discipline and the maintenance of order. When it is considered, furthermore, that in analyzing the data from the observed and self-monitored phases, administrative action--the writing of reports, interviews with parents, follow-up discussion with students--following student misdemeanours are separated out from "student discipline", then the extent of its pervasive influence can be better assessed.

There is little consolation in the fact that studies elsewhere (Casey 1980, Martin 1980) have found a similar concern on the part of principals. The question must still be asked, what is the cause of this apparent obsession with student discipline and control? In the local context, it must be recognized that the society is still only gradually moving away from the traditional view that children "should be seen and not heard", "should be controlled and kept in order". Furthermore, all the evils of society are laid at the door of the school, where "standards of discipline and behaviour are not what they used to be", where teachers are

no longer "dedicated and concerned" and teaching today is "just a job", as popular wisdom has it.

Schools are concerned with training and it is only natural that headteachers should endeavour to ensure that good discipline is established and good orderly climate is maintained. Indeed, research has established the importance of orderly, purposeful climate to student outcomes (Shoemaker and Fraser 1981). However, when the concern appears to be excessive, further investigation is indicated. Serious attempts must be made to understand this phenomenon so that appropriate action can be initiated as deemed necessary.

4. Collegiality and Delegation

The headteachers' claim to participatory leadership has already been noted. So, too, has the fact that to different degrees they interact regularly with their staff. In this respect, then, it would appear, and not surprisingly, that they more closely resemble their British counterparts (their former colonial masters and architect of the local education systems) than their American colleagues. For according to Calder and Shibles (1974), whereas the role relationships of the U.S. principal are fundamentally bureaucratic, those of the British headmaster are essentially collegial. An important factor may be that

of size. Barbados schools like British schools have tended to be small, while American schools by comparison are generally much larger.

Contrast the reported collegiality and approach to leadership of these headteachers with the absence of proper frameworks and practices of delegation, coordination and communication. While there is a great deal of prescriptive literature that extols the virtue of delegation, the research literature seems less abundant. However, common sense would suggest that the principal who delegates with sound structures for coordination and feedback would be better able to carry out those roles and functions considered crucial to achieving school goals and objectives.

Why do these headteachers not delegate? Is it, as some teachers suggest, fear that if the delegated job is done in a superior or more efficient manner than they themselves are capable of, they will suffer status-loss and insecurity? Is it, perhaps, their enactment of the tradition that, to ensure a job is well done you must do it yourself? While both of these may be plausible in the context, it is the thesis of this study that collegiality and participatory leadership, especially in small societies, restrict or even totally inhibit the ability of leaders to delegate. It is not necessarily a question of familiarity and contempt but rather one of lack of courage,

priorities or values. It is not easy to set standards and deadlines and insist on them in a collegial atmosphere without the fear of compromising the very collegiality one treasures. It takes a bold and astute leader whose commitment to school improvement is clear and unquestionable to take this step.

Since participatory leadership is held to generate greater commitment to the goals of the school (Erlandson 1976) and be a characteristic of effective schools (Leithwood 1983) and delegation has been linked with more efficient operation (e.g. Lipham and Hoeh 1974), it is necessary that this thesis be tested. Indeed, the whole area of collegiality and delegation should be investigated on a large scale.

5. Accountability and the Headteachers

An important justification for the central control of schools, according to Watson (1981) is the need for public accountability for the use of public funds and resources. Headteachers are held responsible for all aspects of the school, including such things as the maintenance of buildings and equipment, the attendance, performance and behaviour of students and the attendance and performance of staff. Two interesting factors related to accountability

manifest themselves in the study and will be briefly examined here.

The first is the question of reactivity and proactivity. The headteachers in this study were essentially reactive. They were constantly reacting to presented situations and problems, hardly, if ever defining the situation and initiating action. Blumberg and Greenfield (1980:236) describe the school as a "setting that puts high priority on reactivity--immediacy of response". Yet the principals in their study were not reactive. They were proactive because they continuously decided to be proactive and define their situation according to their philosophies and values. It is being argued here that where principals behave reactively or proactively it is not a feature of the school per se, but rather a choice conscious or otherwise of the principals themselves. By extension, the argument is being advanced that the headteachers in this study, deliberately or otherwise have not defined the situation for themselves, have not set priorities, have not used the means available to them to free themselves for important tasks.

A likely reason for this state of affairs may be that they take the issue of accountability both too literally and too seriously. This interpretation could then force them into the position where they have to know what is

going on at all times and to be part of it. They therefore, engross themselves in the constant daily activities of the school--discipline, attendance, student welfare matters,--leaving themselves no time to reflect on other issues. Indeed, they soon convince themselves no other issues exist. In this way, the reactivity myth of the school setting is perpetuated. Proactivity cannot be regarded as the preserve of the dynamic few. All headteachers must be challenged into proactive action within their schools and must be given the proper support for relevant activity. The implications for training and research cannot be overlooked.

The second aspect of accountability touches the requirement that "headteachers report annually, or at such other time as the Chief Education Officer determines on the performance of teachers" (Education Regulation 1982). The approach to this important matter was quite cavalier. Indeed, it may be recalled that it was one of the areas some heads found distasteful. It is clear that the role of teacher evaluation is a controversial one in the local system. The purposes and approaches to the evaluation and assessment of teachers need to be clarified and set in proper perspectives within the system. There is enough research evidence to show the ill consequences for teachers and therefore the teaching-learning situation of improper

assessment procedures and purposes. Equally research has shown that teachers react positively to assessment when it is carried out under correct procedures, for acceptable purposes and when there is useful and honest feedback. The fear exists locally, that its main purpose is punitive.

6. Formalism, Powerlessness and Ambiguity

The phenomenon of formalism manifested itself from the earliest states of the study. In their essays, but particularly in the interviews, the headteachers were able to enunciate principles and beliefs, and equally able to explain why they could not put them into practice. It is not unreasonable to expect an element of formalism in human organizations, but it does appear to be somewhat extensive among the headteachers.

Almost without exception, the headteachers experienced feelings of powerlessness and ambiguity. They questioned the amount of freedom they had and felt the need for clarification of their role. They complained of having no discretion to make decisions of any significance without referral to a higher authority. Often, they felt a particular decision would only be effective if it were made on the spot but they were not free to act. They felt their decision-making powers were limited to low order decisions. If their curricula were static, for example, it was because

they had little power to determine curricula if only by virtue of not being able to appoint staff or secure resources to make changes to meet perceived needs. They felt handicapped at not being able to reward staff who made tremendous effort for the school, or to remove students who were exerting a bad influence on their peers. All this created feelings of insecurity and frustration on the part of the principals.

To put these phenomena of formalism, powerlessness and ambiguity into perspective it is necessary to pause for a moment, and examine briefly the education system of the country. The education policy-makers, conscious of education as a means of social mobility and social change in a developing society, have been determined to ensure that the system operated in a way that favoured no section of the society above any other, and also that there was efficiency in the use of scarce national resources. The route to this was the establishing of a central bureaucracy and a set of rules that govern and control the system. The intended consequences of a rule-governed centrally-controlled system are the absolute reduction of the areas of discretion of teachers and principals, the low status of teachers (seen as clerks) and principals (chief clerks) and the reviewing by a higher authority of any discretion the principal may still exercise (Watson 1981). The seeds of formalism,

insecurity, powerlessness and ambiguity are all here, for, as Watson (1981) argues, teachers and principals will either ignore or bend the rules, or ensure that in their public performances and statements they keep within the rules and philosophy as they perceive them coming from the administration. It is this acceptance of the system and of a clerical definition of their role that causes teachers and principals to provide for their students a routine minimal education, lacking in development and innovation. Watson argues that in the process of this, the teachers and principals themselves become quite impervious to any attempts to change them, thus becoming further evidence for rule-oriented administrators of why teachers and principals cannot be given discretion. Watson (p. 4) concludes "Thus, there can and will be a real dichotomy between what actually happens in schools and what appears to be happening from outside". Formalism, powerlessness and the consequences of a centrally controlled rule governed approach can have serious implications, therefore, for what goes on in schools and especially for student outcomes.

7. Typical and Effective Headteachers

A particular thrust of the study was the exploration of some of the features that the research literature has associated with school effectiveness. The design of the

study did not focus specifically on this, but by selecting the sample on the basis of perceived effectiveness it was hoped to distinguish and separate the two groups by their approaches, conceptualizations and practices. This did not substantially materialize. There was no way in which, by applying the salient features of effectiveness one could say X is an effective principal. No principal, for example, could say that in his role performance he stressed leadership in education, that he saw to it that well-designed instructional objectives and evaluative systems were established and used. Only one principal appeared to have an "obligation to improve the quality of staff performance" (Gross et al. 1985) and to be making an effort to realize it. There was some verbal recognition of their responsibility with respect to school effectiveness but little effort was made to practically translate words into action. As Johnston and Sackney (1982) observe they stated their willingness to provide educational leadership but also found some reason or another for managing to put off doing it. The search, however, for practices that distinguish typical and effective headteachers must be pursued vigorously. Studies mounted to discover the specific factors that contribute to effectiveness in the local context would contribute enormously to a practice-oriented body of knowledge.

8. The Place of Theory

An interesting and inevitable question in the light of an earlier reference to the transfer of theory now is: to what extent has the study, even accepting that the theory-transfer issue was not a direct focus, enlightened the situation? It has already been shown that the results of this study are quite similar to those in the research literature. The local headteachers are quite like their colleagues in the developed world in ways that need not be reiterated in detail at this point.

However, while the results of the behaviours may be similar, there is no guarantee that the reasons for them are the same. This study has already indicated a number of traditions and value considerations which may help to explain why the headteachers behave the way they do. Since the explanation of behaviour does not seem to have featured as a major concern in the relevant research on the principalship, comparisons in this area are not really feasible. Yet the findings of research on organizational behaviour across cultures strongly indicate that social and cultural factors influence the behaviour of individuals in organizations. This is a very important point in this discussion for if it is accepted that socio-cultural factors help to shape behaviour, then it must follow that the theories that attempt to explain that behaviour or the

practical steps that are taken to change that behaviour must take these very social-cultural factors into account. In other words universalistic theories cannot hold. For example, the powerlessness and ambiguity the headteachers experience have not led to the alienation or despair which often accompany these states. The absence of these emotions may be ascribed to what Figueroa (1971) terms the great value attached to education in the West Indies. The factors that motivate action cannot be comprehended in general universal theories.

Although two types of principals are generally recognized (the typical and the effective) in the literature, it is probably more useful to think of an operational continuum with the typical and effective principals at the extreme ends. A useful framework for analyzing administration-behaviour in schools can be derived from the literature. Farquhar (1978) following Katz (1955) has suggested three levels of skills required by administrators. These three levels are the technical, the human relations and the conceptual level. Others have suggested a continuum or hierarchy of skills (Higley 1975, Marshall and Newton 1984). Marshall and Newton further argue that for survival on the job, the administrator requires well developed technical/managerial skills together with basic human relations skills. As s/he goes towards the maximum effect-

iveness s/he will require high levels of development in all three skill-areas.

It is clear from the literature, that like the head-teachers in this study, most principals operate at the lower end of the continuum, that is, they may be termed typical principals and can be assumed to operate within the technical/managerial and basic human relations skills areas.

Two pertinent observations can be made. The first is to recall the suggestion made by Kiggundu et al that when the operation is within the technical spheres the conventional theory could apply in the developing world. The second is that when principals employ conceptual-analytical skills and reach high levels of effectiveness as Blumberg and Greenfield (1980) show, their way of operating becomes highly individualistic and cannot be explained in terms of any theory or model. These observations are very important because they bring into focus the whole issue of the place and value of theory as it now stands. The first questions that must be asked are, why teach theory if its value can be shown, at best, to be minimal, and if it is to be taught, at what point in the career and training of the administrator. These questions are particularly pertinent in contexts where the theory is exogenous and where resources are scarce. The more important concern, however,

is the search for ways of moving headteachers beyond the technical levels into spheres of higher levels of competence and effectiveness.

The call for a practice-oriented approach to training would appear to be the more effective and efficient route. Such a move might eventually lead to a theory of practice and a set of indigenous doctrines based on a knowledge of schools and educational practices in different settings.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

In order to explore the work-world of secondary school headteachers in Barbados, seven headteachers were randomly selected for study. The sample consisted of three "grammar" schools and four "newer" secondary school headteachers. Of these, four were deemed "effective" and three "typical" headteachers. There were four females and three males.

The research was focused on four basic questions, namely:

1. What do these headteachers feel they as heads ought to do?

The purpose here was to describe and clarify how the headteachers see their role in the light of the many role prescriptions current today.

2. What do these headteachers think they do? How does the reality as they see it, square with their conceptions? If they are unable to perform according to the conceptions which they hold, what are the inhibiting factors? If, on the other hand their performance matches their conception, what

are the factors that facilitate them in their work?

3. What do they actually do? There is no doubt that one's perception of what one does can vary quite substantially from the reality. It was considered wise to observe the heads at work as well as to seek their cooperation in recording their own activities for study.
4. How do they feel affected by their work? Schools in Barbados as elsewhere, are constantly under public scrutiny, often even public attack. The pressure can be great for principals and school personnel generally.

A variety of methods was used to collect the data in the investigation for the sake of accuracy and depth. Each headteacher was asked to write about four to six pages on the topic 'A Typical Year in my Life as a Headteacher'. The limitation of pages was set in order to force the respondents to concentrate on those things that were significant to them in their work, perhaps because they valued them or resented them or simply found themselves having to do them very often. Another technique used was that of structured observation. The researcher studied each respondent over a three-day period from start to finish of the working day, noting down everything s/he did, each con-

tact s/he made on pro forma sheets. On similar sheets, each headteacher was requested to monitor and note down his/her own activities over a period of five consecutive working days and submit them to the researcher. This was done with varying degrees of care and meticulousness. It was learnt from the study that it was not the simplest thing for an actor to put down his/her activities in a way that truly reflects the way they occurred. The final technique was that of the structured interview.

The data were collected during the period March to June of the academic year 1983-84. The researcher visited each selected headteacher in his/her school, explained the nature of the research project and requested his/her participation. They all agreed and were sent all the relevant information and pro forma sheets. They should all have recorded their activities during the same work-week but because of unforeseen difficulties, two were forced to do their recording on different occasions. Only six essays were used in the study because one headteacher could not manage to get her typical year in less than fifty pages and the important consideration of choice and selection could not have been operative. The essay was, thus, invalid in the terms of the study.

After a preliminary analysis was done of the first three phases of the research, an interview schedule was

drawn up based on the findings in current literature and also using ideas from the analysis. While the same format was followed with all headteachers some questions of clarification arising out of their particular data was put to each respondent.

A great deal of data was thus collected for analysis. The observed and self-monitored phases of the study represent a total of fifty-six principal-workdays. Both qualitative and quantitative analyses were used in looking at the data.

Review of Major Findings

Headteachers' Conceptions of Their Work

These headteachers hold conventional text-book conceptions of their role. They see the principalship as multifaceted, embracing a wide range of tasks and activities that could be subsumed under such broad categories as the management of curriculum and instruction, staff and student personnel management, the management of finances, plant and resources, and the handling of school community relations. While they endorsed the Roe and Drake encapsulation of these tasks, they could not fully agree on where the emphasis, if any, should fall. Five felt that both the administrative-managerial and the educational leadership dimensions were equally important and should therefore be given

equal emphasis. Two were adamant that educational leadership was the more important role and should take precedence.

They consider the observation of classroom teaching a vital function of the headship. It gives the headteacher the opportunity to discover what is going on in the school and is important for the process of improving teaching and learning in the school. They stress that the purpose was not to criticize but to help. They were generally agreed that teaching should not be a compulsory task for headteachers. The headship was already overloaded and in any event, the students would suffer as headteachers often could not keep to the schedules. A pivotal role of the headship is to build and maintain good interpersonal relations in the school.

The headteachers asserted their belief in participatory but assertive leadership. They believe that headteachers should work closely with their staff to further the interest of the school, and should not be afraid to put the school's case where it matters. They also attest an obligation to staff development and a commitment to the involvement of parents in achieving the objectives of the school.

What The Headteachers Think They Do

These headteachers see themselves as providing a service to their students and their parents. They thus attach great importance to their job which some preferred to call a vocation. It is perhaps not surprising then, that they present the discipline and control of students as a major concern which accounts for a good deal of time and energy.

They claim they interact frequently with staff, students, parents and members of the Board of Management. Their interaction is therefore clearly inwardly focused.

The common tasks they perform on a regular basis relate to student discipline, correspondence, the preparation of information and statistics for the Ministry of Education, attending meetings and school assemblies and interacting with students, parents and staff. None of these tasks fall outside the dimension of the administrative-managerial area.

Contrary to the position taken with respect to educational leadership earlier, they now claim that tasks related to the promotion of teaching and learning and student development are the critical ones and demand the crucial concern of headteachers. They are quick to point out, however, that pressure from other aspects of their role, makes it difficult for them to do anything of consequence in this area.

Their major decisions are made in the broad areas of curriculum management, personnel management and the control of students. The major student problems are disciplinary, attitudinal, and social-welfare problems. The main staff problems were absenteeism, rapid turn-over and in some cases lack of cooperation and dull teaching. These staff and student problems are very serious ones that have consequences for student learning.

The headteachers' efforts at curriculum renewal or change appear to be minimal and there were no real means of ensuring that teaching and learning were meaningfully and effectively being pursued. They perceived themselves as being participatory, assertive leaders but were not quite as pleased with their efforts at staff development or the involving of parents in the school.

What The Headteachers Do

On average, they spent seven hours working at the job per day and during this time they performed forty-five activities (taking the observed record as more typical). While in the observed and self-monitored phases they performed between them some twenty-four different types of tasks, only thirteen of these were done to any noticeable extent and only nine were significant in both phases. None of the tasks that figure to any appreciable degree was in

the area of educational leadership.

This part of the research did not support the concerns noted in the essays and the interviews, that ancillary staff, visitors and correspondence consumed a great deal of their time. But there was support for their perception that not a great deal was being done with respect to educational leadership. Their work was mainly in the administrative-managerial area.

The headteachers interacted mainly with members of the school community, spent most of their time in their offices and working on scheduled activities.

How The Headteachers Are Affected By Their Work

Headteachers feel powerless, devoid of freedom and discretion to make decisions because they have to refer everything to a higher authority. They are thus, for the most part, unable to run the school as they would like. This powerlessness and lack of discretion cause some degree of frustration, but there is no question of alienation, of giving up the battle. For there is the satisfaction which comes from watching the development of their students and knowing that they had some part in it all. They all felt deeply committed to the welfare and development of their students.

Conclusions

A set of interrelated conclusions may be drawn from the study. The most important among them are briefly stated below.

There was no evidence of the beleaguered principal working at a hectic rate. Yet their work suffered too much from interruptions and consequent fragmentation. They spent disproportionate time on tasks that could be done at a lower level. A likely conclusion is that they have no carefully established priorities in the role, nor do they have a clear concept of the role of delegation.

There is a wide gap between their beliefs and their performance in the role. The headteachers claim to value one thing and then proceed to operate in a manner that is quite incompatible with their beliefs. Claiming to value the educational leadership role dimension above or at least equally with the administrative-managerial dimension, they admit that little is done in the former dimension. Rationalization about demands on their time and pressure of work notwithstanding, it seems clear that, a new orientation in which educational leadership features prominently is necessary.

The school is presented as a service organization in which order, good climate and good interpersonal relationships are highly valued and the headteachers' role in these

areas is crucial. Student discipline and control, therefore, emerged as a major pre-occupation with virtually each of the headteachers. Yet, there was no evidence of the headteacher as a harsh uncaring disciplinarian. There was hardly any evidence of them punishing without attempting to uncover the antecedent cause of bad behaviour.

The disturbing presence of the phenomena of formalism, powerlessness and ambiguity has led to a fair degree of frustration among the headteachers. This state of affairs might easily have arisen as a consequence of being in a rule-governed, centrally-controlled system. Fortunately, so far there is no evidence of alienation. The headteachers' sense of devotion to duty, and their devotion to students, parents and society as a whole seem to be the redeeming feature in what might well be a gloomy picture.

The headteachers assess themselves as assertive leaders, yet on the evidence from the study they find themselves enacting a reactive role. It must be concluded that their being in a reactive role is the direct result of their own actions and it is within their power to bring about change in this respect. An immediate opportunity for proactive behaviour, arising out of the study is the neglected area of teacher evaluation and assessment where the evidence suggests that much needs to be done.

Linked with the absence of delegation as a significant

factor in their way of operating, is their alleged participatory leadership style and collegiality. It is posited that where collegiality and shared leadership are valued and practised, delegation with its concomitant safeguards becomes a difficult and perhaps even a non-existent proposition.

Though the sample was selected to investigate the factors that distinguish typical and effective headteachers, it was not possible to do so. There was nothing in the way they conceptualized the role, nothing in their description of their work that was characteristic of one group and not of the other. Nor were there any practices or activities observed or recorded by the headteachers themselves.

Recommendations

The local education system has been described in this study as a rule-governed, centrally-controlled one. The powerlessness and lack of autonomy the headteachers experience and the frustration that follows have also been discussed. This state of affairs shows the pertinence to our context of two questions raised by Watson (1981). He wonders firstly, to what extent the rule-governed centrally controlled system is effective in bringing about its goals of uniformity and minimal standards. And secondly, how far

the model itself creates the conditions that make it difficult for the system to go beyond a particular minimum level of functioning. Although much research evidence would be necessary before we can have answers to these questions, the results of this study suggest reactions to the system that will have a deleterious effect on the functioning of headteachers, and hence, on schools.

Rules are designed for existing and foreseen situations and are relevant to standardized routine situations. Much of educational decision-making is new and unique and requires what Simon (1960) calls non-programmed decisions. There are areas of education that cannot be legislated for, except in the broadest possible manner. It is in this context that a goal-oriented approach to education is advocated to replace the present rule-governed system. In a rule-oriented system, it is the rules that assume preeminence and officials are simply seen as enforcers and appliers of the rules. By contrast, goal achievement takes prominence in a goal-oriented system and rules are only used in so far as they help in achieving goals. The simple excuse 'I followed the rules' is no longer valid as a means of justifying incompetence or ineffectiveness. The goal-oriented approach would be built on the notion that

. . . the direction of administrative policy should be to maximize rather than minimize the discretion given to the schools and to princi-

pals; while doing so in a manner that would ensure as far as possible the increasing effectiveness of the schools. (Watson 1981: 5).

It must be stressed that administrative policy would still have to establish structures to ensure quality education and proper means of accountability for the use of public resources. There will still be considerable need to monitor the performance of the school but accountability will be seen in terms of whether the schools are meeting educational objectives, and to what extent teachers and headteachers are behaving professionally to enhance learning in the schools.

The implications of such a change for the training and retraining of headteachers cannot be overlooked. Training programmes would have to be geared to raising the performance of heads to higher levels of effectiveness especially in the educational leadership dimension.

The issues raised in this study are sufficiently significant to merit further research and investigation that could throw light on administrative and educational practices and their consequence for the school. A replication of this and its extension to cover the primary and private sectors would be useful in verifying, questioning or extending some of the findings here. For example, accepting that some aspects of behaviour are contextually bound,

the study attempted to discuss some attitudes in the society that might have influenced the way the headteachers behaved. However, the findings suggest that further explorations in this direction might indeed be fruitful in enlightening the issue of organizational behaviour across cultures and thus the whole question of the transfer of theory.

Attempts should be made to discover how bureaucratic the educational system is perceived to be and what its effects on education, headteachers, teachers and pupils are. It would be valuable for research to seek to answer the question raised above, viz: To what extent is the rule-governed, centrally-controlled system succeeding in achieving its goals of uniformity, minimal standards and accountability? Related to this question is the issue of formalism. The causes, influence and extent of formalism could be explored.

The present study was exploratory and as far as the writer knows ground-breaking in its context. Inevitably, it will have touched on many issues and drawn conclusions that could be corroborated, questioned or rejected through further research. Studies might therefore be mounted to investigate the following areas:

1. The approach and attitudes of headteachers to delegation;

2. The extent of the perception of powerlessness and ambiguity among headteachers, and what their causes and effects are;
3. The nature and extent of disciplinary problems and their effects on school organization;
4. The issue of reactivity and proactivity. In the light of research findings that link proactivity to school effectiveness, special effort should be made to discover to what extent proactivity is a trainable skill.
5. The role of the headteacher in educational leadership in the schools;
6. The whole area of accountability, teacher assessment and staff development;

In addition to these proposed areas of study the following hypotheses are advanced for testing.

1. There is little or no relationship between the headteachers' pressure of work and the non performance of educational leadership tasks;
2. The emphasis placed by headteachers on controlling students is related to their fear of criticism from the community and the consequent damage to the school's reputation more so than to a concern for school effectiveness;
3. The extent of the headteacher's willingness to

delegate is related to the degree of collegiality there is in the school;

4. Reactivity on the part of headteachers is a function of their role perception;
5. The extent to which headteachers in the system are not prepared to exercise initiative is a function of the extent to which they perceive the system to be rule-governed and centrally-controlled;
6. The greater the visibility and the quicker the resolution of the tasks, the greater the likelihood of the involvement of headteachers in those tasks.

Little research has been done in education and educational administration in Barbados. The findings of this study might therefore be useful as a first step in creating a conceptual model for use in the training of school administrators in the local setting and in contributing to the development of a theory of practice.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allison, D. J. The Principal: Prince, Pawn or Prima Donna? The Yellow papers - The School Principal vol. 3:1, 1983, OISE.
- Barry, C. H. and Tye, F. Running a School. London, Temple Smith, 1972.
- Barsky, H. The Political Style of an Urban Principal: A Case Study - University of Pennsylvania Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, 1975.
- Bernbaum, G. The Role of the Head. R. S. Peters (1976). The Role of the Head. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1976.
- Blumberg, Arthur and Greenfield, W. The Effective Principal Perspectives on School Leadership. Boston. Allyn and Bacon Inc. 1980.
- Boyd, William L. What School Administrators Do and Don't Do: Implications for Effective Schools. Canadian Administrator, XXXII No. 6, 1983.
- Brainard, E. The Colorado Department of Education and the Development of School District Based Administrator Renewal Programs. Denver Colorado. ERIC ED 114933, 1975.
- Bridges, Edwin M. Research on the School Administrator: The State of the Art, 1967-80. Educational Administration Quarterly 18:3 (Summer 1982) pp. 12-33.
- Brieve, F. J. Secondary Principals as Instructional leaders. NASSP Bulletin, December 1972.
- Bryne, D. R., Hines, S. A. and McCleary, L. E. The Senior High Principalship, vol. 1. The National Survey Virginia NASSP, Principalship, 1978.
- Button, H. W. Doctrines of Administration: A Brief History. Educational Administration Quarterly. 2:3 (Autumn 1966).
- Calder, C. R. and Shibles, M. The British Headteacher and the American Principal: A Comparison of Roles. The Elementary School Journal. 74:7 (1974) 393-8.
- Campbell, R. F., Bridges, E. M., Corbally, J., Nystrand, R. O. and Ramseyer, J. A. Introduction to Educational

- Administration, 4th Ed. Boston, Allyn and Bacon Inc. 1971.
- Campbell, W. J. Being a Teacher in Australian State Government Schools A.G.P. Canberra AACRDE Report No. 5. (1979) Quoted in Mulford B. (1984) (2).
- Casey, H. Elizabeth. Managerial Behavior: A Study of Public School Principals, Stanford University Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, 1980.
- Cohen, Louis and Manion, Lawrence. Research Methods in Education. London Croom Helm, 1980.
- Culbertson, J. Educational Administration: Where We are and Where we are going. Canadian and Comparative Educational Administration. Univ. of British Columbia, 1980.
- Daniel, Gary S. and Grobe, R. P. Variables Associated with Effective Schooling, ERIC Document Ed. 207 221. September 1981.
- Dean, S. E. Elementary School Administration and Organization U.S. Office of Education Bulletin No. 11. Washington D.C. Government Printing Office, 1960.
- Doll, D. C. Variations Among Inner City Elementary Schools. Kansas City, Missouri University of Missouri at Kansas School of Education, 1969.
- Erickson, Donald A. Educational Organisation and Administration. California, McCutchan Pub. Corp. 1977.
- Erlandson, D. Strengthening School Leadership. Interstate Printers and Publishers 1976.
- Farquhar, R. Recent Developments in the Professional Preparation of Principals. Studies in Educational Administration. No. 121, June 1978.
- Figueroa, J. J. Society, Schools and Progress in the West Indies. Oxford, Pergamon Press 1971.
- Friesen, D. Holdaway, E. A. and Rice, A. W. Satisfaction of School Principals with their Work, Educational Administration Quarterly, 19:4 (Fall 1983) 35-58.
- Galante, F. Perceptions of the Role of the High School in a Large Urban Industrial School District. Wayne State

- University. Unpublished Doctoral dissertation 1964.
- Geertz, C. On the Nature of Anthropological Understanding
American Scientist vol. 63 (Jan-Feb. 1973) pp. 47-53.
- Gersten, R. D., Carnine, D. and Green, S. The Principal as
Instructional Leader: A Second Look. Educational
Leadership, December 1982. pp. 47-50.
- Glaser, Barney and Strauss, Anselm. The Discovery of
Grounded Theory. Chicago - Aldine Pub. Co. 1967.
- Goette, J. H. A Study of the High School Principal in
Texas, University of Houston - Unpublished Doctoral
dissertation, 1959.
- Goldhammer, K., Becker, G., Withcombe, R. Doyel, F.,
Miller, E. Morgan, C., Deloretta, L. and Alridge, B.
Elementary Principals and Their Schools - Beacons of
Brilliance and Potholes of Pestilence - Centre for the
Advanced Study of Educational Administration - Univer-
sity of Oregon, 1971.
- Goldman, H. Evaluation of Administrative Behaviour at the
Building Level, NASSP Bulletin, Sept. 1970 54: pp.
70-79.
- Goldman, H. New Roles for Principals - New York Clearing
House 1970.
- Gorton, R. A. and McIntyre, R. E. The Senior High School
Principalship, vol. 11 - The Effective Principal,
NASSP, 1978.
- Graves, W. and Stoller, N. Principals Study Their Job -
National Elementary Principal 33: 10-21, 1953.
- Greenfield, T. Barr. Theory About Organizations: A New
perspective and its Implications for Schools, in
Hughes, M. ed., Administering Education: International
Challenge, Athlone Press, 1975.
- Greenfield, T. Barr. The man who Comes Back Through the
Door in the Wall: Discovering Truth, Discovering Self,
Discovering Organization. Educational Administration
Quarterly vol. 16:3 (Fall 1980) pp. 26-59.
- Griffiths, Daniel, Clark, D. L., Wynn, D. R. and Iannacone,
L. Organizing Schools for Effective Education.
Illinois, Interstate Publishing, 1962.

- Gross, Neal and Herriott, R. E. Staff Leadership in Public Schools: A Sociological Enquiry. New York, John Wiley, 1965.
- Higley, J. Training and Certification of School Principals NASSP Leadership Digest, Series 12, 1975.
- Hill, P., Wuchitech, J. and Williams, R. The Effects of Federal Education Programs on School Principals. A Rand Note prepared for the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Santa Monica, 1980.
- Hills, G. The Perceived In-Service Needs of Preferred Delivery Systems of Elementary School Principals in relation to In-Service Provision. University of Manitoba - Unpublished M.Ed. Thesis. 1982.
- Hinrichs, R. W. A Comparative Role Analysis of the Elementary School Principalship and the Senior High School Principalship in Selected Iowa School Districts. University of Iowa - Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. 1971.
- Hofstede, G. Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values, Beverley Hills, Sage Publication 1980.
- Hoy, W. C. I. and Miskel, C. G. Educational Administration: Theory, Research and Practice. New York. Random House, 1978.
- Jennings, Arnold ed. Management and Headship in the Secondary School, Glasgow, Ward Lock Educational, 1977.
- Johnson, J. and Sackney, L. E. Principals' Classroom Supervisory Practices. Saskatoon University Press, 1982.
- Katz, R. L. Skills of an Effective Administrator. Harvard Business Review, vol. 33 (Dec. 1955) 33-42.
- Kennedy, M. Findings from the Follow-Through Planned Variation Study, Educational Researcher 7 (1978) pp. 3-11.
- Kerlinger, F. N. Foundations of Behavioural Research, New York, Holt, Rinehart, Winston, 1970.
- Kiggundu, M., Jorgensen, J., and Hatsu, T. Administrative Practice and Theory in Developing Countries: A

- Synthesis. Administrative Science Quarterly 28: 66-84, 1983.
- Knezevich, S. Administration of Public Education, New York. Harper & Row, 1975.
- Lammers, C. J. and Hickson, D. J. Organizations Alike and Unalike. London, Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1979.
- Leithwood, K. A. and Montgomery, D. J. The Role of the Elementary School Principal in Program Improvement. Review of Educational Research. Fall, 1982: pp. 309-339.
- Leithwood, Keith E. Growth in Principal Effectiveness: The Principal Profile. OISE The Yellow Papers: The School Principal vol. 3: No. 1., 1983.
- Lincoln, J., Hanada, P., and Olson, M. Are Organisations Culture-Bound in Lammers E. J. Hickson, D. T. (ibid).
- Lipham, James and Hoeh, James. The Principalship: Foundations and Functions. New York, Harper & Row, 1974.
- Lusthaus, C. S. The Role of the Quebec Principal: An Interpretive Profile. OISE The Yellow Papers - The School Principal. vol. 1. No. 3, 1983.
- Maggagula, C. Leadership Effectiveness Across Cultures Unpublished Paper, Faculty of Education, University of Manitoba, 1983.
- Marshall, David G. and Newton, Earle H. The Professional Preparation of School Administrators in Developing Countries: Some Issues for Decision-Making. Occasional Paper No. 3. Department of Educational Foundations, Centre for International Education and Development - University of Alberta, June 1983.
- Marshall, D. G. and Newton, E. H. A Model for the Delivery of Professional Preparation and Development Programmes for School Administrators in the Commonwealth Caribbean (Unpublished) 1984.
- Martin, W. Joseph. The Managerial Behaviour of High School Principals, Pennsylvania State University. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. 1980.
- Martin, W. J. and Willower, D. J. The Managerial Behaviour of Principals. Educational Administration Quarterly

- 17:1 (Winter 1981) pp. 69-90.
- McCabee, H. V. Time for the Job NASSP Bulletin 42: 39-44, 1958.
- McKague, T. R. The Principal's Role in School Improvement. The Saskatchewan Educational Administrator. 13:4 (June 1981) pp. 4-14.
- Mills, T. The Principal as a Catalyst - An Interview with Troy Mills. Theory Into Practice. 18:1, pp. 21-27.
- Mintzberg, Henry. The Nature of Managerial Work. New York, Harper and Row, 1973.
- Morris, V. C., Crowson, R. L., Hurqitz, E., and Porter-Gehrie, C. The Urban Principal: Discretionary Decision-Making in a Large Educational Organisation. Chicago, University of Illinois College of Education, 1981.
- Mulford, B. (1). Principal Training: How Do We Decide the Content, Educational Change and Development. vol. 5:2 (1984) 3-10.
- Mulford, B. (2). Secondary School Principals - A crisis a day may keep boredom away but is it enough to make a difference? The Secondary Administrator, 2, 2: 35-36: 1984.
- Natriello, G. and Dornbusch, S. Pitfalls in the Evaluation of Teachers by Principals. Administrators Notebook. vol. XXIX (1980-81) No. 6.
- Nickerson, N. C. Status of Programs for Principals. NASSP Bulletin. 56:352, 1972.
- Novotney, J. M. How to Manage Change. American School Board Journal. December 1967.
- O'Dempsey, K. Time Analysis of Activities, Work Patterns and Roles of High School Principals. Administration Bulletin 7, (1976).
- Ontario Institute for Studies in Education. The Yellow Papers - School Principal. vol. 1, December 1983.
- Owens, Robert C. Methodological Rigor in Naturalistic Inquiry: Some Issues and Answers. Educational Administration Quarterly. 18.2, (Spring 1982) pp. 1-21.

- Peters, R. S. The Role of the Head. London, Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1976.
- Peterson, K. D. The Principal's Tasks. Administrators Notebook. 26:8, pp. 1-4, 1977-78.
- Pitner, N. J. A Descriptive Study of the Superintendency, Paper presented at the American Association of School Administration. New Orleans, 1979.
- Redding, S. G. and Martyn-Johns, T. A. Paradigm Differences and their Relation to Management, with reference to South-East Asia in Lammers and Hickson (ibid).
- Riggs, R. W. Administration in Developing Countries. Boston, Houghton-Mifflin Co., 1964.
- Rist, Ray C. Ethnographic Techniques and the Study of an Urban School. Urban Education. April 1975: pp. 66-108.
- Roe, W. H. & Drake, T. L. The Principalship. New York December, 1974.
- Rogers, K. S. Principals Discuss their Roles: An Observational Study. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association. Boston, April, 1980.
- Rosenthal, R. and Jacobsen, L. Pygmalion in the Classroom: Teacher Expectation and Pupil Development. New York, Holt, Rinehart & Winston 1968.
- Sackney, Larry. The Principal as an Educational Leader, The School Trustee. July 1982, pp. 8-11.
- Sarason, S. The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change. Boston. Allyn and Bacon, 1971.
- Shoemaker, Joan and Fraser, H. What Principals Can Do: Some Implications from Studies of Effective Schooling. Phi Delta Kappan, Nov. 1981, pp. 178-182.
- Silver, P. The Development of a Knowledge Base for the Practice of Educational Administration. Administrators Notebook. vol. XXIX (1980-81) No. 1.
- Simon, H. A. The New Science of Management Decision. Harper & Row, 1960.

- Smyth, W. John. Educational Leadership in Schools: What it Might Mean. The Educational Administrator, 1980. (1) 5 pp. 56-68.
- Smyth, W. John. New Directions in the Study of the Principals. The Canadian Administrator. XXII.2, 1982.
- Stavanage, J. A. NCA Principals perceptions of Their Principals. The North Central Association Quarterly. 1972.
- Trump, J. L. The Principal's Role in Improving Instruction. NASSP Bulletin. 1967.
- Watson, L. E. Managerial Discretion: A Key Concept for the Principal. Studies in Educational Administration. No. 24, Sept. 1981.
- Wellisch, J., McQueen, Carrier, R. and Duck, G. School Management and Organisation in Successful Schools. Sociology of Education. vol. 51, July 1978, pp. 211-226.
- Weitz, L. The High School Principal in New York City: A Study of Executive Responsibility in Theory and Practice. (Doctoral Dissertation, New York Univ., 1960).
- Williams, C. O. An In-Depth Investigation of Explicit Tasks Performed by Selected Junior High School Principals. Doctoral Thesis, Ball State University, 1971.
- Willis, O. The Work Activity of School Principals: An Observational Study. The Journal of Educational Administration. No. 18: 1980.
- Wilson, Stephen. The Use of Ethnographic Techniques in Educational Research. Review of Educational Research. 47:1, 1977. pp. 245-265.
- Wolcott, H. F. The Man in the Principal's Office. New York, Holt Rinehart & Winston, 1973.
- Wood, C. L., Nicholson, E. W., and Findley, D. G. The Secondary School Principal: Manager and Supervisor. Boston, Allyn & Bacon Inc., 1979.

APPENDIX 1A TYPICAL YEAR IN MY LIFE AS A HEADTEACHER

Please use the above title to provide, in about 4-6 pages, a bird's eye view of a typical year in your experience as a headteacher.

You may want to describe those aspects of your work as well as those periods of the year that take a great deal of your time and energy. Maybe there are things you consider very important but, because of the work structure you are not able to do them, or at least not in the way you would like to. Perhaps you may also wish to include those features of your work that bring you satisfaction and those that cause you frustration.

Earle H. Newton

1984-03-28

APPENDIX 2

SAMPLE OF PRO FORMA DATA RECORDING SHEETS

<u>TIME</u> (from - to)	<u>DESCRIPTION OF ACTIVITY</u> (what, with whom, nature)	<u>NATURE OF ACTIVITY</u> (Scheduled/unscheduled/unplanned/unplanned)	<u>MEDIUM OF INTERACTION</u> (face to face telephone, correspondence)	<u>LOCATION</u>	<u>ANY OTHER RELEVANT DETAILS</u>

APPENDIX 3HEADTEACHER PERCEPTION AND BEHAVIOUR STUDYINTERVIEW SCHEDULE

HEADTEACHER:

SCHOOL:

DATE OF INTERVIEW:

INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIREIntroduction

I am going to ask you a few questions about your work and experience as a principal. Altogether the interview should take about an hour.

1. Various tasks and responsibilities have been identified for school heads. In the main these can be conveniently grouped under two (2) headings. These are (1) administrative-managerial and (2) educational leadership tasks. Please read this short extract which attempts to define them, and tell me (1) if they adequately cover the tasks of the principalship as you see it, and (2) if a principal should be more concerned with one than with the other.

EXTRACT

Roe and Drake (1974) project a dual perspective on the principalship. In their administrative-managerial perspective the major functions are wide ranging. They cover such activities as record keeping, reporting, budgeting, and control of finances, discipline, personnel administration, scheduling, building administration, the securing and maintenance of supplies and equipment, pupil accounting and the monitoring of programmes and instructional processes prescribed by the central office.

The functions under the second perspective, the "educational leadership emphasis" are no less demanding. Here, the onus is on the principal to stimulate and motivate his staff to maximum performance and to develop with them a realistic and objective system of accountability for learning. He/She must work with his staff to develop sound assessment procedures for on-going programmes in order to identify weak areas and suggest alternatives. With the cooperation of his/her staff s/he must develop and implement strategies and procedures for the evaluation of the staff and for evaluating and reporting student progress. It is the principal's responsibility to make provisions for the involvement of the community in the operation of the school, to encourage the continuous study of curricular and

instructional innovations and to provide leadership to students to help them design and develop meaningful student government.

2. To what extent should the Head's personal philosophy of education etc. be used in organizing and running the school?
3. Should a principal be required to teach on a routine basis?
4. Should a head be required to visit and observe classroom teaching?
5. a) Please give me a brief description of your job.
b) Does the job differ essentially, now that you are in it, from the way you had conceived it?
6. Who are the people with whom you interact on a regular basis?
7. Describe those tasks/activities etc. you perform on a regular basis.
8. Are there any tasks/activities/duties etc. you now perform or are required to perform which you think a principal should not have to perform?
9. Are there any tasks/activities/duties you do not now perform that you feel as a principal you should be performing?

10. What aspects of your work take up most of your time?
11. What do you consider the least important aspect of your job?
12. What do you consider the most important tasks of the headship?
13. Do you find it possible to devote the time, energy, resources etc. you consider appropriate to these important tasks? Explain.
14. How much emphasis do you put on long-range planning?
15. How much on short-term planning?
16. Describe the approach to leadership you perceive yourself to have.
17. What are some of the major decisions you are faced with in your work?
18. Minor decisions?
19. What kinds of problems come up
 - a) very frequently
 - b) occasionally
 - c) seldom?
20. Describe the staff development provisions and structures, if any, that exist in your school.
21. a) Describe the general tone and climate of your school, especially during class time.

- b) Is it what you would like it to to be?
22. a) Describe the expectations you hold for the staff and pupils of your school.
- b) How do you communicate these expectations to them?
- c) To what extent do you feel these expectations are understood by (a) staff (b) pupils?
23. a) Describe the steps you take to ensure (a) that the curriculum of the school is adequately meeting the needs of the students.
- b) Describe the steps you take to ensure that the teaching learning-processes are properly carried out.
24. Please indicate by circling the appropriate number on the continuum (1) low to (5) high
- a) the emphasis which you think a head should give to the following:
- b) the emphasis which you yourself give the following:
1. Taking the initiative in planning ahead and in solving school problems.
 2. Working cooperatively and effectively with people on school and school-related activities.
 3. Enjoy being in charge and ensuring that tasks are performed.

4. Listening to others and considering their points of view.
5. Observing staff to learn their strengths and weaknesses for positive action.
6. Trying out ideas and suggestions put forward by others.
7. Attempting to involve parents in their children's education.
8. Viewing parents as possible source of help in achieving the goals of the school.
9. Seeking to create and maintain good interpersonal relations between the various elements of the school community.
10. Defining the situation, rather than leaving it to others to do so.
11. Actively undertaking classroom observation of lessons.
12. Ensuring that relevant personnel regularly carry out classroom observation of teachers.
13. Securing recognition in the appropriate places for the needs of the school.
14. Actively fostering the professional development of staff.
15. Promoting discussion on various teaching methods and approaches.

25. Do you feel able to run your school in the way you would like to? (Please elaborate).
26. Are there particular factors that inhibit or support you in this respect.
27. What factors contribute most to your overall satisfaction with the headship.
28. What factors contribute most to your overall dissatisfaction with the headship?
29. How much time on average do you spend per week on work and work-related activities?

APPENDIX 4EXPLANATION OF CATEGORIES USED IN ANALYZING THE
TASKS/ACTIVITIES OF THE HEADTEACHERS

Without trivialising or reducing the work of the head-teachers to unmanageable details, fairly neat distinctions were used in order to capture as nearly as possible the tone and nature of their operation. Twenty-four different tasks were identified, although not all were performed by each headteacher.

ADMINISTRATION:

This is the broadest category. It includes a number of general matters such as entries in the schools diary or log book, timetabling or adjusting timetables for whatever reason, the preparation of information/statistics/reports for the Ministry of Education, dealing with absence, lateness or the returning to school after absence by both staff and pupils, writing of transcripts and testimonials.

ANCILLARY:

This covers any contact with or handling of issues related to the janitorial, cleaning or ground staff. In the light of the fairly frequent reference to them by the

heads, it was considered wise to single out each contact for study.

ASSEMBLY:

Traditionally the school day in Barbados begins with morning worship (hymn singing and prayers and an address). This takes different forms and is sometimes organized for the whole school, or various groups within the school. The head may preside solely, share it with others or simply attend.

BUDGET:

This covers all financial matters from the preparation of the yearly estimates to the spending of or accounting for the smallest sum.

CLASSROOM OBSERVATION:

The headteacher visits a teacher in the classroom to observe and assess his/her teaching.

CORRESPONDENCE:

Reading and reacting to incoming mail and writing, dictating letters, memos etc. Does not include transcripts and testimonials etc.

DETENTION:

A form of punishment. Very rarely is the head involved in supervising this activity.

DISCUSSION:

The headteacher becomes involved in a serious professional discussion, whether at his/her instigation or not, that is not immediately and obviously related to a school problem.

EXCHANGES:

A social exchange of any duration.

INSTRUCTIONAL:

A matter touching on curriculum and instruction. For example, a discussion on the best way of arranging options at a particular year level, or the merits of different texts in a given subject area. These matters were hardly ever initiated by the headteacher but rather were started by an individual member of staff.

INTERVIEWS:

Job interviews in which the headteacher was involved alone or with others.

MEETING:

This is distinguished from a staff meeting. It covers any meeting that the headteacher is called upon to attend rather than one he summons and has direct control over e.g. Board of Management, Professional Associations, etc. Travel time is calculated in the overall meeting time.

MONITORING:

The headteacher stations himself in a strategic position to observe whether a particular event is taking place or not e.g. to ascertain when a tardy teacher shows up for a class. Tours may be interrupted for the purpose of monitoring a situation.

PERSONAL:

Any activity of a private or personal (non-school nature)--including lunch, reading the newspaper, private phone calls etc., done on or off the premises.

PHONE:

The use of the telephone for school-related matters.

PLANNING:

Any forward looking projection whether short- or long-term, or alone or with staff.

STAFF MEETING:

Any formal meeting with sections of or the full academic staff.

STUDENT DISCIPLINE:

Any behaviour problem involving students, but not follow-up activity such as writing letters or reports on them for Ministry, parents or Board, or entering it in the log book.

STUDENT WELFARE:

Matters relating to the well-being, usually of individual students who are ill, hungry, lacking bus fares, needing social welfare assistance, or needing help with other problems.

TEACHER APPRAISAL:

Headteacher evaluates the teacher's work with him.

TEACHING:

Covers not only actual classroom teaching but also the preparation of lessons, materials, and tests and the marking of assignments.

TOUR:

A walk around the premises and buildings or any part thereof.

TRAVEL:

A very limited restricted use. It involves going to a place to collect or deliver something for or on behalf of the school e.g. the post office to collect a parcel.

VISITOR:

Any non-school person calling in to see the head e.g. a salesman.