

6-19-2011

Examining the Work Elements and Impact of the Teaching Building Level Administrator

Gregory E. Shoemaker
Indiana University of Pennsylvania

Follow this and additional works at: <http://knowledge.library.iup.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

Shoemaker, Gregory E., "Examining the Work Elements and Impact of the Teaching Building Level Administrator" (2011). *Theses and Dissertations (All)*. 690.
<http://knowledge.library.iup.edu/etd/690>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by Knowledge Repository @ IUP. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations (All) by an authorized administrator of Knowledge Repository @ IUP. For more information, please contact cclouser@iup.edu, sara.parme@iup.edu.

EXAMINING THE WORK ELEMENTS AND
IMPACT OF THE TEACHING BUILDING LEVEL ADMINISTRATOR

A Dissertation

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies and Research

In Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Education

Gregory E. Shoemaker

Indiana University of Pennsylvania

May, 2010

Indiana University of Pennsylvania
The School of Graduate Studies and Research
Department of Professional Studies in Education

We hereby approve the dissertation of

Gregory E. Shoemaker

Candidate for the degree of Doctor of Education

Douglas Lare, D.Ed., Co-Chair
Professor of Professional and Secondary Education
East Stroudsburg University

Kelli Jo Kerry Moran, Ph.D., Co-Chair
Associate Professor of Professional Studies in
Education

Angelo Senese, D.Ed.
Assistant Professor of Professional and Secondary
Education
East Stroudsburg University

ACCEPTED

Timothy P. Mack, Ph.D.
Dean
School of Graduate Studies and Research

Title: Examining the Work Elements and Impact of the Teaching Building Level Administrator

Author: Gregory E. Shoemaker

Dissertation Co-Chairs: Dr. Douglas Lare
Dr. Kelli Jo Kerry Moran

Dissertation Committee Member: Dr. Angelo Senese

In recent years there has been increasing pressure on kindergarten-12 building level administrators to become more directly involved in classroom instructional practices. The purpose of this study was to examine elements that impacted the teaching building level kindergarten-12 administrator. Specifically, the study explored potential impediments that prevented a building level administrator from teaching. In addition, the study considered the elements that helped an administrator find time to enter a classroom to teach. It also examined what they believed to have been the effect that a teaching principal had on teachers' perceptions and attitudes of the building level administrator as an instructional leader.

A survey was distributed to all building level administrators who were employed within schools located near two Intermediate Units in Northeastern Pennsylvania. Eighty-seven building level administrators responded to the survey. This process garnered data about the impediments and supports that were needed to allow a building level administrator the time to teach on a consistent basis. It also examined what principals believed the effect a teaching principal had on teachers' perceptions and attitudes of the building level administrator as an instructional leader. Eight building level administrators who currently teach, or recently taught, as part of their administrative

work day were interviewed about the related impediments and supports needed to allow a building level administrator the time to regularly teach. The final process included a case study which resulted in a comparison of the data from the triangulation of the survey and the interviews with the direct experience of the researcher while co-teaching for eight weeks.

Results suggested that having a heavy management workload and the lack of time to plan for effective instruction were two key impediments that might prevent a building level administrator from teaching or co-teaching on a reoccurring basis. The research identified four elements that supported an administrator's decision to teach. The elements included having additional administrative office support, central office administrative support, a teacher with whom the principal could exchange roles, and the act of co-teaching with another teacher. The data from the surveys, interviews, and case study also indicated that building level administrators believed their credibility increased in relation to "classroom" instructional initiatives that were introduced. Additionally, increased credibility about the principal's ability to lead an effective school was the result of this instructional leadership practice. Two other benefits identified were improved relationships with the teachers in their school and increased confidence in the principal as an educational leader.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I dedicate this work to my nephew Nicholas Pantalone. His battle with cancer has been an inspiration to me to complete this dissertation. Nick's attitude is one that never lets any obstacles get in his way to complete his goals in life.

I would like to thank my wife for her support and patience while I worked on this dissertation. I would also like to acknowledge and thank Dr. Douglas Lare, Dr. Kellie Jo Moran, Dr. Angelo Senese, and Dr. Dennis Riker for their patience, encouragement, and guidance through the dissertation process.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I	RESEARCH PROBLEM.....	1
	Introduction.....	1
	Need for Study.....	6
	Purpose of the Dissertation.....	7
	Design of the Study.....	8
	Definition of Terms.....	9
	Limitations of the Dissertation.....	10
	Summary.....	12
II	REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	14
	Introduction.....	14
	Historical Evolution of the Principalship.....	18
	Instructional Leadership.....	34
	Studies on Teaching Principals.....	38
	A Qualitative Study.....	39
	A Qualitative Study.....	41
	A Survey Research Methodology.....	45
	The Co-Teaching Model.....	49
	Gaps in the Literature.....	62
	Summary.....	63
III	METHODOLOGY.....	65
	Introduction.....	65
	Setting of the Study.....	66
	Participants of the Survey.....	66
	Quantitative Data Survey Design.....	67
	Content Validity.....	67
	Reliability.....	68
	Procedures.....	69
	Quantitative Data Analysis.....	71
	Measures of Central Tendency.....	71
	Measures of Variability.....	71
	Data Analysis.....	72
	Quantitative Data Summary.....	72
	Qualitative Data.....	73
	Interview Design.....	73
	Interview Participants.....	74
	Interview Setting.....	75

Chapter		Page
	Assessment of Trustworthiness.....	76
	Qualitative Data Summary.....	77
	Triangulation of the Data.....	78
	Case Study.....	78
	Co-Teaching Participant.....	79
	Interview of Elementary School “B” Community Members.....	79
	Summary.....	80
IV	ANALYSIS OF THE DATA.....	81
	Introduction.....	81
	Research Questions.....	82
	Quantitative Data.....	82
	Demographic Data of Survey Participants.....	83
	Individual Survey Data of Teaching Building Level Administrators: Individual Data Summary.....	84
	Surveys with Intermediate Unit Number 20 and Intermediate Unit Number 21 Principals: Impediments that Prevent Building Level Administrators from Teaching.....	87
	Surveys with Intermediate Unit Number 20 and Intermediate Unit Number 21 Principals: Impediments that Prevent Building Level Administrators from Co-Teaching.....	88
	Surveys with Intermediate Unit Number 20 and Intermediate Unit Number 21 Principals: Supports Needed to be in Place for You to Consider Teaching One Class Per Day.....	90
	Surveys with Intermediate Unit Number 20 and Intermediate Unit Number 21 Principals: Increased Credibility About the “Classroom” Instructional Initiative Introduced by the Principal is a Benefit of Being a Teaching Principal.....	92
	Surveys with Intermediate Unit Number 20 and Intermediate Unit Number 21 Principals: Increased Credibility About the Principal’s Ability to Lead an Effective School is a Benefit of Being a Teaching Principal.....	94
	Surveys with Intermediate Unit Number 20 and Intermediate Unit Number 21 Principals: Improved Relationships are a Benefit of Being a Teaching Principal.....	96
	Surveys with Intermediate Unit Number 20 and Intermediate Unit Number 21 Principals: An Increase in Confidence as an Educational Leader is a Benefit of Being a Teaching Principal.....	98

Chapter	Page
Surveys with Intermediate Unit Number 20 and Intermediate Unit Number 21 Principals: Increased Credibility About the “Classroom” Instructional Initiative Introduced by the Principal is a Benefit of Co-Teaching Principal.....	100
Surveys with Intermediate Unit Number 20 and Intermediate Unit Number 21 Principals: Increased Credibility About the Principal’s Ability to Lead an Effective School is a Benefit of Being a Co-Teaching Principal.....	102
Surveys with Intermediate Unit Number 20 and Intermediate Unit Number 21 Principals: Improved Relationships are a Benefit of Being a Co-Teaching Principal.....	104
Surveys with Intermediate Unit Number 20 and Intermediate Unit Number 21 Principals: An Increase in Confidence as an Educational Leader is a Benefit of Being a Co-Teaching Principal.....	105
Surveys with Intermediate Unit Number 20 and Intermediate Unit Number 21 Principals: Increased Teacher Morale is a Benefit of Being a Teaching Principal.....	107
Surveys with Intermediate Unit Number 20 and Intermediate Unit Number 21 Principals: Increased Empathy for Teacher Responsibilities is a Benefit of Being a Teaching Principal.....	109
Qualitative Data.....	110
Demographic Data of Interview Participants.....	111
Interviews with Current or Recent Teaching Principals: Impediments that Prevent Building Level Administrators from Teaching.....	113
Interviews with Current or Recent Teaching Principals: Supports Needed to be in Place for You to Consider Teaching One Class Per Day.....	115
Interviews with Current or Recent Teaching Principals: Increased Credibility About the “Classroom” Instructional Initiative Introduced by the Teaching Principal.....	117
Interviews with Current or Recent Teaching Principals: Increased Credibility About the Principal’s Ability to Lead an Effective School is a Benefit of Being a Teaching Principal.....	119
Interviews with Current or Recent Teaching Principals: Improved Relationships is a Benefit of Being a Teaching Principal.....	120

Chapter	Page
Interviews with Current or Recent Teaching Principals: An Increase in Confidence as an Educational Leader is a Benefit of Being a Teaching Principal.....	122
Interviews with Current or Recent Teaching Principals: Increased Teacher Morale is a Benefit of Being a Teaching Principal.....	123
Interviews with Current or Recent Teaching Principals: Increased Empathy for Teacher Responsibilities is a Benefit of Being a Teaching Principal.....	124
Case Study.....	124
Case Study: Impediments that Prevent a Building Level Administrator from Co-Teaching.....	125
Case Study: Supports Needed to be in Place for a Building Level Administrator to Consider Teaching One Period Per Day.....	127
Case Study: Possible Benefits of Being a Teaching Principal: Increased Credibility About the “Classroom” Instructional Initiative Introduced by the Principal.....	129
Case Study: Possible Benefits of Being a Teaching Principal: Increased Credibility About the Principal’s Ability to Lead an Effective School is a Benefit of Being a Teaching Principal.....	130
Case Study: Improved Relationships as a Possible Benefit of Being a Teaching Principal.....	132
Case Study: An Increase in Confidence as an Educational Leader is a Benefit of Being a Teaching Principal.....	134
Case Study: Increased Teacher Morale is a Benefit of Being a Teaching Principal.....	136
Case Study: Increased Empathy for Teacher Responsibilities is a Benefit of Being a Teaching Principal.....	136
Summary of Impediments that Prevent a Building Level Administrator from Teaching.....	137
Summary of the Supports Needed to be in Place for a Building Level Administrator to Consider Teaching One Period Per Day.....	139
Summary of Possible Benefits of Being a Teaching Principal: Increased Credibility About the “Classroom” Instructional Initiative Introduced by the Principal.....	142
Summary of Possible Benefits of Being a Teaching Principal: Increased Credibility About the Principal’s Ability to Lead an Effective School is a Benefit of Being a Teaching Principal.....	144
Summary of Possible Benefits of Being a Teaching Principal: Improved Relationships is a Benefit of Being a Teaching Principal.....	146

Chapter		Page
	Summary of Possible Benefits of Being a Teaching Principal: An Increase in Confidence as an Educational Leader is a Benefit of Being a Teaching Principal.....	148
	Summary of Possible Benefits of Being a Teaching Principal: Increased Teacher Morale is a Benefit of Being a Teaching Principal.....	150
	Summary of Possible Benefits of Being a Teaching Principal: Increased Empathy for Teacher Responsibilities is a Benefit of Being a Teaching Principal.....	150
	Summary.....	151
V	FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	153
	Introduction.....	153
	Data Conclusions.....	157
	Recommendations for Further Study.....	168
	Summary.....	171
	REFERENCES.....	173
	APPENDICES.....	181
	Appendix A – School District “A” Elementary Principal Position Description.....	182
	Appendix B – Survey Instrument.....	185
	Appendix C – Superintendent/District Letter of Approval.....	192
	Appendix D – Superintendent/District Informed Consent Form...	194
	Appendix E – Description of the Study.....	198
	Appendix F – Letter for Principals to Participate in the Study.....	203
	Appendix G – Letter to Request to Receive the Results of the Study.....	205
	Appendix H – Interview Questions.....	207
	Appendix I – Superintendent/District Letter of Approval to Interview Building Level Administrators Who Teach.....	209
	Appendix J – Letter to Principal to Participate in Study by Being Interviewed.....	211
	Appendix K – Informed Consent - Interview Participant.....	213
	Appendix L – Administrator Daily Reflection Sheet/ Administrative Four/Eight Week Reflection Sheet.....	217

Chapter	Page
Appendix M – Superintendent/District Letter of Approval to Co-Teach.....	219
Appendix N – Superintendent Informed Consent - Co-Teaching.....	221
Appendix O – Co-Teaching Letter to Third Grade Teacher.....	225
Appendix P – Informed Consent – Co-Teaching Principal.....	227
Appendix Q – Elementary School “B” Community Interview Perception Questions.....	231

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Demographic Data for the Survey Participants.....	85
2	Impediments that Prevented Building Level Administrators from Teaching.....	87
3	Impediments that Prevented Building Level Administrators from Co-Teaching.....	89
4	Supports Needed to be in Place to Consider Teaching One Class Per Day.....	91
5	Increased Credibility on the Part of _____ About the “Classroom” Instructional Initiatives Introduced by the Principal is a Benefit of Being a Teaching Principal.....	93
6	Increased Credibility with _____ About the Principal’s Ability to Lead an Effective School is a Benefit of Being a Teaching Principal.....	95
7	Improved Relationship with _____ are a Benefit of Being a Teaching Principal.....	97
8	Increase in Confidence as an Educational Leader with _____ is a Benefit of Being a Teaching Principal.....	99
9	Increased Credibility on the Part of _____ About the “Classroom” Instructional Initiatives Introduced by the Principal is a Benefit of Being a Co-Teaching Principal.....	101
10	Increased Credibility with _____ About the Principal’s Ability to Lead an Effective School is a Benefit of Being a Co-Teaching Principal.....	103
11	Improved Relationships with _____ are a Benefit of Being a Co-Teaching Principal.....	104
12	An Increase in Confidence as an Educational Leader with _____ is a Benefit of Being a Teaching Principal.....	106
13	Increased Morale is a Benefit of Being a Teaching Principal.....	108

Table		Page
14	Increased Empathy for Teacher Responsibilities is a Benefit of Being a Teaching Principal.....	109
15	Demographic Data of Interview Participants.....	112

CHAPTER I

RESEARCH PROBLEM

Introduction

As America's publicly funded school systems entered the 21st century, a demand for increased accountability resulted in unprecedented legislation to reform schools in an effort to raise student achievement. This is one of several reasons why on January 8, 2002, President George W. Bush signed into law the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*(NCLB) (Public Law 107-110), which re-established the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act*. NCLB continues to be a prominent focus by President Barak Obama's administration in his Race to the Top (RTTT) initiative under the *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009* (Public Law 111-5).

NCLB (Public Law 107-110) is a United States federal law aiming to improve the performance of primary and secondary schools. This law increased accountability for all public schools by mandating the creation of learning standards and assessments for reading and mathematics. Every public school must have a minimum percentage of their students attain an expected level of proficiency on this test. All public schools are expected to have every student reach a proficient level in the identified subjects by the year 2014. NCLB also provides a parent more flexibility in choosing which schools their children can attend if a school fails to meet the required expectations. This increase in teaching/learning accountability established by NCLB is having a significant impact on the role of principals as educational leaders around the country.

Faculty, staff, students, parents, and the community perceive the principal's role in a variety of ways. However since schools are now being held more accountable for the

academic performance of all students, principals are in the spotlight more than they ever have been. This accountability is based on whether schools and districts are making Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) toward the goal of bringing 100% of their students to academic proficiency by the end of the 2013-2014 school year. If a building fails to meet the AYP a consequence may be that principals may lose their job.

Since principals are being held more academically responsible for student achievement, building level administrators are becoming more active in the teaching process. Teachers can no longer be allowed to close the door to their room and just cover any curriculum. Pressure is also on building level administrators to adjust their roles in the school environment to become the instructional leaders of their buildings.

Historically, job descriptions in many school districts indicated the building level administrator's role was mainly that of a manager which involved setting clear goals, allocating resources for instruction, managing the curriculum, monitoring lesson plans, and evaluating teachers. Today, the job description of a building level administrator (Appendix A) is evolving to also emphasize instructional leadership. More than ever principals need to become involved in the "core technology" of teaching and learning. The building level administrator's job now carries a more sophisticated focus on teaching and learning, developing leadership capacity in teachers, creating conditions for professional learning, emphasizing the use of data to inform instructional program decisions (King, 2002). By immersing themselves in the teaching process, the researcher of this dissertation believed a building level administrator performing the act of teaching on a daily basis would have a positive impact on the teaching and learning process which ideally would improve student achievement.

Building level administrators who become a teaching principal will most likely subscribe to King's (2002) view of the principal's role which includes a focus on teaching and learning, developing leadership capacity in teachers, creating conditions for professional learning, emphasizing the use of data to inform instructional program decisions. Becoming a teaching building level administrator would not only force many building level administrators to change their traditional roles, it would also require them to adjust their daily routines. One prevailing question is when will building level administrators find the time to teach? Most building level administrator's days are already packed with numerous managerial tasks. Reeves (2006), suggests that it is important to take activities out of one's busy schedule to accommodate any new initiatives. His analogy to this situation is that educators should first pull weeds before planting more flowers. If building level administrators would be expected to perform additional duties such as teaching, then what managerial tasks can be delegated to someone else or even eliminated to lessen the administrative responsibilities of the building level administrator so they can find the time to teach?

Another question that came to the surface was how does the act of the building level administrator teaching influence teachers' attitudes in relation to the acceptance of the role of the principal or assistant principal as an instructional leader? Will the perceptions of a building level administrator teaching be positive or negative? Lare (1995) found that having a principal who teaches could have a positive influence on the teachers' perceptions in respect to the principal's ability to teach and understand the teachers' daily routines in addition to the pitfalls that teachers face on a daily basis.

The shift in the building level administrator's role seems to be a return to the beginning of public school history in the United States when the leader of the school was a master teacher or principal teacher (Cubberley, 1934). During this time in history, master teachers were selected because of their expertise in teaching as well as their ability to manage the building. During the 1920s and 1930s increasing demands of the bureaucratic school system caused the role of the master teacher to evolve into one where a principal's function no longer included teaching responsibilities. The primary focus became school management (Beck & Murphy, 1993). The building level administrator's focus of school management continues today.

However, research is increasingly focusing on principal leadership as a function or process rather than a management role (Hallinger & Murphy, 1986; Murphy, 1994). Goldring and Rallis (1993), Louis, Kruse, and Marks (1996) state there is no question that principals play a critical role in creating and maintaining environments that support school improvement. Examples of this include principals leading the way to have teachers form teams to collect and examine data. The examination of the data can then help individuals and grade level teams to make needed adjustments in their instruction. The building level administrator who visited classrooms once or twice a year is proving to be insufficient in raising student achievement. Building level administrators need to believe that they have the capacity to influence teachers to change their instructional practices, especially those teachers who have not demonstrated the ability to improve student achievement.

Flatt (1987), Lare (1995), and Kelley-Brockel (1998) believe the return of a building level administrator to the classroom could be a possible solution. By becoming

a teaching principal, the building level administrator may be able to create a more “academically successful” learning environment. Flatt, Lare, and Kelley-Brockel each researched teaching principals. All three of the researchers’ studies suggest that principals should become more involved in the teaching/learning process. They also believe that one way to address the perceived need for additional instructional leadership, and to increase influence in bringing about educational change is to have a building level administrator teach on a regular basis, much as they did over 100 years ago. Having a teaching principal or assistant principal might demonstrate to teachers, parents, students, and in some cases to community members that principals can model and perform the very same tasks expected of their teachers. Imagine the boost in confidence it would give teachers in a building to have a principal or assistant principal who could manage and teach during the student day successfully. The act of teaching might also give a building level administrator insight to some of the difficulties teachers may have in implementing best practices. Furthering the research on teaching principals may result in the finding of a viable solution that will help a building level administrator find time in their schedules so they can teach without increasing the burden on the daily tasks they must perform.

Flatt (1987) examined the task behavior of elementary principals who taught a portion of the day. Her dissertation pointed out how teaching principals spend their time throughout the day. The dissertation also examined the content of their work and the similarities and differences concerning their observed work. She compared the teaching principals’ work with the work of supervising principals. The results of her dissertation indicated that teaching principals spent the largest portion of their time engaged in teaching, unscheduled meetings, monitoring, and communication exchanges.

Kelley-Brockel's (1998) dissertation identified a number of principals who served in the dual role of teacher and principal in the United States during the 1997-1998 school year. She collected information from teaching principals and non-teaching principals that identified obstacles that hindered a principal's ability to teach. Her conclusion was that the number one obstacle identified by teaching principals was dealing with time constraints.

Lare (1995) studied the changes that take place in schools that experience a teaching principal for the first time. His dissertation provided useful information to principals, assistant principals, and central office administrators who were thinking about teaching on a more regular basis. His dissertation clarified how a school's climate changes when the managerial administrator becomes a teaching administrator.

While Flatt (1987), Lare (1995), and Kelley-Brockel (1998) each researched teaching principals, their studies did not focus on identifying solutions that would help principals find time in their busy schedules. The researcher of this dissertation believes the existing research involving teaching principals needs to be continued. Specifically this research included identifying impediments and suggests specific possible solutions that support a building level administrator so he or she can teach on a daily basis.

Need for Study

Demands of accountability coupled with new legislation require a building level administrator to be an instructional leader. There are several barriers. A potential barrier is how teachers might perceive a principal or assistant principal in the role of a teacher. Another barrier is that the building level administrators are currently removed from planning, teaching, and assessing students in a classroom setting.

There are teachers who might believe that building level administrators who have been removed from teaching need to walk “in their shoes” before making decisions about changing their instructional practices. Building level administrators who regularly teach in a building might have a positive influence on the perceptions and attitudes of teachers and impact their ability to become educational leaders. However, for building level administrators to be able to return to the time in history where they served as a “teaching principal,” certain supports will probably need to be developed. There is only a limited amount of anecdotal records to examine the situation when a “managerial school administrator” becomes a “teaching school administrator.” Flatt (1987), Lare (1995) and Kelley-Brockel (1998) have each researched the principal as a teacher. However, they did not identify possible supports that need to be in place to sustain the goal of being a teaching principal. With all the managerial tasks a building level administrator must perform daily, teaching could be a very difficult undertaking if proper supports are not put in place. This researcher expanded the body of research by identifying impediments and examining possible supports that would allow a building level administrator to find the time to teach.

Purpose of the Dissertation

The primary purpose of this dissertation was to examine what barriers might prevent a principal from teaching and what supports may help a building level administrator find time in their busy schedule to regularly teach a subject. A secondary purpose of this dissertation was to examine what principals believe the effect a teaching principal would have on teachers’ perception and attitude of the building level administrator as an instructional leader.

Specifically, this dissertation addressed the following questions about the teaching principal models:

1. What are the impediments that can be identified which prevent a principal or assistant principal from becoming a teaching or co-teaching building level administrator?
2. What elements need to be in place that would allow a principal or assistance principal the time to teach or co-teach on a recurring basis?
3. Do building level administrators believe teachers' perceptions of them will change if they teach or co-teach? If so, in what way(s)? Will the act of a building level administrator teaching impact the perceptions of how he or she is perceived by teachers, parents, and community members

Since the effects of any change in an organization as complex as a school can be very elusive, this researcher used a qualitative and quantitative mixed study approach as the best means to capture the data. The examination of the data included a triangulation exercise to capture and enrich the results of the study. The final process included a case study resulting from a comparison of the data from the triangulation of the survey and the interviews with the direct experience of the researcher while co-teaching for eight weeks.

Design of the Study

The research design for this dissertation was both qualitative and quantitative. Qualitative and quantitative measures used in this dissertation included surveys and interviews. The researcher surveyed kindergarten-6 public school districts located within two Intermediate Units in Northeastern Pennsylvania. The survey was distributed to all kindergarten through sixth grade elementary principals and assistant principals who erre

currently employed within the two identified Intermediate Units. Survey participants were asked to respond to questions through the use of a five-point Likert scale. The components on the survey included: impediments that practicing building level administrators perceive prevent them from being a teaching principal; supports that practicing building level administrators believe need to be in place for them to consider teaching on a reoccurring basis; and, items pertaining to their perception of any possible benefits of being a teaching building level administrator. The second part of the study (the interviews) included teaching building level administrators located in Pennsylvania and one building level administrator from the state of Oregon. The third part of the study (the case study and interviews) took place at Elementary School B located in School District “A” located in Northeastern Pennsylvania.

Definition of Terms

Building Level Administrators – In this dissertation these are individuals with more than one semester as an assistant principal and/or principal.

Principal – The designated leader of a school who was hired by the Board of Education to manage and oversee the educational process of any schools that contain any combination of the grades from kindergarten to sixth grade.

Assistant Principal – An administrator who supports a principal in managing and overseeing the educational process of any schools that contain any combination of the grades from kindergarten to sixth grade.

Principal as a Manager – A principal or assistant principal who does not teach a class on a regular basis and performs traditional duties such as attending meetings, student discipline, desk work, monitoring, etc.

Principal as an Instructional Leader – A principal or assistant principal who is focused on strengthening classroom instruction, professional development, data-driven decision making, and accountability.

Teaching Building Level Administrator – A teaching principal is a practicing building level administrator (head principal/assistant principal) who integrates time on a daily basis to provide direct instruction to students in the classroom. This educator teaches or co-teaches the course content for the prescribed class at least three times a week/cycle.

Staff – Employees of a school building which include instructional and non-instructional individuals.

Co-Teaching – The practice of two individuals having equal input in classroom design and the instruction of students in a classroom.

Principal Perception – In this dissertation, principal perception is the principal's insight about his or her perception of himself/herself as an instructional leader.

Elements – Occurrences that could have a positive or negative influence on allowing principals to teach on a regular basis.

Intermediate Unit – Organizations developed to support school districts in their endeavor to improve the education of students.

Limitations of the Dissertation

This dissertation was limited to kindergarten through sixth grade elementary principals and assistant principals located in two Intermediate Units in Northeastern Pennsylvania. Since this dissertation focused on elementary principals and assistant principals, questions might be raised whether the findings of this dissertation are valid in

a middle school or high school setting. An additional limitation is that a convenience sample was used and not a random sample. As a result, this study might not be generalized to other schools. Such an analysis will be a recommendation for further study.

An additional limitation of this dissertation is the parameters that define a building level administrator. These parameters are that a teaching principal or assistant principal is a practicing building level administrator who integrates time on a weekly basis to provide instruction to students in the classroom. The building level administrator teaches or co-teaches the course content for the prescribed class at least three times a week/cycle.

This dissertation can only begin to answer the question whether there should be a national movement to bring back the teaching principal. Rather, the purpose of this dissertation was to provide useful information to those principals, assistant principals, and central office administrators who might think about teaching on a more regular basis provided support is given to relieve their busy, demanding, and highly accountable school day. These individuals no doubt have strong intuitive feelings about the personal benefits and disadvantages of teaching on a regular basis. Some have a limited personal experience to back up these perceptions. Ideally, this dissertation clarifies and more precisely identifies elements that can assist the transition of a principal from a predominately managerial administrator to an instructional leader in the roll of a teaching principal.

Summary

At the present time in educational administrative history there is a large increase in accountability demanding every student reach specific levels of proficiency in several academic subject areas. State assessments indicate that numerous children are not meeting these benchmarks. Individual schools struggle to help children reach these benchmarks. School districts are asked to implement different research based initiatives as part of the current educational reform to improve student achievement. Veteran teachers have seen these reform movements come and go. Teachers also feel they are being asked to make these changes by administrators who have been removed from the classroom and are out of touch with the day-to-day realities of teaching.

The idea of a principal teaching is not a new concept. Well over 100 years ago, as the educational system was being formed, some teachers were given the additional responsibility of performing management duties to help their school function. These master teachers performed this dual role until the 1930s. During this time period, the increased demands of the school system caused the role of the master teacher to develop into one where the principal's job no longer included teaching responsibilities and the primary focus became school management. Building level administrators became managers of the schools. This administrative style has continued to the present day.

The researcher of this dissertation believes that the option of a building level administrator teaching could have a positive impact on teachers' perceptions by giving a teacher the confidence to implement new educational programs. According to several studies one barrier to a building level administrator teaching is time. A building level

administrator's daily duties can be overwhelming without the responsibility of teaching a class.

This dissertation attempted to find possible solutions. It also attempted to identify elements that need to be in place to give a building level administrator the time to teach. This dissertation examined how building level administrators believe the teachers' perceptions were influenced by a teaching administrator. Chapter II provides the readers with the literature surrounding the topic of the teaching building level administrator. Chapter II begins with an examination of the history of the evolution of the school principal. The topic of instructional leaders is discussed. Three dissertations which examined specific aspects of the teaching principal are reviewed. The topic of co-teaching is also reviewed. Finally, several gaps in the literature which lead to the focus of this study are presented. Chapter III presents the methodology and procedures for the dissertation. It begins with an introduction and includes the setting of the dissertation, the participants of the dissertation, a quantitative data survey design, and a qualitative data interview design. The quantitative data survey design included sections on content validity, reliability, procedures, measures of central tendency, measures of validity, data analysis, and quantitative data summary. The qualitative data interview design included sections on the interview participants, the interview setting, and assessment of trustworthiness, qualitative data summary, triangulation of the data, and a chapter summary. Chapter IV presents the analysis of the data collected. Chapter V presents the summary of the findings in response to the research questions, the conclusions, and suggestions for further study.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter outlines the literature surrounding the teaching principal. Literature and research relevant to this study is presented. Because of the potential for the option of a principal to return to the classroom to teach, from which the first principals evolved, the first section of this chapter traced the history of the school principal from its beginning to the present. Both the literature and the research indicated that principals who are instructional leaders raise student achievement. It is inferred by the researcher of this study that a teaching principal is an instructional leader who leads by example. The second section of Chapter II focused on the research related to instruction leadership. The third section included research on teaching principals. Since research on teaching principals is very limited, past studies related to teaching principals are examined to give the reader background knowledge important to understanding the context of this dissertation. The fourth section reviewed the literature and research on co-teaching. Finally, the gaps in the research are reviewed.

The No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (Public Law 107-110), commonly known as NCLB, aimed to improve the performance of primary and secondary schools in the United States. NCLB continued to be a prominent focus by President Barak Obama's administration in his Race to the Top (RTTT) initiative under the *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009* (Public Law 111-5).

The demand for increased accountability by mandating the creation of learning standards and assessments resulted in legislation to reform schools. The NCLB

legislation has put unprecedented pressure on building level administrators in an effort to raise student achievement. Every school must now have a minimum percentage of their students attain an expected level of proficiency. All schools are expected to have every student reach a proficient level in the identified subjects by the year 2014. In order to improve student achievement principals, whose primary role was school manager, are being challenged to add the role of being an instructional leader to their leadership profiles.

The model of the principal as a manager became the dominant role since the early part of 20th century. Educational literature indicates that most public school principals are still primarily managers (Dembrowski, 2007; Samuels, 2008). There are some principals who are effective managers and lead schools where the majority of students have reached the established benchmark according to state assessments. These principals keep their schools focused on student achievement. The dilemma is that these identified principals generally keep a school performing adequately with little change when the student population is generally achieving a certain level of proficiency.

Today the status quo is not enough for a school just to be doing well. Schools now are required to look at specific subgroups (low income, black, hispanic, etc.) to determine whether their school has met the benchmark scores set by the state. The mandates of NCLB require that we look at every student to make sure they are going to reach a proficient level of achievement by the year 2014. To meet the NCLB mandates and the continuously increasing benchmark levels, there will need to be changes in curriculum. The grouping of students, remedial programs, and instructional practices used by teachers will each effect the manner in which schools are run and the way teachers teach. This

transition will force most principals to evolve from the traditional manager model to a model that would combine the role of a manager with the role of an instructional leader (Dembrowski, 2007). Effective schools research (McREL, 2005) agrees that the role of leadership is important in bringing about changes needed in order to improve student achievement.

It is understood that change will need to occur if the principal is to convert from a manager and become an instructional leader (Flatt, 1987; Kelley-Brockel 1998; Lare, 1995). Adding additional tasks to the principal's already overwhelming number of administrative duties can have negative repercussions. Since the creation of the position of the principal, tasks have been added as the position evolved. It seems that as tasks were being added, very few were ever removed.

Common sense dictates that some administrative/managerial tasks will have to be removed from the already overwhelming large list of administrative tasks if principals are to convert or assume the role of being an instructional leader. First, principals will need to examine their list of administrative duties and prioritize them. They will have to determine which management duties can be delegated to other school personnel. Delegating some of their management duties could free time to take on duties associated with instructional leadership. If the number of tasks is too large, they may need to request additional administrative help. Second, to take on the role of an instructional leader, principals will need to educate themselves with curricular changes that research has shown to increase student achievement. Third, principals will need to have a plan that will lead teachers to incorporate the changes into their teaching repertoire. Upon addressing these needs, it might be possible for the building level administrator to include

the role of instructional leader.

This researcher agrees with Lare (1995), and Kelley-Brockel (1998) that a possible solution to help transition managing principals to principals who are instructional leaders would be to have them take on the responsibility of teaching. Teaching on a daily basis would allow them to model instructional practices that have been shown to increase student learning and achievement. The act of teaching by a principal would also allow principals to demonstrate their ability to use the practices and strategies a principal would require his teachers to use to gain creditability. The act of the principal teaching should increase the confidence of teachers to make the necessary changes in their teaching practices. It may also increase the awareness of sensitive issues teachers encounter throughout the school day which could allow the principal to make insightful decisions about developing schedules, staff development plans, instructional decisions, etc.

The whole process of teaching itself can consume a lot of time. There is more to teaching than just presenting information to children in a classroom. The planning and frequent assessing that needs to occur on a regular basis if students are to benefit from the instruction are very important. Also, if there is an urgent need for the teaching building level administrator to leave the room to handle a particular situation, the interruption could interfere with the continuity of the lesson which could also negatively impact student learning. Teaching with another teacher (co-teaching) could be a possible solution.

This dissertation focuses on examining impediments that might prevent a principal from finding time within their busy schedule to teach. It also explores what supports may help a principal find time in their busy schedule to regularly teach a subject.

Finally, this dissertation investigated building level administrators' opinions whether teacher, student, and community members' perception of them will change if they teach or co-teach.

Historical Evolution of the Principalship

In the early history of American schooling, principals did not exist. Teachers simply performed duties which included administrative, clerical and janitorial tasks (Pierce, 1935). According to Campbell, Fleming, Newell, and Bennion (1987), the administration of schools was hardly differentiated from teaching. The evolution of the principal began toward the end of the 19th century. Outside forces seemed to have influenced these changes which occurred throughout the 20th century and continue to the present. The term "principal" actually appeared as early as 1838 in the Common School Report of Cincinnati (Pierce, 1935). Over the last 150 years an evolution of administrative roles continued to develop and evolve until it reached its current state. Considering the large span of time that has passed, it is not surprising that many authors who have written about the history of education have varying opinions on the forces that have influenced the development of the administrator's role.

One big influence in education history that created a need for the position of principal was the increase in the number of students entering public schools. With the increased number of students, administrative tasks increased proportionally. Pierce (1935) indicates that the increase in the number and size of schools forced the earliest superintendents to delegate the responsibility of local supervision to principals. Pierce pointed out that systematic courses of study were developed with the introduction of grading, i.e., organizing students into large groups of similarly aged students. This

naturally led to academic departments, which in turn produced the necessity of having a single lead person directing the school.

Since classes were now graded, there grew the need for principals to visit the classrooms and supervise the teachers. Principals started to be “freed” from teaching. The first stage in “freeing the principal” from classroom teaching was the position of head-assistant. Part of the day was spent in the classroom as a teacher and the remainder of time was spent on clerical duties associated with the school. Reports to school boards during the late 1800s suggest that time allocated to these specific tasks varied greatly from school to school and from system to system (Pierce, 1935). Teachers who were perceived by school trustees to possess the qualities of a leader were assigned to complete these chores.

According to Lare (1995) a large number of clerical duties were designed to “keep the school going.” According to different reports, no special training was required and it was not in the scope of the head-assistant’s job description to improve the quality of work from classroom teachers. As schools became larger with the rapid growth of urban areas during the latter half of the 19th century, the head-assistants became more concerned with the management of schools. In short, the role had become that of a directing manager, rather than a “presiding teacher” of the school.

During the turn of the century, Pierce (1935) detected a growing prestige in the principal’s office. They were given the right to graduate pupils on the basis of the principal’s standards, the right to exclusively supervise their teachers, and the right to assign and transfer teachers. In addition, there is evidence in the reports that principals for the first time were permitted to rate custodians, actively pursue parent cooperation,

requisition educational supplies, and “enforce safeguards to protect the health and morals of pupils” (Pierce, 1935, p. 211).

The position of principals continued to evolve throughout the 1920s. One major influence on the development of the principalship was the development of the Departments of Elementary and Secondary School Principals by the National Education Association in the 1920s. The introduction of these departments was a sign that the educational community recognized and legitimized the position of the principal. Tyack and Hansot (1982) also point out that during this time period university-based educators have also contributed to the sense that principals are professionals by establishing special courses of study intended to prepare educational leaders. Pressure came from the community for principals to be effective in their leadership role. According to Beck and Murphy (1993), a second influence was the principal being viewed as a public servant in an important and prestigious position. At this time, teachers saw the principal as someone who could carry their voice to the central office in an effort to collaborate on the manner in which schools should operate. In turn, the central office saw the principal as its link to individual schools (Blumburg & Greenfield, 1993). A third influence was the scientific management movement. According to Cubberley (1934), principals focused their time on teacher meetings, plant management, and efficient use of their time.

The scientific management movement continued to influence principals in the 1930s. Beck and Murphy (1993) indicated that schools are viewed as a business enterprise and principals were executives who managed them. They communicated that the principalship was becoming separate from, but related to, teaching and becoming more entrenched in scientific management. Campbell, et al. (1987) all agreed when they

noted that educators began to pay a lot of attention to accounting procedures, budget preparation, all forms of record keeping, public relations, the production of annual reports, and the adoption of other managerial trappings normally associated with the corporate world. Callahan (1962) suggested that during this time period school administrators deserted traditional educational values for “the attitudes, ethics and methods of corporate America.” Callahan (1962) also cited the example of a lecture given by Frank Spaulding at the annual superintendents meeting held in Philadelphia. Spaulding, who was the superintendent of the Newton, Massachusetts Schools, was then considered the leaders’ leader among school administrators. The purpose of his presentation was to propose a plan that would demonstrate the effectiveness of scientific management in the public schools. Tyack and Hansot (1982) pointed out that educational administration in the 1930s focused their research efforts on practical issues such as fiscal and business administration, personnel, building and equipment management, and “similarly applied fields such as construction costs, school bonds, the single salary schedule, and techniques of child accounting.”

During the 1940s, outside pressures continued to influence the role of the principal. A major influence on the principalship was the war effort. According to Beck and Murphy (1993) the expectation was that the principal should be a leader in the war effort. The principal was viewed as the leader on the home front. They were expected to demonstrate democratic leadership so that students and teachers could lead peaceful and productive lives. The principal’s supervisory role shifted from directing and management to facilitating and helping. Campbell, et al. (1987) subscribed to the belief that a school and democratic leadership should occur together and that evidence of either or both

would testify to the principal's effectiveness. Principals were also expected to be a curriculum developer, a group leader, and coordinator and a supervisor. Because the military had an image that was generally associated with democratic leadership rather than authoritarian leadership, it was believed that teachers, students, and parents should participate with principals in the decision making process (Giles, 1945; Parker, 1986). Beck and Murphy (1993), indicate as the decade of the 1940s came to an end, the emphasis on the values of equality and democracy was still very strong.

According to Campbell, et al. (1987), and Culbertson (1988), the decade of the 1950s was one of great change in the field of educational administration. These changes were brought about by outside forces. The most evident was the Supreme Court decision of *Brown v. Board of Education* in 1954, which required every public school system to enroll students from designated attendance areas without regard to race. This verdict planted the seed for the Civil Rights movement that resulted in a series of bills that became bolder with each modification from 1957 through 1965. A second influence was the creation of university-based administration training courses (Beck and Murphy, 1993). These courses increased links between professionals from different locations and disciplines, the centralization of society and the increasingly large role played by the United States on the international scene, the rapid advance of technology, the development of more complex and more crowded schools and school systems, and a continued interest in the human relations side of business and schooling.

Beck and Murphy (1993) confirmed principals of this decade were viewed as having two distinct roles. In the first role principals were expected to be skilled administrators who used empirical data to demonstrate the effectiveness of educational

practices. In the second role there was a focus on principals using their time in an effective and efficient manner by analyzing, prioritizing tasks, delegating responsibility, and work when possible. Principals continued to focus on minute details of school operation. These details included methods for handling daily attendance slips, change of classroom procedures, effective ways to introduce a new secretary to teachers and students, etc.

Beck and Murphy (1993) noted that the principal's job continued to expand and continued to become more complex. Time management was mentioned as a concern of principals. An example of the concerns over time management and effective delegation methods was contained in the 1954 yearbook of the Department of Elementary School Principals, *Time for the Job*. Beck and Murphy (1993) wrote that many principals had indicated grave concern about the "lack of time for the job" and suggested that the development of several competencies would enable the principal to tackle this problem.

The principal's role during the 1960s continued to be shaped by a number of historic events. As the *Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka* case had an influence in the 1950s, so did the Civil Rights Movement and the Coleman Report in the 1960s. According to Tomasetti (2007) and Beck and Murphy (1993) these events all led to a restructuring of schools that increased the complexity of what school leaders faced on a daily basis. It seems that it was during this time period that the expectations and the role of the principalship began to transition from that of the dominant role of a manager to one that included the role of an instructional leader.

The decade of the 1960s was one of social and political turbulence that characterized life in America. The Supreme Court decision of *Brown v. Board of*

Education in 1954 which started in the 1950s continued its influence in the 1960s.

Although this law required every public school system to enroll students from designated attendance areas without regard to race, many schools were still very slow in reacting to this legislation. As it was in the 1950s, in different parts of the country, many schools continued to overtly oppose it and in spite of the Civil Rights Law refused to allow blacks to attend traditionally white schools. The Civil Rights bills became stronger as this decade progressed (Tomasetti, 2007). With this legislative support, blacks fought for more control over leadership positions on local school boards and as district and building administrators. Additionally, the Federal Office of Education began to apply sanctions that included withholding federal dollars from school systems that resisted desegregation initiatives.

Although the desegregation movement was initiated to equalize educational opportunities for all children (Knezevich, 1975), the vision of this movement's originators was to create an educational system that would produce free citizens with a strong sense of community pride and loyalty (Fraser, 1997). This mindset prompted the United States Congress to order a study of the effects of segregation and to further uncover the causes of poor academic achievement of black students. In 1966, James Coleman began to study this issue and collect data for what became known as the Coleman Report. His conclusions were that family backgrounds, in relation to socio-economic status, were stronger predictors of academic success than any interventions provided by the formal educational process (Kowalski & Reitzug, 1993).

According to Tomasetti (2007), it was during this time period in public school history that principals began to be held accountable for student learning in their building.

Usually, standardized tests were used as objective measures for the effectiveness of the school's instructional practices. It was believed that the performance of the classroom teachers directly related to the leadership style of the principal (Beck & Murphy, 1993). Principals were expected to understand the differences between leading and managing. Leading, it was said, dictated the introduction of structural change to keep the organization in motion and in the process of achieving goals. Blumberg and Greenfield (1986) believed managing translated into keeping things as they are and running the current operations in a smooth manner

The principal's role continued to evolve during the 1970s. According to Beck and Murphy (1993), the tone of the educational administration literature became more humane. Education was continued to be perceived as a meaningful experience that made a difference in society. The influence of the Coleman report was still prevalent in the 1970s and its effect on education continued well into the 1980s (Fraser, 1997). Campbell, et al. (1987) agreed with this when they noted that external factors continued to have a heavy influence on administrative thought and practice. The 1970s saw a shift in the role of the principal. The principal became a facilitator of positive relationships among staff and students. Teachers were seen as partners, not adversaries (Beck & Murphy, 1993).

Beck and Murphy (1993) indicated that the principal was now expected to lead students, teachers, and also individuals within the larger community. Community involvement began to play a role in the school environment. The expectation was for the entire community to become involved with the educational process. Building community alliances was a strategic activity engaged in by a shrewd principal who recognized that

their continued professional success hinged on the support of persons outside schools (Beck & Murphy, 1993). Sergiovanni and Carver (1973) agreed that principals had to consider themselves integral members of communities and that civic leadership was obligatory for school officers.

Beck and Murphy (1993), and Lipham and Hoeh (1974) indicated that as changes continued in the 1970s another focus became relationships, principals were also expected to interact with teachers as professional colleagues rather than managers and subordinates. Teachers began to gain some authority in the educational community. The language used in the literature describes this relationship between the principal and teacher as “equal,” however, they also indicated that principals had the final word on decisions. They noted that principals were supposed to persuade teachers to exercise good judgment when making decisions.

As the 1970s came to an end, the term instructional leader started to be heard in the educational realm. Beck and Murphy (1993) cited the work of Roe and Drake (1974) stating that this expectation began to cause considerable conflict for principals. They noted that the managerial role, alone, demanded that principals keep records, make reports, develop budgets, handle scheduling, supervise the building, administer supplies, monitor all school programs, and manage student activities. At this time, these responsibilities did not include the expectations that each principal function as an instructional leader. Under these conditions, it is expected that the principal was primarily an administrator and manager. All parties agreed that instructional leadership conversations being mentioned during this era was mostly lip service paid to create a greater self-respect within the profession. Even though it was basically just talk at this

point in time, instructional leadership was beginning to be looked at as being part of the principal's role. If instructional leadership became an expectation, it would need to be combined with the principal's traditional management role.

The role of the principal continued to expand in the 1980s. The expectation that the principal now needed to be an instructional leader not just a manager of a school was solidified in the 1980s. According to Lashway (2002), in the 1980s, "instructional leadership" became the dominant model for school leaders after researchers noticed that effective schools usually had principals who kept a high focus on curriculum and instruction. Interestingly, the expanded role of the principal did not stop at just adding the expectation of a principal becoming an instructional leader. The literature indicated that a principal of this decade is also expected to be a visionary and a change agent. Lashway (2002), also noted that instructional leadership of the 1980s was principal-centered, often accompanied by images of heroic leaders single-handedly keeping the school on track.

To validate instructional leadership as a prevalent expectation, Beck and Murphy (1993) stated that principals should be instructional leaders by becoming directly involved with the teaching/learning process. During the 1980s, Phi Delta Kappan (1982) developed a list of "Traits of the Effective Principal." Heading the list was the statement that successful leaders "devote time to the tasks of coordinating and controlling instruction." Other traits listed in this publication included understanding teaching styles and learning styles and the relationship between the two, providing coherence to the school's instructional program, and acting as the school's instructional manager. Leithwood and Montgomery (1982) stated that good principals had a clear commitment

to the goal of promoting student cognitive growth. They believed that effective principals defined priorities focused on the central mission of the school and should intervene directly and constantly to ensure the priorities were achieved. For the first time it was mentioned that leading in the instructional arena allowed and even mandated that principals needed to become actively involved in classrooms (Murphy, Hallinger, Weil, & Mitman, 1983). Little and Bird (1987) agree by writing that principals who were instructional leaders should possess “a close to the classroom orientation.” They also stated that administrators directly involved with teachers in classrooms were those most able to create a structure of leadership and mechanisms for teachers to emerge as leaders.

Certain characteristics associated with instructional leadership begin to become synonymous with the role of the effective leader. Deal (1987) tied instructional leadership together with being an effective leader with the characteristic of being a good problem solver and resource provider. Achilles (1987) similarly suggested a good leader fostered open communication, decision making, and focused faculty meetings on solving problems. These principals moved toward higher levels of excellence as they sought and acquired information and materials to assist teachers.

Beck and Murphy (1993) communicated that in addition to functioning as an instructional leader, problem solver, and resource provider, principals of the 1980s were expected to cultivate and communicate a vision to teachers, students and the community. Bredeson (1985) offered that vision was the principal’s ability to holistically view the present, reinterpret the mission of the school to all its constituents, and to use imagination and perceptual skills to think beyond accepted notions of what was practical. It also helped with the application in present situations to speculative ideas and to, preferably,

possible futures. Barth (1988) stressed the importance of vision in education. He called on teachers and principals to consider, reflect, develop, and articulate their visions about how classrooms and school might become better. Deal (1987) implied that excellence without a vision is, in his view, impossible.

Once a vision is established, Beck and Murphy (1993) suggested that good leaders take active steps to move their school toward these visions. This required that principals should work to initiate and facilitate change in educational practices. Bennis (1989) stressed that vision provides the impetus for organizational change and that powerful leaders were those able to persuade others to share their ideals. Leaders who effect change were those who could harness the energies of followers and direct these energies toward the realization of ideals.

According to Beck and Murphy (1993), the world economy has had an influence on the position of the principal from the 1990s up to the present. At the base of these proposed reforms in the corporate and educational sectors is the belief that the United States is losing, and perhaps has already lost, its foremost position in the world economy. Several reports produced in the 1980s indicated that the United States was in fact losing its edge in its once unchallenged pre-eminence in commerce, industry, science, and technological innovation. The possibility that other nations might out stage the United States in inventiveness and productivity was very troubling to Americans (Educational Commission of the States, 1983). As a solution, the focus became the American school system and the leaders who guide them. This concern still continues today. According to Friedman (2005) many jobs traditionally performed in the United States are now being outsourced to China, Russia, and India.

The expectation for principals to be instructional leaders that was introduced in the 1980s expanded through the 1990s and continues to expand to the present. Currently, principals have become accountable for the academic achievement of all students. Lashway (2002) indicated a similar understanding when he wrote, in the first half of the 1990s, attention to instructional leadership seemed to waver, displaced by discussions of school-based management and facilitative leadership. Recently instruction has surged back to the top of the leadership agenda, driven by the relentless growth of standards-based accountability systems. Explicit standards of learning, coupled with heavy pressure to provide tangible evidence of success, have reaffirmed the importance of instructional leadership. More than ever before principals are being asked to become instructional leaders so they can help establish needed change.

Some of the actions that provided the catalyst for a portion of these changes were national reports created during the 1980s, 1990s, and early 2000. These reports indicated that our nation was losing its position as the world's leader in industry and economy. The National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983) reported that the once unchallenged pre-eminence of the United States in commerce, industry, science, and technology innovation has taken a terrible beating. Beck and Murphy (1993) pointed out that the Carnegie Forum on Educational and the Economy (1986) report revealed it did not take reformers long to draw a connection between a stagnant economy and a deteriorating educational system. The National Commission on Excellence in Education (1983) also reported that the United States needed to dedicate itself to reform the educational system if only to keep and improve upon the slim competitive edge we, the United States, still retain in world markets. Searching for solutions to these economic

problems that were identified in these reports reformers turned their attention to the very institutions they chastised, asking them to help jumpstart the faltering economy (Beck & Murphy, 1993).

To find possible solutions to the economic dilemma, in 1989 an Educational Summit was held at the University of Virginia campus at Charlottesville. President George W. Bush and governors from all around the country met to develop a set of goals that would articulate a national vision for public school improvement. This group of political leaders developed a set of national education objectives that became known as “Goals 2000.” The work of these political leaders delivered a clear message that the expectations for public schools were on the rise .

According to Tomasetti (2007), in an effort to ensure a strong economic future by increasing the academic accountability in our schools, President George W. Bush introduced the NCLB that became law on January 8, 2002. This law changed the role of the federal government in K-12 public education by providing specific measures of accountability and consequences directly related to all students’ academic progress (United States Department of Education, 2002). Specifically, NCLB emphasizes the following four areas for reform:

1. Stronger Accountability for Results - Beginning in the 2002-2003 school year school systems administered achievement tests in each of the three grade spans: 3-5, 6-8, and grades 10-12. Beginning in 2005-2006 tests had to be administered every year in grades three-eight. Results of these tests are displayed in national and state reports and disaggregated into subgroups (i.e., ethnicity, special education and limited English proficiency). School districts

are held accountable for the improvement of student achievement. There are both positive and negative consequences for exemplary and poor performance.

2. Record Flexibility for States and Communities - The NCLB Act gave local school systems greater say in the manner in which federal education dollars are used.
3. Concentrating Resources on Proven Education Methods - The NCLB Act targeted educational dollars for research-based programs that have proven to increase student learning.
4. More Choice for Parents - Parents of children enrolled in “failing schools” have the option of moving them to other public schools within their district or to an approved charter school of their choice. Additionally, parents are able to access federal money to support learning activities before or after school or in the summer months.

With NCLB as the catalyst for public school reform, school systems are being held accountable more now than ever before. A principal becoming an instructional leader is no longer considered an option. Instructional leadership is imperative if a school is to succeed in achieving the goals of 100% of all students becoming proficient on the mandated state assessment. School officials need to develop strategic plans for school improvement and principals are expected to lead the implementation of the necessary changes at the building level. This expectation is verified by effective schools research that has been collected over the past four decades (Robinson, 1985). It seems that being an instructional leader is no longer an option for principals as they move into the 21st Century.

Current definitions of instructional leadership are richer and more expansive than those of the 1980s. Originally, the role involved traditional tasks such as setting clear goals, allocating resources to instruction, managing the curriculum, monitoring lesson plans, and evaluating teachers. Today, instructional leadership includes much deeper involvement in the "core technology" of teaching and learning, carries more sophisticated views of professional development and emphasizes the use of data to make decisions (King, 2002). It seems the position of the principal is currently undergoing another shift. Attention has shifted from teaching to learning and some now prefer the term "learning leader" over "instructional leader" (Richard DuFour, 2002). Lashway (2002), emphasize that leaders must model learning. Jamentz (2002) notes that principals must be able to recognize whether lessons are aligned with standards, develop classroom assessments consistent with standards, and evaluate student work for evidence that standards have been achieved. Their knowledge needs to be deep enough to let them coach teachers using explanations, practical examples, and demonstration lessons. Just as important, leaders should be able to demonstrate the same learning traits that they expect in teachers: openness to new ideas; willingness to be driven by results; and, persistence in the face of difficulty.

The position of the principal has undergone a continuous change since the late 1800s when the role was conceived. Influences of our society seemed to cause the position to evolve. It started when housekeeping or basic managerial duties were added to the role of a teacher. The increase of students, duties and higher expectations eventually led to the principalship becoming a position freed from the combined classroom teacher/head master position. Early in the 20th century the

position adopted a scientific management method, which continued until the 1970s.

At this point in time the position of the principal, whose job was primarily a manager, underwent a transformation and began to include the need to lead changes in instruction. The need for a principal to be an instructional leader continues to the present. One thing is apparent, the position of principal will continue to evolve as we move through the 21st century.

Instructional Leadership

Instructional leadership is the action a principal takes, and delegates to others, to promote growth in student learning (Flath, 1980). The instructional leader makes quality instructional the top priority of the school and attempts to bring that vision to realization.

The role of “instructional leader” by school leaders is a concept that emerged in the early 1980s. The decade of the 1980s called for a change of emphasis from principals being managers or to principals being instructional or academic leaders (Lashway, 2002). This shift was attributed to research which found that effective schools usually had principals who stressed the importance of instruction (Brookover & Lezotte, 1982). Later in the first half of the 1990s, “attention to instructional leadership seemed to waver displaced by discussions of school-based management and facilitative leadership” (Lashway, 2002). Recently, instructional leadership has made a comeback with an increasing emphasis placed on academics and the need for schools to be accountable. An example is the focus on accountability brought about by the passing of NCLB. School leaders need to not only implement effective programs but also provide evidence of their success and justification for changes.

School leadership is very important to the success of any school improvement effort. Leadership is envisioning mission, developing strategy, inspiring people, and changing culture. Extensive studies of effective leadership from different perspectives in education, business, government, and non-profit organizations have been conducted by Tichy (1997), Sorcher and Brant (2002), and Goleman, Boyatziz, and McKee (2004). It is clear from the literature on school improvement that good leadership is essential if a school is to develop (MacGilchrist, Myers, & Reed, 1997). Further more, that improvement will only be effective if there is a concentration on teaching and learning and an awareness of what is going on in the classrooms. Neil, Carlisle, Knipe, and McEwen (2001), agree that the job of the principal of a school is one of the most critical in the education system. Goldring and Rallis (1993), Louis, Kruse, and Marks (1996) state there is no question that principals play a critical role in creating and maintaining environments that support school improvement. Elmore (1997) affirms the principal as the key actor in instructional improvement. Principals recognize that pupils' learning depends on good leadership in the schools in where that learning takes place.

According to Boleman and Deal (1991), school leaders may spend more of their time managing than leading. For managing principals, running an organization seems to be a matter of solving an endless set of "messes." Bush (1995) believes current principals have to fulfill a dual function; being the general manager of the school and also being responsible for leading teachers. Fullan (1991) concurs that successful principals need to be both managers and leaders simultaneously. The dilemma is how a principal moves beyond the administrative and management level to the educational leadership

level without neglecting the tasks which are necessary for the organization to continue to function (Neil, Carlisle, Knipe, & McEwen, 2001).

Day (2000) acknowledges that effective principals are continuously engaged in reflecting on the context of her/his daily actions and the implications they may have for the school day. The importance of reflection on teaching has been highlighted as an important vehicle for self-development. Barth (1990) developed a conceptual model for reflecting which includes: engaging in practice; reflecting on practice; articulating the practice; and, better understanding the practice and improving the practice. According to Barth (1990), this conceptual model was quite different from previous models, which simply presented checklists of competences. It is implied in this model that, in order to improve, one must be involved in practice, reflect on one's actions and be in position to articulate what is being done in order to understand it better.

Phillips (2010) believes principals who are instructional leaders make adult learning a priority; set high expectations for performance; create a culture of continuous learning for adults and get the community's support for school improvement. Blase and Blasé (2000), expressed instructional leadership in specific behaviors such as making suggestions, giving feedback, modeling effective instruction, soliciting opinions, supporting collaboration, providing professional development opportunities, and giving praise for effective teaching. Phillips (2010) suggests that inherent in the concept of an instructional leader is the notion that learning should be given top priority while everything else revolves around the enhancement of learning which undeniably is characteristic of any educational endeavor. Phillips (2010) also recommends that to have credibility as an instructional leader, the principal should also be a practicing teacher.

Phillips (2010), Elmore (1997), Fullan (1991), Whitaker (2003) are in agreement that principals need to know what is going on in the classroom. Many times, principals are not in touch with what is going on in the classroom and are unable to appreciate some of the problems teachers and students encounter. The tendency is for a principal to address instructional issues from a perspective when they were teachers. A teaching principal, who works closely with students, can develop teaching techniques and methods for understanding teacher perspectives and can use that knowledge as a base for making curricular decisions.

Lare (1995) and Kelly-Brockel (1998) both indicated that principals teaching as part of their work day is not a common practice. There are some countries for which this is a common practice. Weindling (1990) indicates that most principals in the United Kingdom spend an average of 20% of their time weekly on teaching.

The idea of principals being instructional leaders came about in the 1980s. Before this decade, most principals were mainly managers of their buildings. The phrase instructional leadership faded briefly in the 1990s but made a strong return in the latter part of the decade. At the present time, educational leadership still remains a strong expectation for principals who want to operate an effective school and lead educational reform. Instructional leaders make learning a priority for students and all adults in the school community. Instructional leaders can be described as being very reflective about the educational practices taking place in their schools. They often solicit opinions, give constructive feedback, model effective instruction, and provide staff development opportunities for teachers. To be an instructional leader, Phillips (2010) goes one step

farther by proposing that principals take part of their day and become a practicing teacher to help themselves gain an understanding of his/her teachers' points of view.

Studies on Teaching Principals

By the end of the 19th century, the “principal teacher” had become an administrative manager, and “principal” came to be recognized as an administrative title. The scientific management movement, which had an influence on educational progressives in the early 20th century, further defined the principal’s emerging role as an administrator (Callahan, 1962). Principals had become part of a hierarchical organization that was similar to those of a well-run business. Since that point in time educational literature indicates that principals separated themselves from the classroom. Only under certain circumstances in the public school system have they returned to the classroom to teach. According to Kelley-Brockel (1998), the exceptions where principals have had to teach generally have been in rural areas of the United States where the small size of the school and general economics had an influence on this situation. Another exception is that of private, non-parochial independent schools. These schools have followed a different path with respect to the role of principals than that followed in public schools. In many independent schools the principal is still viewed as the “master” teacher and it is an expectation that they teach several classes throughout the school year. Administrators are actively involved with students in the classroom. The managerial movement that has so heavily influenced public schools seems to never have made its way into most independent schools.

Over the last 20 years there has been a movement for principals to transition from a role of being solely a manager to a role that would now include an increased emphasis

on the supervisor of instruction. Some educators may still perceive principals primarily as a building manager. If this perception is to now include instructional leadership, principals' goals may need to become similar to the "teaching principals" who ran schools over 100 years ago. Yet with all the multiple demands placed on a principal in today's schools, most would confess that they simply do not have the time to teach. Currently there has been very little research related to the topic of "teaching principals." There are three studies that are relevant to this subject. Flatt (1987), Lare (1994), and Kelley-Brockel (1998) authored these studies.

A Qualitative Study

The earliest research completed on the topic of the teaching principal begins with Flatt (1987). This study provided a descriptive analysis of the task behavior of elementary school principals in the state of Tennessee who taught part of the school day. Five principals worked in schools that had student populations of 300 or less. They had to teach at least 15% of the time and no more than 65% of the time and they also had to supervise no fewer than five teachers. This study sought to collect data that would answer four questions:

1. How do elementary principals spend their time?
2. What is the content of their work?
3. What similarities and differences can be noted among these principals concerning their observed work behavior?
4. How does the work behavior of teaching principals compare to those similar studies of supervising principals?

Flatt's (1987) study established several findings about principals who taught as

part of their work day. One discovery was that the average amount of time each principal spent on each activity was three minutes. The three minutes did not provide sufficient time for the principals to create and execute long-term goals important to the role of instructional leader. A second discovery suggests that principals in this study experienced many disruptions in their day. This resulted in what Flatt called “polychronics,” which is defined as doing more than one thing at a time. Flatt also noted that principals experienced interruptions that began in the morning and led directly to a series of other events. Flatt referred to the chain of interruptions as “domino eruptions.” The work activities, polychronics and domino eruptions were typical examples of how these principals spent their time. Together, these disruptions did not allow these principals the time needed for reflection and planning and appraising the effectiveness of the day’s activities.

Flatt (1987) recognized that even though there were many disruptions throughout the principals’ workday, they enjoyed their jobs. She pointed out two advantages. The first was that the principals’ involvement with the students helped to limit discipline problems. The second advantage was that each principal believed their teaching experiences helped them to understand the problems often faced by teachers.

The disadvantages cited in Flatt’s (1987) research dealt with the principals not being able complete administrative tasks or teaching tasks without being interrupted. The conflict of the demands of being a teaching principal was very evident. The interruptions and the lack of time to complete all of their administrative and teaching responsibilities were evident. She noted that whether a principal teaches or not, the same disadvantages can be found with the job of the principal.

The findings of Flatt's (1987) study had several limitations which prevented generalization of the results. She noted that the findings could not be generalized because the sample for this study was small. The study only included five male principals from rural Tennessee who volunteered to participate in this study. The chance for bias was also increased because she was the only researcher who made the observations.

A Qualitative Study

Lare's (1995) qualitative study took a slightly different perspective on teaching principals from Flatt's study. The participants included building principals representing both genders and all organizational levels and a central office administrator. The participants in Lare's study differ from Flatt's as they were not teaching principals or administrators before the study.

The purpose of Lare's (1995) study was to determine the impact of a teaching building administrator upon faculty/administrator relationships, student/administrator relationships, and administrator job satisfaction. To guide this study, the following questions were used:

1. With respect to the faculty, will their perceptions of the administrator change?
In what way?
2. Will the perception of the students taught by the principal change? If so, in what way?
3. Will the perceptions of students not taught by the principal change? If so, in what way?
4. With respect to the administrator, will his/her perceptions of faculty, students,

fellow administrators, staff and parents change? In what way?

5. How will the administrator's sense of job satisfaction change as a result of his/her participation in the project?

Lare (1995) solicited the help of six public school administrators who volunteered to participate in this study. The administrators who volunteered to become part of this study included three elementary principals, one middle school assistant principal, and two high school principals. All six participants and the primary researcher, who was an assistant superintendent, were participant researchers. Before this study, all seven administrators did not teach during their workday. To participate in this study, each participant agreed to teach at least 40 minutes a day 4 times a week for 6 months. They also collected data from teachers and students through interviews, field notes, questionnaires, observations, journals, videotapes, etc. Seven distinct cases emerged from this study.

Lare (1995) noted that all seven administrators shared several points of view. They all desired to model what they believed to be good instructional techniques for the teachers in their school. It was important to them that they develop and maintain credibility as an instructional leader. This motivated them to participate in the study. All seven administrators shared a common teaching philosophy that all students should be actively engaged in the learning process. They also had a strong belief that they should be very visible throughout the student and teacher day, which aligns with the Monitoring By Walking Around (MBWA) philosophy. Their administrative styles also included the belief of collaboration and shared decision making, along with other best

practices related to school reform (Frase and Hetzel, 1990; Griffin, 1988; Schmoker & Wilson, 1993).

Lare (1995) discovered four things through this study. The first discovery came while examining the impact of the role of the teaching administrator on the relationship between the faculty and the administrator. He found many of the teachers suggested that being a teaching administrator goes against the role expectations for a principal in a public school setting today. Yet, the teacher interview statements indicated that the creditability achieved by teaching administrators had a positive impact on their perceptions of their principal as an instructional leader.

The second finding by Lare (1994) involved the students in the classroom where the administrator taught. At the beginning of the study the students seemed to have a role expectation that principals do not teach. By the end of the study the students had a change in their perception of the principal because they saw the administrator primarily as a teacher. It was noted that a strong bond grew between the students the administrators taught compared to the students that the administrators did not teach. The works of Grady (1990), McRobbie (1990), Lare (1994), and Marshall (1993) validate this type of behavior.

Lare's (1995) research led to a third discovery, which dealt with the administrators' satisfaction about their jobs. The administrators experienced conflicts between their administrative and teaching responsibilities. Six of the seven participants were able to resolve the conflicts. The seventh participant was not able to do so. It seemed that job satisfaction rested on the principal's ability to resolve the conflicts. The results of Lare's (1995) study indicated that the participants experienced satisfaction

through both teaching and their administrative duties. It was felt that this teaching enhanced their administrative jobs as principals. The works of Grady (1990), McRobbie (1990), and Marshall (1993) agree with the result of this finding.

Lare's (1995) research pointed out several other findings that could be considered important to the concept of having principals who teach even though they were not the primary focus of his study. Supported by Blasé and Blasé (2000) and Solow (1995), the first additional observation noted that teachers approved of administrators returning to the classroom because the action of a principal teaching inferred the principal placed an emphasis on the teaching/learning process. A second observation, which is supported by Bearse (1985) and Marshall (1993), showed teachers wanted administrators to be aware of the problems they face dealing with students today. They want to be appreciated by administrators, parents, and students. A third observation indicated that teachers are looking to ease the role of the teacher as a subordinate which is characteristic of an administrator/teacher relationship. An interesting belief created by Lare's (1995) study is that teachers believe that the multiple responsibilities of principals need to be reprioritized (Frase & Hetzel, 1990; Lare, 1995; Solow, 1995).

Lare's (1995) study had several limitations. As in Flatt's (1987) study, the small number of participants from a specific location and the use of using a solely qualitative design study prevented both from being generalized. A second limitation of this study included Lare being directly involved as a primary researcher and participant. His participation increased the possibility that the participants were responding in a manner promoted by him. Yet another limitation was the length of time the administrators performed the task of a teaching principal. The six months represented in this study did

not represent all of the challenges faced by a principal during an entire school year. Lare believed that all of the administrators in his study were perceived to be exceptional principals by their teachers and superiors. He questioned what would happen if the participants were viewed as average to poor administrators and/or teachers.

An interesting note from this study was that one participant was not able to resolve conflicts. Kelley-Brockel (1998) noted that at the time she was performing her study, none of the participants of Lare's (1995) study were still teaching in their capacity as administrators. She did not know why these administrators stopped teaching.

A Survey Research Methodology

Kelley-Brockel (1998) used a survey to identify the number of principals in the United States who served in the dual role of teacher and principal. She also identified factors that support or hinder teaching principals. She did the same for non-teaching principals who indicated an interest in teaching.

Kelley-Brockel (1998) described the sample population, data collection procedures and presented hypothesis' tests. The data was entered into the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) statistical software using a .05 level of probability to determine significance. The Delphi Technique (Weaver, 1971) was used to verify the survey instrument. The questions addressed in her study were:

1. What proportion of building administrators in public education are teaching principals?
2. What are the demographic characteristics of teaching principals?
3. What reasons are cited for teaching by teaching principals?
4. What are the perceived drawbacks and obstacles of being a teaching

principal?

5. What proportion of non-teaching principals would consider being a teaching principal?
6. What are the demographic characteristics of non-teaching principals?
7. What conditions would encourage non-teaching principals to return to the classroom to teach?

The population for Kelley- Brockel's (1998) study all held the official title of principal in public school education in the United States of America during the 1997-1998 school year. A survey titled "Principals in Public Education" was sent to a random sample that consisted of 1,800 elementary, middle/junior high, senior high, and combined k-8 and k-12 public school principals. They were selected in a mathematical pattern that was calculated by Market Data Retrieval with the use of the computer. Of the 1,800 participants selected (747 female principals and 1,053 male principals), 849 principals returned their surveys.

Kelley-Brockel's (1998) survey instrument included a total of 60 items. It identified three different groups of principals. The three groups included non-teaching principals, current non-teaching principals who at one time were teaching principals and teaching principals. Non-teaching principals were asked to complete 18 items on the survey. Teaching principals were asked to complete 39 items on the survey. Both the non-teaching principal and teaching principal surveys included the following demographic information:

1. Experience of principals (first year principals and those with two or more years of experience as a principal).

2. Gender (male or female).
3. Geographic locations (rural, suburban, urban and combined).
4. Responses by level (elementary, middle/junior high, high school, combined).
5. Responses by position (principal or assistant principal).
6. Responses by grade distribution (pre-kindergarten, kindergarten, kindergarten to three, etc.).
7. Responses by years as principal (1-3, 4-6, 7-9, 10-12, etc.)

The section of the survey instrument for non-teaching principals asked questions to determine under what conditions they would consider becoming a teaching principal. Other questions on the survey instrument asked if they would consider the possibility of becoming a teaching principal if it increased their credibility as an instructional leader and asked if they knew someone that was currently a teaching principal.

The 39 items that the teaching principals answered centered on obstacles that make the role of a teaching principal difficult to fulfill, the benefits derived from being a teaching principal and drawbacks associated with being a teaching principal. Other questions included years spent as a teaching principal, reason for being a teaching principal, number of periods taught, subject(s) taught and the length of each period. One question specifically asked if given the choice, would the individual continue to be a teaching principal?

The results of the survey, which Kelley-Brockel (1998) found difficult to generalize, indicated teaching principals represented 4.8% (41) of the population of public school principals who responded. A typical teaching principal represented in this survey was employed on the elementary level and located in western, rural areas of the

United States. Most principals were teaching principals for one-three years and principals for four-six years in predominately kindergarten to sixth grade schools. The majority of the teaching principals indicated they either chose the role or it was assigned as part of their contract. Most of the teaching principals indicated they would continue being a teaching principal during the next school year.

Kelley-Brockel (1998) encapsulates the benefits, drawbacks and obstacles of being a teaching principal derived from this survey. The benefits included teaching principals get to know students better and they were able to better understand the demands of the classroom. Benefits also included increasing credibility with students, staff, parents, schools boards, and superintendents. Increased job satisfaction and modeling good instructional techniques were also noted as benefits. The drawbacks included the majority of the principals attempted to do too much. Burnout was identified by almost half of the teaching principals. One drawback extended to the office staff. The survey showed that some office staff experienced feeling overwhelmed. Kelly-Brockel (1998) pointed out the number one obstacle was dealing with time constraints. Neither size of student population, expectations of the superintendent, board, or faculty nor financial incentives were identified as obstacles to serving as a teaching principal.

While examining the survey results of the non-teaching principals in public education in the United States, Kelley-Brockel (1998) noted that 95.2% (808) of the respondents were non-teaching principals. Of this group, 20.6% had been teaching principals. The principals, who once were teaching principals, identified a change in the administrator's contract to replace teaching with other administrative duties as the main reason they became non-teaching principals. Kelley-Brockel (1998) also mentioned that

of the 808 non-teaching principals, 60.1% would consider being a teaching principal if the conditions were right. Fifty-seven point two percent responded that increased creditability as an instructional leader would be their reason for becoming a teaching principal. The respondents of this survey identified several roadblocks that would prevent them from becoming teaching principals. The solution to these roadblocks included having fewer administrative duties, a need for increased personnel assistance in the office, increased support from their faculty and superintendent and a reduced student population.

Kelley-Brockel's (1998) research supports the idea that the experience and benefits a principal receives from teaching can help strengthen their leadership ability and effect how well they are perceived by their staff and school community in the role of an instructional leader. She concluded her study by making 8 recommendations to promote the role of teaching principal in public schools and 15 recommendations for further study. Kelley Brockel (1998) noted that educators, school boards, school communities, and institutions of higher learning needed to address the eight recommendations together, if the role of the teaching principal was to become a regular expectation. She points out the results of her study reinforce the benefits derived from being a teaching principal. She made 15 recommendations for further study; primarily focus on the obstacles and drawbacks that need to be studied in order to encourage non-teaching principals to return to or consider the role of being a teaching principal.

The Co-Teaching Model

According to Reeves (2004) teachers and educational leaders are extraordinarily busy, inundated with demands for more work and better results with fewer resources and

less time. He claims administrators know what to do; yet decades of research and reform have failed to connect leadership intentions to classroom reality. Professionals are more than a little weary at the prospect of implementing one more program, particularly when it is placed on top of other proven programs within the same time constraints. Reeves referred to the mountain of research that exists but acknowledges that without application in the classroom, our efforts are in vain. Many teachers and educational leaders communicate an attitude “Just tell us what to do” when we want them to say, “Let’s try it, test it, reflect on it, and refine it.”

Many teachers also believe administrators/principals are out of touch with classroom teaching. The researcher of this study believes that teaching building level administrators can affect teacher’s attitudes in a positive manner. Having a teaching building level administrator who can “walk the walk” and “talk the talk” could increase a teacher’s confidence in implementing new initiatives. The studies of Lare’s (1995) and Kelley-Brockel (1998) indicated teachers’ and building level administrators’ perceptions were influenced in a positive manner when the building level administrators taught on a daily basis in their school. Lare’s (1995) study also indicated communication was increased between faculty and administrators. Both groups confirmed this conclusion. In addition, both groups felt that the administrator/faculty discussions centered more on instructional issues as a result of the administrator's involvement in the classroom. From the administrator perspective, the project resulted in an increased empathy for teachers and their work. Finally both teachers and administrators felt the experience added credibility to the administrator. Teacher observations became more credible and meaningful. When the principal suggested instructional techniques, they were more

likely adopted by teachers. The administrator became a more credible “instructional leader.”

Previous studies included building level administrators who did all the planning and taught by themselves. This most likely added pressure to a principal’s already very demanding workday. Emergency situations, which require a principal’s attention, may have caused him/her to abort the day’s teaching. This could negatively affect the student learning for that scheduled time period if another alternative was not available. If this happens too much, being pulled from the classroom might not only have a negative impact on student achievement, it could also have a negative impact on the teachers’ perception of the principal’s ability to be an instructional leader.

This researcher’s belief is that a model of co-teaching may be a possible solution to many of the barriers that prevent a building level administrator from teaching. Co-teaching might help resolve several concerns related to a busy principal’s schedule while at the same time allowing a principal to deal with an occasional emergency situation. The act of co-teaching may also enhance teacher’s perception of the teaching building level administrator being an instructional leader. Co-teaching could allow the partnered teacher to directly observe on a daily basis the principal’s knowledge and ability to implement instructional best practices. With these thoughts in mind, it would be interesting to find out if the act of co-teaching could be a solution to many of the barriers that prevent a building level administrator from teaching.

The accumulated literature on co-teaching provides a brief overview of the history of co-teaching and identified important variables that would insure its success. The literature also acknowledges several challenges that if not addressed could lead to a failed

co-teaching experience. It should be noted that the research on co-teaching is limited and mostly anecdotal; however, available evidence most importantly suggested that teachers believed that co-teaching had an overall positive effect on student achievement.

According to Villa, Thousand, and Nevin (2004), the history and evolution of co-teaching in U.S. schools began in the 1960s when it was popularized as an example of progressive education. In the 1970s, co-teaching was advanced by legislated school reforms and teachers' increasing need to modify instruction for a more diverse student population. The effectiveness of school-based collaborative activities, with co-teaching began to be documented in the research and practice literature. Literature shows co-teaching resurfacing and becoming an acceptable practice in the early 1990s being used with special education students. In the 2000s, both IDEA and NCLB have brought the co-teaching practice into the forefront (Villa, Thousand, & Nevin, 2004).

Co-teaching, which includes two educators working together in one classroom, is becoming a popular option in many school districts around the country (Welsh, Brownell, & Sheridan (1999). The co-teaching approach is defined as “two or more professionals delivering instruction to a diverse or blended group of students in a single physical space” (Cook & Friend, 1995, p. 2). Cook and Friend (1996) contend that co-teaching increases student's instructional options, it improves programs, reduces stigmas for special needs students and provides for more professional collaboration. Recently, this teaching approach, which emphasizes shared responsibility, has been routinely utilized by a special education and a regular education teacher (Ripley, 1997).

Co-teaching occurs when two or more professionals who have equivalent licensure share a classroom. Friend (2005) indicates there are five factors involved with

the act of co-teaching. The first is that co-teaching could be two teachers, a teacher and a psychologist or a teacher and an ESL teacher working together. The second factor is co-teaching is purposeful instruction. It is two teachers actively engaged in the teaching process. The third element of co-teaching is that it is designed for a single heterogeneous group of students. Some students may have Individual Education Plans (IEP) and some students may have diverse needs but not identified as special education students. The goal is to engage all of the learners to make sure they succeed. The fourth feature of co-teaching is that it takes place in one setting, sharing a single common classroom. A fifth characteristic is that co-teaching involves joint accountability. Participation may vary in a co-taught class. Co-teaching participants may not be able to divide responsibilities equally. It is also not turn taking where one teacher teaches one day and the other teacher teaches the next. However, co-teaching may mean one teacher may be responsible for the content and the second teacher is responsible for the process or strategies.

The co-teaching approach can be very challenging and will probably fail if the two individuals working together are not well prepared. For co-teaching to work, Friend (2005) suggests using a five-part framework to make a co-teaching model successful. She suggests that for co-teaching to be successful, the framework should include a shared system of beliefs, prerequisite skills, collaboration, classroom practice, and administrative roles.

Friend (2005) points out that the first component for co-teaching is a shared system of beliefs. This shared system of beliefs relates to day-to-day classroom instruction and some of the matters that surround it. It starts with both teachers sharing

and then forming fundamental beliefs that will help them govern the class. One example of a basic belief is that given enough time and by using appropriate instructional practices, all students can learn. A second example of having a shared belief system includes fairness as it relates to instruction. How do teachers respond when certain students need accommodations or modifications in the instructional materials and does this practice have an impact on grading? Friend (2005) stresses that teachers need to know ahead of time how they want to handle these types of situations. She feels it is important to look at what is best for the students. A third example of having a shared system includes student discipline. What does each teacher believe in regards to appropriate student discipline? Considerations must be made for things like classroom noise level; the extent that students are allowed to move about the room, and what is a constructive classroom verses a disruptive classroom. Friend (2005) states, “if they do not share beliefs they are bound to encounter problems.”

The second component of a framework for co-teaching is prerequisite skills. Friend (2005) believes that co-teaching is about what each person brings to the partnership. There are three types of prerequisite skills. The first prerequisite skill is personal skill. It is important that each person involved in the co-teaching experience be willing to give up control and be willing to compromise when necessary. They need to be tolerant, able to share control and able to communicate well with each other. The second prerequisite skill has to do with general pedagogical skills. That is how teachers interact with their students. This includes respect for students, wait time after asking questions, modeling and understanding that the goal is not to win when there is an oppositional interaction. The goal is to resolve the situation so learning can proceed.

The third prerequisite skill is discipline/subject specific. These include knowledge related to the curriculum, techniques to best teach the curriculum, remediation, developmental learning, accommodations, modifications, and strategies. If each person brings these prerequisite skills to the co-teaching situation, it increases the chance that this experience will be successful.

The third component involves collaboration of co-teaching. Friend (2005) indicates it is the style that teachers use as they interact with each other. This is the key to the partnership. Collaboration begins outside the classroom. It occurs during the planning process when the partners set a mutual goal for their instruction. This is when they share the key decisions and divide the labor. Friend (2005) notes finding time to plan during the school year is difficult. The main planning usually occurs before the school year begins. During the summer months, participants can plan for the entire school year. They can also meet periodically throughout the school year when a mutual time can be arranged to make adjustments to the plan. They should share the accountability for the instruction and both co-teaching participants should be responsible for the outcome of the students. This should truly be a partnership. There is not one leader and one follower or one teacher and one helper. They both learn and take advantage of each other's strengths.

The fourth component of a framework for co-teaching is classroom practice. Friend (2005) communicates classroom practice as six specific approaches to teaching. They are identified as one teach/one observe, station teaching, parallel teaching, alternative teaching, teaming and one teach/one assist. She stresses that there is no one best way to co-teach. Each approach has an appropriate place in the co-taught class. The

use of each approach will depend on the instructional goals and teacher styles. The key to getting the desired results and you wish for the students is to combine these classroom practices with high quality instructional practices.

Friend (2005) pointed out the one teach/one observe style of co-teaching results in one teacher teaching or leading the whole group while the other teacher is going around observing and gathering data on the students. Villa, et al. (2004) refer to this as Supportive Teaching. The advantage of this style is that while one teacher is focusing on the lesson content, the other is making sure the students are on task, meeting their behavioral goals and have an understanding of the lesson being taught. This approach permits teachers to gather information that can help them make instructional decisions for future planning. If the partners are experienced and comfortable, they could also collect a little data about each other. An example of data that could be collected is whether they are calling on students consistently or making sure they are treating students fairly in responding to discipline issues.

According to Friend (2005) and Villa, et al. (2004), station teaching incorporates the use of three to four different stations/centers related to specific content/topics. Each teacher could work with a group of students while the other students work independently at another station. The time allotted to teaching needs to be divided so that each group gets equal time at each station. It is suggested that a timer be used to make sure each group sticks to a predetermined schedule. It is important for the partners to spend time up front teaching the procedures involved with working independently and rotating from station to station. The advantages of stations are that both teachers are actively engaged. In addition, this approach provides the opportunity to increase the instructional intensity.

If a student or small group of students needs extra help the students can be divided into groups so they receive the attention they need to learn the task, strategy, or content. An issue with this approach is that the pacing needs to be consistent. Therefore, students must stick to a time schedule so that every student gets equal time at each station. Another issue is that students need to be able to work independently. If students cannot work independently, then the number of stations will need to be limited. The third issue involves noise level. If students get too noisy then the teachers may have to work to keep the noise at a more reasonable level.

Friend (2005) and Villa, et al. (2004) identify parallel teaching as co-teachers giving instruction to different groups of students at the same time in the classroom. The teachers may teach the same or different content. A benefit is that it reduces the teacher-to-student ratio, allowing for increased individualization to meet student's needs. A second advantage involves behavior issues. If there are students in the room who have behavior problems they can be separated and that may help the room run more efficiently. A third advantage relates to the ability of each teacher to give a different perspective on the same topic. These teachers can also divide the reading load so that each group might read part of the lesson and then get back together to share what they have learned. The disadvantages of parallel teaching include both teachers needing to be familiar with the content and that they are comfortable teaching it. The teachers also have to be able to end their teaching at approximately the same time. The third disadvantage of parallel teaching may be the noise level. If both groups are actively engaged, the teachers may have to remind the students to speak softly.

Friend (2005) noted that alternate teaching enables co-teachers to design small group instruction for a specific purpose. Some advantages include teachers re-teaching concepts that students may have misunderstood. They can also pre-teach concepts that may be difficult for some students to comprehend and may not understand in a large group setting. A third advantage is performing an assessment on skills that they have just learned or administering a comprehension check. The risk of frequently using this approach depends on the students in the group. If this is constantly used as a remedial technique, then the approach may obtain a negative connotation with the students as it could be viewed as a separate instructional program. Friend (2005) suggests the solution to making alternate teaching successful is to vary the purpose of the group and make sure the students return to the larger group so they don't miss any of the key instruction.

Friend (2005) and Villa, et al. (2004) view the teaming approach as a sophisticated process that if used correctly has a beautiful flow to it, especially if they share the responsibility for planning, teaching and assessing the progress of students. Teachers can play off each other during the lesson. Teachers may also divide the lesson in a way that one teacher assumes the responsibility for the introduction of the activities and the other teacher closes the lesson and takes responsibility for facilitation of the student's individual practice. Team teaching decisions are mutually determined and based on variables such as each person's curriculum content mastery, preferences and training. The advantage of using the team teaching approach is that ideas can be shared to make lessons interesting. The approach to teaching can be varied when the material is complex or when two different approaches for the instruction could be shown. This approach allows teachers to represent a different point of view when this is required.

Cautions should include understanding that intensity can be lost during large group instruction if small group instruction is not used at least occasionally. The teaming approach may not be the best method to choose if teachers cannot get the flow to go back and forth during a lesson.

One teach/one assist involves one teacher leading the instruction while the other teacher is monitoring the students' progress and assisting students as they need help. This would allow the co-teachers to take advantage of their personal relationship with students or strength in a specific content area. If one teacher has a noticeable strength in a particular content area he/she can lead the lesson while the other interacts with the students who need help. The assisting teacher may also pull out a small group of students as needed. One of the advantages of this one teach/one assist approach is that it may allow valuable assistance to students who struggle to keep up with the lesson. Caution should be used so that it does not can relegate one of the co-teachers to the role of a classroom helper. Friend (2005) believes that the one teach/one assist approach should only be used on a limited basis. She stresses that the one teach/one assist approach should be employed when only absolutely necessary and it should not be the primary approach used while co-teaching.

Although most of the literature on co-teaching relates to its benefits, the literature also identified several challenges that if not addressed could lead to a failed co-teaching experience. Conderman, Johnson-Rodriguez, and Hartman (2009), point out that in spite of recent research indicating its effectiveness, co-teaching does not always realize its potential. Teaching administrators who decide to co-teach along side a teacher need to be aware of these challenges.

In her study, Hildenbrand (2009) explored how to best include a co-teaching placement experience in an inclusion elementary teacher preparation program. In order to better prepare inclusion pre-service teachers for co-teaching, she articulated seven preliminary challenges that were identified by the eight participants in her study. The seven preliminary challenges included adequate planning time, confidence in all content areas, natural flow of the lesson, agreement on discipline plan/style, distinctly different teaching styles, open communication, and relationship issues. In final the reflections of this study, the challenges related to co-teaching were narrowed down to three major concerns. These included open and honest communication, different planning and organizational styles and the willingness to co-teach.

An action research study by Stivers (2008), Hackman and Berry (2000) agree with Hildenbrand (2009) that a roadblock to successful co-teaching may be finding enough time for collaborative planning. Walter-Thomas (1997) stated that finding scheduled time for co-teachers to plan together during school hours is a serious problem for many schools. Suggested solutions to the planning dilemma related to co-teaching include Murawski (2008) suggesting that prospective co-teachers meet before the end of the school year and during the summer to proactively plan instruction for the next school year. Stivers (2008) offers the recommendation that educators involved in co-teaching schedule a block of uninterrupted time, two to three hours each month to build new units of standards-based, differentiated lessons. Kohler-Evans (2006) believes a minimum of 45 minutes a week is a must. She states that if the co-teaching team fails to plan together, co-teaching should not take place.

Like Hindenbrandt (2009), Gately and Gately (2001) mention that content knowledge is an important component of co-teaching. Mastropieri, Scruggs, Graetz, Norland, Gardizi, and McDuffie (2005) all agree the interaction between course content and teacher knowledge did prove to have a substantial influence on co-teaching. Co-teachers who clearly understood the content were able to share teaching responsibilities more equitably

Conderman, et al. (2009), and Stivers (2008) agree that educators who wish to pursue co-teaching should have a working knowledge of different teaching strategies associated with this style of teaching. Friend and Cook (2007), note that a lack of knowledge of different effective co-teaching models may also hinder successful implementation. Educators planning to co-teach should be encouraged to attend specially designed education teacher preparation programs, co-teaching workshops or seminars before they start this endeavor.

The co-teaching literature emphasized that it is important for each teacher to be an equal partner. Keefe, Moore, and Duff (2004) found that a major barrier to successful co-teaching resulted from a lack of parity. In most failed co-teaching experiences the teachers involved could not agree on goals, had a different attitude about work and could not agree on who would be the lead teacher/instructor. Kohler-Evans (2006) believes that each of the co-teachers should treat one another as equal partners. Examples of co-teachers being equal partners include parents having access to each teacher, both co-teacher's names included on the report card and co-teachers sharing responsibility for all the students in the classroom. Villa, et al. (2004) noted that co-teaching requires that teachers agree on a goal(s), share a common belief(s) system, demonstrate parity, share

leadership roles while completing tasks and practice a cooperative process.

Scruggs, Mastropieri, and McDuffie (2007) identified personal compatibility as the most critical variable for co-teaching success and attribute weak teacher collaboration skills as the reason for co-teaching failure. To begin to establish a solid co-teaching partnership, Conderman and Bresnahan (2007) believe co-teachers need to respect each person's responsibilities and areas of expertise. Conderman, et al. (2009), go one step farther in proposing that each member put their thoughts in writing to help articulate individual views which, in turn, will provide each participant with a product that could be frequently revisited and revised.

In closing the literature about co-teaching, there are several co-teaching models exist that have demonstrated success in the classroom through effective instruction. However, concerns have been identified that could have a negative outcome. These concerns include, but are not limited to, collaborative planning time, strong content knowledge, a working knowledge of different teaching strategies associated with co-teaching, lack of parity, and personal compatibility. Walther-Thomas (1997) concurs with Hildenbrand (2009), educators who participate in a sustained co-teaching experience over several school years will narrow down many of the challenges encountered in the onset of the practice. Administrators that are successful in navigating around such obstacles should be able to use co-teaching as an effective component of instructional leadership.

Gaps in the Literature

There is limited literature and/or research studies on the topic of "Teaching Principals." Because the literature and research is limited, there appears to be many

identifiable gaps in the literature. Three studies involving “Teaching Principals” were written over the past two decades by Flatt (1987), Lare (1995), and Kelley-Brockel (1998). All three of the research studies focused on a different aspect of the teaching principal and each were narrow in scope. The research by Flatt (1987) focused on observing the task behavior of five elementary teaching principals in schools located in the state of Tennessee. The Pennsylvania qualitative research by Lare (1995) focused on seven administrators in public education who chose to become teaching principals for a six month period. This was done to determine if the act of a principal teaching would have a direct impact on the perception of faculty, students and themselves. The purpose of Kelley-Brockel’s (1998) study was to identify the number of principals in the United States who served in the dual role of principal and teacher. Each study was limited to a small number of participants. The schools in which the principals taught varied in size, geographic location and social economic status. The timeline of these studies were short in their duration and the time of year each study was performed varied. Therefore, there is a need for more research to be performed in order to expand the breadth of information about “Teaching Principals.” Specifically there is a need to identify potential impediments that would prevent a principal from teaching and also examine elements that may help a principal find time to teach a subject on a regular basis.

Summary

This chapter presented literature and research relevant to this study. Because of the potential for the option of a principal to return to the classroom to teach, from which the first principals evolved, the first section of this chapter traced the history of the school principal from its beginning to the present. The literature and the research used in this

study indicated that principals who are instructional leaders raise student achievement. The second section focused on the research related to instruction leadership. The third section included research on teaching principals. The fourth section reviewed the literature and research on co-teaching. Finally, the fifth section the gaps in the research were examined.

Chapter III presents the methodology and procedures for the dissertation. It begins with an introduction and includes the setting of the dissertation, the participants of the dissertation, a quantitative data survey design, and a qualitative data interview design. The quantitative data survey design includes sections on content validity, reliability, procedures, measures of central tendency, measures of validity, data analysis, and quantitative data summary. The qualitative data interview design includes sections on the interview participants, the interview setting, and assessment of trustworthiness, qualitative data summary, triangulation of the data, and a chapter summary. Chapter IV presents the analysis of the data collected. Chapter V presents the summary of the findings in response to the research questions, the conclusions and suggestions for further study.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The principal served in the role of a teacher and manager of a school when the position of the principal was first created at the latter part of the 19th century. The expectation for the building leader to teach lessened and eventually faded away as the role of the building level administrator evolved through the 20th century. The responsibilities of the principal became primarily that of a manager, which has continued to the present time. With the re-establishment of the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act* and the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (Public Law 107-110) through President Barak Obama's Race to the Top (RTTT) initiative under the *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009* (Public Law 111-5), many researched-based reform initiatives aiming to improve the academic performance of students attending primary and secondary schools are currently being put into place. The success of the implementation of these initiatives is believed to be dependent on the instructional leadership ability of the principals. The researcher of this dissertation suspects that having a building level administrator who teaches on a regular basis could influence how initiatives are implemented in a positive manner.

However, with a building level administrator's schedule full to capacity with day-to-day management duties, how can they find the time to teach? The focus of this dissertation was to discover perceived impediments that prevent a building level administrator from teaching. This dissertation also examined the supports that practicing principals believe need to be in place for administrators to consider teaching on a

reoccurring basis. This dissertation also examined what building level administrators believe the effect a teaching building level administrator will have on teachers' perceptions and attitudes of the building level administrator as an instructional leader.

This chapter describes the procedures used in the dissertation including the setting of the study, participants of the study, survey and interview design, content validity and reliability of the data analysis, data collection procedures, data analysis, a description of the case study that was performed by the researcher, and a summary section.

Setting of the Study

The first part of the study (the surveys) involved all k-12 public school districts located within Intermediate Units located in Eastern Pennsylvania. The second part of the study (the interviews) included teaching building level administrators located in Pennsylvania, and one building level administrator from the state of Oregon. The third part of the study (the case study and interviews) took place at Elementary School B located in School District "A" located in Northeastern Pennsylvania.

Participants of the Survey

The survey was distributed to all k-6 elementary building level administrators who are currently employed within the two identified Intermediate Units during the months of September, October, and November. Guidelines established by Gay and Airasian (2000) suggest that all administrators participate in the study. "For smaller populations, say N = 100 or fewer, there is little point in sampling; survey the entire population" (Gay & Airasian, 2000, p. 134).

Quantitative Data Survey Design

The survey (Appendix B) for the study was designed to collect data about perceptions related to being a teaching principal. Survey participants were asked to respond to questions through the use of a five-point Likert scale. The Likert scale survey options for measuring each study participants' perception were: strongly agree; agree; undecided; disagree; strongly disagree. Survey questions were focused on gathering data about impediments that prevent a principal from teaching, the supports that need to be in place for a building level administrator to consider teaching on a reoccurring basis, and whether principals believe the act of the building level administrator teaching or co-teaching would have a positive effective on the school community's perceptions of the principal as an instructional leader.

Content Validity

Content validity refers to the degree to which a test actually measures the content for which it is designed. Content validity is based upon careful examination of course textbooks, syllabi, objectives, and the judgments of subject matter specialists. A panel of experts in the field of the study often assesses the criterion of content validity. However, there is no numerical way to express the judgment of adequacy (Best & Kahn, 1989). Content validity is measured from two perspectives – item validity and sampling validity. “Item validity is concerned with whether the test items are relevant to measurement of the intended content area. Sampling validity is concerned with how well the test samples the total content area being tested” (Gay & Airasian, 2000, p. 163). Content validity is determined by expert judgment. Usually experts in the area covered by the test are asked to assess its content validity. There is no formula by which it can be computed and there

is no way to express it quantitatively. These experts carefully review the process used to develop the test, as well as, the test itself. A comparison is made between what ought to be included in the test, given its intended purpose, and what is actually included.

The survey was tested for content validity through a series of validation procedures. Five superintendents were asked to review each question for relevancy in respect to the specific standard. In order to serve on the superintendent review committee, the individual was required to have served in the capacity of superintendent for a minimum of five years and possess an earned doctorate degree.

Each question was classified as valid or in-valid. In order for a question to advance to the next phase of the validation test, three of the five superintendents were required to indicate if the question was acceptable. If a question had been found to be in-valid by two or more of the superintendents, the question would have been removed and/or rewritten. No survey questions had to be rewritten.

The questions were then shared with five experienced principals and/or assistant principals and subjected to the same review procedure. Each individual was required to have served in the principal and/or assistant principal position for a minimum of five years. If any of the questions had been determined to be unacceptable by two or more of the administrators, it would have been removed and/or rewritten. Rewritten questions would have required to be validated by the superintendents prior to advancing back to the principal/assistant principal review phase. No questions had to be rewritten.

Reliability

A test is considered to be reliable to the extent in which it consistently measures the content of the survey. Higher coefficients of reliability exist when errors of

measurement have been reduced to a minimum. “Reliable tests are stable in whatever they measure and yield comparable scores upon repeated administration” (Best & Kahn, 1989, p. 169). Reliability is expressed numerically and is obtained by using a correlation. The reliability is usually expressed as a coefficient. A high reliability coefficient represents a high reliability. A reliability coefficient of 1.00 would indicate a perfect reliability score.

Internal consistency is a commonly used form of reliability. The survey for this study was examined for internal consistency and reliability using a Split Half Test (Gay & Airasian, 2000). Internal consistency testing requires only one test administration therefore eliminating sources of measurement errors such as different testing conditions. Ten administrators were asked to participate in the reliability exercise. Five administrators held central administrative positions and five of the administrators held building level administrative positions.

The survey questions were divided into two sub-tests. The odd numbered questions generated one test and the even numbered questions became the second test. The participating administrators completed the entire survey and then were asked while in the same setting to answer the questions from one of the sub-tests. A correlation of the two sets of scores was calculated.

Procedures

A letter asking for approval to conduct the study document (Appendix C) and a Superintendent/District Informed Consent Form (Appendix D) was mailed to each superintendent in Intermediate Units #20 and #21. The informed consent document fulfilled the requirements of the East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania

Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects. The informed consent document introduced the principle investigator of the research study and provided a brief description of the study. The risks and benefits of the study were outlined. The compensation features and confidentiality procedures were reviewed. The superintendents were directed to individuals associated with the study in the event additional information was needed. They were reminded that the study was voluntary and individuals had the right to withdraw at any time without penalty. A self-addressed, stamped envelope was provided for the return of the approval to conduct the study document. Superintendents who did not respond were contacted by telephone and sent a second request. If there was still no response after the second attempt, the researcher of this study tried to set up an appointment with the superintendent to discuss the study and deliver the request.

Upon receiving permission from consenting superintendents, the individual in charge of human resources for each participating school district was contacted by telephone to obtain the names, specific positions, and mailing addresses of individuals currently holding the position of principal or assistant principal.

Identified k-6 building level administrators were mailed a survey packet. The packet sent to each individual's office included:

- A description of the study (Appendix E);
- A letter requesting the recipient to participate in the study with an attached self addressed, stamped envelope with a request to encourage the recipient to participate in the study (Appendix F);
- A survey including a self-addressed, stamped envelope to return the survey

independently from other documents (Appendix B); and,

- A letter requesting to receive the results of the study with a self-addressed, stamped envelope (Appendix G).

The building level administrator's participation was done in an anonymous manner. No names were required on the survey. A returned completed survey received from a building level administrator indicated their consent to participate in this study.

Quantitative Data Analysis

Measures of Central Tendency

There are three measures of central tendency: mode; median; and, mean. The mode is the most common score. The median is the value that lies in the middle when the data is arranged in order. The mean is the average of the data and the most commonly used measure of central tendency. The measures of central tendency will be calculated for each survey question.

Measures of Variability

The measures of variability describe the degree to which individual data is clustered about or deviate from the mean. There are three commonly used measures of variability: range; variance; and, standard deviation. The range is the distance from the lowest to highest score of the data. The variance is a value that describes how all the scores in a distribution are dispersed or spread about the mean. The standard deviation is the square root of the variance and is the most frequently used measure of variability. All three measures of variability will be calculated for each survey question.

Data Analysis

Quantitative data from the surveys were analyzed through the use of excel software. The survey identified demographic data. Demographic data from the survey included ranges of age (25 to 34.9, 35 to 44.9, 45 to 54.9 or 55, and above), a range of the total number of years in education (less than 11, 11 to 20, 21 to 30, 31 to 40, or above 40), a range of the size of the student population of the district (less than 2,500, 2,500 to 4,999, 5,000 to 7,499, or 7,500 and above), a range of the building student enrollment (less than 500, 500 to 999, 1,000 to 1,499, or 1,500 and above), the capacity that they serve the school (principal or assistant principal) and a range of the number of years as a principal and/or assistant principal (less than 6, 6 to 10, 11 to 15, 16 to 20, above 20). The components of the demographic data were carefully reviewed and selected to reduce the probability of identifying a participant of the study through an analysis of the data. The second section of the survey identified impediments that would prevent a building level administrator from teaching. The third section of the survey highlighted identified impediments that would prevent a building level administrator from co-teaching. A fourth section gathered data about the supports that need to be in place for them to consider teaching one class per day. The last two sections collected data about possible benefits of being a teaching principal and the possible benefits of being a co-teaching principal.

Quantitative Data Summary

The information included in Chapter IV was obtained from the quantitative component of the study. Chapter IV includes a summary of the participants' demographical information and complete documentation of the quantitative data. The

measures of central tendency and variability were calculated and reported. A comparative analysis within the elements and overall review of each standard is provided. The summary section includes a reflective summary of the quantitative data.

Qualitative Data

Interview Design

The purpose of qualitative research is not to confirm whether people's perceptions are accurate or true reflections of a situation, but rather to ensure that the research findings accurately reflect people's perceptions; whatever they may be (Key, 1997).

Each interview began with the researcher collecting demographic data from each interviewee. The demographic data collected included ranges of age (25 to 34.9, 35 to 44.9, 45 to 54.9, or 55 and above), a range of the total number of years in education (less than 11, 11 to 20, 21 to 30, 31 to 40, or above 40), a range of the size of the student population of the district (less than 2,500, 2,500 to 4,999, 5,000 to 7,499, or 7,500 and above), a range of the building student enrollment (less than 500, 500 to 999, 1,000 to 1,499, or 1,500 and above), the capacity that they serve the school (principal or assistant principal), and a range of the number of years as a principal and/or assistant principal (less than 6, 6 to 10, 11 to 15, 16 to 20, above 20). The components of the demographic data were carefully reviewed and selected to reduce the probability of identifying a participant of the study through an analysis of the data.

The teaching building level administrators were then asked a set of questions related to their particular situation. The interview questions for the study were designed to discover perceived impediments that prevent a building level administrator from teaching, discover the elements that they believe need to be in place for a principal to

consider teaching on a reoccurring basis, and to examine the building level administrators' perceptions whether teachers and their own perception of themselves as an instructional leader changed because they taught. One of the supports that is specifically examined is co-teaching.

When conducting qualitative research it is important for the researcher to gain a total and complete picture. Thus, the interview process examined specific elements that the teaching building level administrator might consider viable solutions in aiding other principals in becoming teaching principals. The interview concluded with the participant being allowed the opportunity to make any comments about the role of a teaching principal.

Interview questions (Appendix H) were designed and reviewed with the dissertation chairs and co-chairs associated with this study. While conducting the qualitative research, the investigator sought to gain a total and complete picture of understanding, reality, and perceptions of the building level administrator.

Productive interview strategies included the researcher controlling his or her reaction to question responses. The researcher avoided asking yes or no questions and recorded the interviewee's responses which provided a majority of the research input.

Interview Participants

The researcher called and sent e-mails to every school district located in the state of Pennsylvania searching for building level administrators who currently taught or had recently taught as part of their work day. Seven teaching building level administrators were found in the state of Pennsylvania. One teaching principal from the state of Oregon responded to an e-mail that was intended for a school district in Pennsylvania. All eight

building level administrators were invited to participate in the interview process. A letter requesting approval to conduct the interviews for the study (Appendix I) was mailed to each superintendent of the district where the teaching building level administrator was located. Each superintendent was sent a description of the study and a superintendent/district consent form for approval to interview building level administrators who teach along with a self-addressed, stamped envelope. Upon receiving permission from the superintendent, teaching building level administrators were sent:

- A description of the study (Appendix E);
- A letter requesting the interview recipient participate in the study (Appendix J);
- An informed consent form for interview participants as prescribed by the Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects Guidelines (Appendix K);
- A copy of the interview questions (Appendix H); and,
- A request to receive the results of the study with a self-addressed, stamped envelope (Appendix G).

Individuals indicated their willingness to participate in an interview by returning the completed required documents. Eight building level administrators who currently teach or recently taught as part of their work week volunteered to participate in the study by being interviewed.

Interview Setting

Interview participants had the option of having the interview conducted in a multitude of settings. Interview options included the researcher coming to the participant's office, the interview taking place at the researcher's office, the interview

taking place at a location independent of either office, or the interview being conducted over the phone or by computer through a skype program. Interview participants selected the option that provided them with the most comfortable interview environment that the situation would allow. Five interviews were conducted over the phone. Two interviews were completed in person, and one interview was conducted with the use of the skype computer program.

Prior to each interview the informed consent document for interview participants as prescribed by the Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects guidelines was reviewed. In addition, the interviewee was instructed that at anytime, for any reason, the interview could be stopped and/or be continued at a later date. Each interviewee was made aware of the fact that it is the goal of the interviewer not to encourage any specific type of response. If a question was unclear clarification was provided. A copy of the interview questions was given to the interviewee before the interview began. At the midpoint of the interview process, each participant was reminded of the interview guidelines. All interviews were recorded with the prior consent of the participants. The recordings were transcribed for analysis. Interviews took place during the months of October, November, and December of 2010.

Assessment of Trustworthiness

Quantitative data analysis consists of internal and external validity, reliability, and objectivity. Guba (1981) translates the quantitative terms to qualitative terms as credibility, transferability, dependability, and objectivity respectively. Credibility depends less on sample size than on richness of the information gathered and on the analytical abilities of the researcher. Thus, interview questions are carefully designed

with extensive analysis of the interview responses. Transferability refers to the ability to generalize findings across different settings. However, the transferability of a working hypothesis in a study to other situations depends on the degree of similarity between the original situation and the situation to which it is transferred. The setting for this study was limited to k-6 building level administrators within Intermediate Units #20 and #21. The transferability would relate to disseminating the results of this study across the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and further.

Dependability refers to the similarity of measurements within a given period of time. The interview material was reviewed from an elementary perspective to identify similarities in responses. Confirmability relies on interpretations and is considered to be subjective. Increased subjectivity leads to results that are both unreliable and invalid. A researcher who is neutral strives to be non-judgmental and reports what is found in a balanced manner. Throughout the interviews and analysis of responses, the researcher continually strived to remain neutral. Finally, each area of trustworthiness can be further validated through the triangulation of data. Thus the final component of the analysis process was a comparison of quantitative and qualitative information.

Qualitative Data Summary

Information included in Chapter IV obtained from the qualitative component of the study and the interviews includes a summary of the eight participants' perspectives. This summary outlines the demographic information; it also provides an analysis and summary of the responses for each question asked during the interview.

Triangulation of the Data

The review of each research question of this study is provided through a comparison of the quantitative and qualitative information obtained through the surveys and interviews respectively.

Case Study

Once the researcher of this study tabulated and reviewed the data gained from both the survey and the interviews of teaching building level administrators, he performed a case study to gain additional data on the subject of teaching building level administrators. The teaching experience lasted eight weeks. During the eight week period, the researcher was scheduled to teach five days per week. Each of the teaching experiences lasted one hour in length each day. The researcher recorded his daily experiences on an administrator daily reflection sheet (Appendix L). The log included the obstacles he was able to overcome and the obstacles he was not able to overcome. The daily reflection sheet also documented the co-teaching classroom experience and included other significant reflections about the preparation of classroom work, planning, creating activities, correcting assessments, comments made by teachers, etc. A product of the case study was a four/eight week reflection sheet (Appendix L) which documented the obstacles he was able to overcome, the obstacles he was not able to overcome, the co-teaching classroom experience, and included other significant reflections about the preparation of classroom work, planning, creating activities, correcting assessments, comments made by teachers, etc in chronological order. After the eight week period the researcher compared his co-teaching with the results of the survey and interviews.

Co-Teaching Participant

The co-teaching experience took place at Elementary School “B.” The Superintendent of the School District “A” was sent a letter (Appendix M) asking for permission to co-teach with a teacher in his building. Upon the superintendent giving his consent by signing a Co-Teaching Consent Form (Appendix N), the researcher co-taught with a third grade teacher. The third grade teacher is a veteran teacher who has 26 years of classroom experience. The teacher was invited to participate in the co-teaching experience by means of a letter (Appendix O). The teacher indicated her willingness to participate in the co-teaching experience by returning the completed Informed Consent – Co-Teaching Participant form (Appendix P). There was a potential risk for the teacher with whom he would co-teach. A safeguard for the teacher with whom the researcher co-taught was that she was evaluated by another administrator during the year of the study.

Interview of Elementary School “B”

Community Members

The assistant superintendent of human resource and support services and the superintendent of the School District “A” were given a list of teachers, parents, and community members to be interviewed. Both the assistant superintendent and superintendent randomly selected individuals from the list to interview. The individuals were asked to participate in an interview via telephone. The individuals were informed how their information would become part of an overall summary for a dissertation about *Examining the Work Elements and Impact of a Teaching Building Level Administrator*. They were informed that their names would not be used or identified anywhere in the summary or dissertation. These individuals had the choice of participating or not

participating. The individuals also had the choice of being interviewed in person at a place of their choice or they could be interviewed via telephone. Each individual being interviewed was asked the perception questions (Appendix Q) related to the survey and interview questions. The assistant superintendent of human resources wrote a summary from the results of the individuals who were interviewed. Common points and perceptions were the focus. This maintained the confidentiality of those being interviewed.

Summary

The quantitative and qualitative methodologies as defined and outlined in this chapter enabled the researcher to gather significant data to be reviewed and analyzed. To add to the richness of the study, the two sources of data were triangulated to obtain a deeper understanding and appreciation of the findings. Performing an eight week case study allowed the researcher to actually experience some of the impediments as well as the elements that were identified to allow a building level administrator the time to teach on a regular basis. Chapter IV will provide the results of the methodologies performed in the study.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Introduction

The purpose of this dissertation was to examine impediments that could prevent a building level administrator from teaching. Specifically, the study explored potential impediments that would prevent a building level administrator from teaching and identified supports that may help a building level administrator find time to consistently teach in a classroom. This dissertation examined what building level administrators believe the effect a teaching principal will have on teachers' perceptions and attitudes of the building level administrator as an instructional leader.

During the first part of this study, the researcher collected data through the use of a survey completed by k-6 building level administrators located in the two intermediate units located in Northeastern Pennsylvania. In the second part of this study the researcher collected data through interviews of teaching principals. Demographic information was collected from both the survey participants and the interviewees. During the third part of this study, the researcher conducted a 40 day case study to experience being a co-teaching principal. After the completion of the 40 day self-study, the Assistant Superintendent of Human Resources and the Superintendent of School District "A" collected data through interviews of Elementary School "B" community members. This chapter examined the information obtained through the quantitative and qualitative perspectives and will include a triangulation component in the analysis of the data.

Research Questions

The data obtained in this study was used to address the following questions:

1. What are the impediments that can be identified which prevent a principal or assistant principal from becoming a teaching or co-teaching building level administrator?
2. What elements need to be in place that would allow a principal or assistant principal the time to teach or co-teach on a recurring basis?
3. Do building level administrators believe teachers' perceptions of them will change if they teach or co-teach? If so, in what way(s)? Will the act of a building level administrator teaching impact the perceptions of how he or she is perceived by teachers, parents, and community members?

Quantitative Data

The survey questions for the study were designed to: (1) examine impediments; (2) examine supports needed to allow a building level administrator the time to teach on a regularly-scheduled basis; and; (3) examine possible benefits of being a teaching building level administrator. Demographic data from this survey included age range, total number of years in education, capacity in which they served the district (principal or assistant principal), total number of years as a principal and/or assistant principal, size of the district, and size of the building. Individual data included identifying whether the principal had ever taught while simultaneously serving as a principal/assistant principal. Those principals who answered "yes" were required to answer six additional questions. This data included: (1) whether they were currently teaching and in what content area; (2) the capacity they taught; (3) the number of weeks they teach/taught; (4) the time

(minutes) taught each day; (5) the number of days per week taught; and, (6) the number of courses/subjects taught each day. The survey was distributed to all building level administrators who are currently employed within the two intermediate units located in Northeastern Pennsylvania.

The survey used in this study was sent to Kindergarten through sixth grade building level administrators located in the two intermediate units located in Northeastern Pennsylvania. There were 166 building level administrators located in the two intermediate units. Eighty-seven surveys were returned for a response rate of 53%. Responding building level administrators answered 58 questions. The first seven questions of the survey were used to inquire if the individual participant ever had the duties of a teaching building level administrator. The researcher established the mode, median, and mean to determine the central tendency for the other 51 questions. The range, variance, and standard deviation were also calculated to describe the degree to which individual data is clustered about, or deviate from, the mean.

Demographic Data of Survey Participants

There were a total of 87 building level administrators who volunteered to be survey participants. The researcher collected demographic data from each participant who completed the survey or was interviewed. The demographic data that was collected included the participant's administrative capacity (principal or assistant principal), their age, total years in education, years of experience as an administrator, the student population of their district, and the student population of the school where they were a building level administrator.

The demographic information confirmed that 67 of the building level administrators in the two intermediate units located in Northeastern Pennsylvania who completed the survey were principals. Twenty were assistant principals. Dominant demographic information of these building level administrators included 56 of the building level administrators were between the ages of 35 and 54.9. The largest number of survey respondents (43 or 49%) had 11 years to 20 years of experience in education. The data collected gave evidence that over 67 or 76% of the survey respondents had 10 years of administrative experience or less. A majority of the survey participants (47 or 54%) worked in a school district that had a student population of 7,500 +. Most of the survey participants (32 or 36%) were building level administrators of schools that had student populations of 499 to 749. A detailed demographic breakdown can be found in Table 1.

Individual Survey Data of Teaching Building Level

Administrators: Individual Data Summary

There were five individual survey participants who responded they had taught a course in the building while simultaneously serving as a principal. This was 5% of the 87 building level administrators who responded. This percentage of teaching building level administrators was consistent with Kelley-Brockel's (1998) study of teaching principals.

Table 1

Demographic Data for the Survey Participants

Administrative Capacity	Principal		Assistant Principal		
Age	67 (77%) 25 to 34.9 12 (14%)	35 to 44.9 30 (34%)	20 (23%) 45 to 54.9 26 (30%)	55+ 19 (22%)	
Total Years in Education	10 or less 9 (11%)	11 to 20 43 (49%)	21 to 30 21 (24%)	31 to 40 14 (16%)	40+ 0 (0%)
Years of Administrative Experience	5 or less 31 (35%)	6 to 10 36 (41%)	11 to 15 14 (16%)	16 to 20 3 (4%)	20+ 3 (4%)
District Student Population	Less than 2,500 14 (16%)	2,500 to 4,999 7 (8%)	5,000 to 7,499 19 (22%)	7,500+	47 (54%)
School Student Population	Less than 250 5 (6%)	250 to 499 24 (28%)	499 to 749 32 (36%)	750 to 999 13 (15%)	1,000+ 13 (15%)

Only two of the five building level administrators who had taught as part of the work day were currently teaching. This was 2% of the 87 building level administrators who responded. One of the two teaching building level administrators was teaching reading and one was teaching reading and math. The capacity in which they taught was evenly split with: one teaching building level administrator was a substitute on a regular basis; one teaching building level administrator served his students as a tutor; and one building level administrator co-taught. Two teaching building level administrators had taught a subject and no teaching building level administrators served in the capacity of a teaching assistant. The number of weeks taught by the teaching building level administrators indicated that 2 of the teaching building level administrators taught for 1 to 3 weeks and 3 teaching building level administrators responded that their teaching experience lasted more than 16 weeks. There were no teaching building level administrators who were identified as teaching 4 to 8 weeks, 8 to 12 weeks, or 12 to 15 weeks. The number of minutes taught per day varied. Two teaching building level administrators taught 30 to 45 minutes per day. The remaining three teaching building level administrators taught 45 minutes to 1 hour, 1-2 hours per day or more than 2 hours per day. When identifying the number of days per week taught, one teaching building level administrator taught one day per week and the other four administrators taught five days per week. A majority (four) of the teaching building level administrators taught only one course/subject per day. One teaching building level administrator taught two course/subjects per day.

Surveys with Intermediate Unit Number 20 and
Intermediate Unit Number 21 Principals: Impediments that
Prevent Building Level Administrators from Teaching

Questions 8-13 (Appendix B) were asked of each survey participant in reference to impediments that would prevent them from teaching (Table 2). The specific questions identifying impediments that prevented them from teaching included Question 8: The lack of time to plan for effective instruction; Question 9: A heavy management workload; Question 10: The lack of supports; Question 11: Having no interest in teaching; Question 12: The lack of confidence to be an effective teacher; and, Question 13: The lack of knowledge about effective teaching strategies. Table 2 is a statistical analysis of the data.

Table 2

Impediments that Prevented Building Level Administrators from Teaching

Question	N	Mean	Mode	Median	Range	Variance	Standard Deviation
Lack of planning time	86	2.3	1	2	4	2	1.4
Heavy workload	86	1.8	1	1	4	1.3	1.1
Lack of supports	86	3.2	4	3	4	1.8	1.3
No interest in teaching	86	4.1	5	4	4	1.2	1.1
Lack of confidence	86	4.8	5	5	1	0.2	0.4
Lack of knowledge	86	4.8	5	5	1	0.2	0.4

Table 2 exhibits an above average number of survey participants agreed (2.3) that “a lack of time to plan for effective instruction” was an impediment for teaching. The response of Strongly Agree (1) was the response that was selected the most often. “A heavy management load” had a lower mean score (1.8) indicated an Agree reply when it came to teaching. Again the mode was Strongly Agree (1). The lack of support as an impediment had a mean score of 3.2, therefore it indicated a below average response which supports a response of Undecided. The mode was Disagree (4). “Having no interest in teaching,” “the lack of confidence to be an effective teacher” and “the lack of knowledge about effective teaching practices” each had a mean score above 4.0, thus indicating they were not an impediment. The mode for all three of these categories was Strongly Disagree (5).

The survey data pointed out that the two greatest impediments that would prevent building level administrators from teaching during their work day were “the lack of time to plan for effective instruction” and “a heavy management workload.” The survey data indicated that “the lack of supports,” “having no interest in teaching,” “the lack of confidence to be an effective teacher,” and “the lack of knowledge about effective teaching practices” would not have prevented them from teaching during their work day.

Surveys with Intermediate Unit Number 20 and

Intermediate Unit Number 21 Principals: Impediments that

Prevent Building Level Administrators from Co-Teaching

Questions 14-19 (Appendix B) were asked of each survey participant in reference to impediments that would prevent them from co-teaching (Table 3). The specific questions identifying impediments that prevented them from teaching included Question

14: The lack of time to plan for effective instruction; Question 15: A heavy management workload; Question 16: The lack of supports; Question 17: Having no interest in teaching; Question 18: The lack of confidence to be an effective teacher; and Question 19: The lack of knowledge about effective teaching strategies. Table 3 is the statistical analysis of the data.

Table 3

Impediments that Prevented Building Level Administrators from Co-Teaching

Question	N	Mean	Mode	Median	Range	Variance	Standard Deviation
Lack of planning time	85	2.2	1	2	4	1.8	1.3
Heavy workload	85	1.9	1	1	4	1.3	1.1
Lack of supports	84	3.3	4	4	4	1.8	1.3
No interest in teaching	85	4.2	5	5	4	1.2	1.1
Lack of confidence	85	4.7	5	5	2	0.3	0.5
Lack of knowledge	85	4.7	5	5	3	0.3	0.5

Table 3 shows an above average number of survey participants agreed (2.2) that “a lack of time to plan for effective instruction” was an impediment for teaching. The response of Strongly Agree (1) was the response that was selected the most often. “A heavy management load” had a lower mean score (1.9) indicating an Agree reply when it came to teaching. Again the mode was Strongly Agree (1). “The lack of supports” as an impediment had a mean score of 3.3. It had a mode of (4) Disagree. “Having no interest

in teaching,” “the lack of confidence to be an effective teacher” and “the lack of knowledge about effective teaching practices” all had a mean score above 4.0, thus indicating to not be an impediment. The mode for all three of these categories was Strongly Disagree (5).

The survey data pointed out that the two greatest impediments that would prevent building level administrators from co-teaching during their work day were “the lack of time to plan for effective instruction” and “a heavy management workload.” The survey data indicated that “the lack of supports,” “having no interest in teaching,” “the lack of confidence to be an effective teacher,” and “the lack of knowledge about effective co-teaching practices” would not have prevented them from co-teaching during their work day.

Surveys with Intermediate Unit Number 20 and

Intermediate Unit Number 21 Principals: Supports Needed to be in

Place for You to Consider Teaching One Class Per Day

Questions 20-24 (Appendix B) were asked of each survey participant in reference to supports that would be needed to consider teaching one class per day (Table 4). The specific questions identified supports that would be needed to consider teaching one class per day included Question 20: Additional clerical office support; Question 21: Additional administrative office support; Question 22: Central office support; Question 23: A teacher with whom I could exchange roles; and, Question 24: Co-teach with another teacher. Table 4 is the statistical analysis of the data.

Table 4

Supports Needed to be in Place to Consider Teaching One Class Per Day

Question	N	Mean	Mode	Median	Range	Variance	Standard Deviation
Clerical office support	85	3.4	4	4	4	1.7	1.3
Administrative office support	85	2.2	2	2	4	1.6	1.3
Central office support	85	2.8	2	3	4	1.7	1.3
Exchange of roles	85	2.7	2	2	4	1.4	1.2
Co-teach	85	2.6	2	2	4	1.5	1.2

“Having additional clerical office support” had a mean score of 3.4, indicating a below average which supports a response of Disagree. The response of Disagree (4) was the response that was selected the most often. “Additional administrative office support,” “additional central office support,” “having a teacher with whom they could exchange roles” and “co-teaching with another teacher” had mean scores between 2.2 and 2.8 which indicated they agreed. The mode for all four of these categories was Agree (2).

The survey data confirmed that most survey participants agreed that “additional administrative office support,” “additional central office support,” “having a teacher with whom they could exchange roles” and “co-teaching” with another teacher were acceptable supports. The survey data also demonstrated that “having additional clerical office staff” would not be a support that would allow them to consider teaching.

Surveys with Intermediate Unit Number and

Intermediate Unit Number Principals: Increased Credibility

About the “Classroom” Instructional Initiative Introduced

by the Principal is a Benefit of Being a Teaching Principal

Questions 25-28 (Appendix B) were asked of each survey participant in reference to possible benefits of being a teaching principal (Table 5). The specific question referred to increased credibility on the part of _____ about the “classroom” instructional initiative introduced by the principal is a benefit of being a teaching principal. Question 25: Referred to teachers; Question 26: Referred to parents; Question 27: Referred to students; and, Question 28: Referred to community members. Table 5 is the statistical analysis of the data.

Table 5

Increased Credibility on the Part of _____ About the “Classroom” Instructional Initiatives Introduced by the Principal is a Benefit of Being a Teaching Principal

Question	N	Mean	Mode	Median	Range	Variance	Standard Deviation
Teachers	85	1.7	1	2	3	0.7	0.8
Parents	85	2.2	2	2	3	1.1	1.0
Students	85	2.1	2	2	4	1.1	1.0
Community Members	85	2.3	2	2	4	1.1	1.0

“Increased credibility on the part of teachers about the “classroom” instructional initiative introduced by the principal” was a benefit of being a teaching principal had a mean of 1.7. The response of Strongly Agree (1) was the response selected most often. “Increased credibility on the part of parents, students, and community members about the “classroom” instructional initiative introduced by the principal” was a benefit of being a teaching principal all had mean scores between 2.2, 2.1, and 2.3 respectively which indicated they agreed. The mode for all three of these categories was Agree (2).

The survey data indicated that most of the survey participants believed that being a teaching building level administrator would “increase credibility with teachers, parents, students, and community members about “classroom” instructional initiatives that they introduce.” However, survey participants believed the greatest impact of their teaching experience would be on teachers.

Surveys with Intermediate Unit Number 20 and

Intermediate Unit Number 21 Principals: Increased Credibility

About the Principal’s Ability to Lead an Effective

School is a Benefit of Being a Teaching Principal

Table 6 graphs questions 29-32 (Appendix B) which asked each survey participant about the possible benefits of being a teaching principal in reference to increased credibility with _____ about the principal’s ability to lead an effective school as a benefit of being a teaching principal (Table 6). Question 29: Referred to teachers; Question 30: Referred to parents; Question 31: Referred to students; and, Question 32: Referred to community members. Table 6 is the statistical analysis of the data.

Table 6

Increased Credibility with _____ About the Principal's Ability to Lead an

Effective School is a Benefit of Being a Teaching Principal

Question	N	Mean	Mode	Median	Range	Variance	Standard Deviation
Teachers	86	1.8	1	2	3	1.0	1.0
Parents	86	2.2	2	2	4	1.1	1.0
Students	86	2.2	2	2	4	1.1	1.1
Community Members	86	2.4	2	2	4	1.2	1.1

“Increased credibility on the part of teachers about the principal’s ability to lead an effective school” was a benefit of being a teaching principal had a mean of 1.8. The response of Strongly Agree (1) was the response that building level administrators selected most often. “Increased credibility on the part of parents, students, and community members about the principal’s ability to lead an effective school” was a benefit of being a teaching principal. They all had mean scores between 2.2, 2.2, and, 2.4 respectively. The mode for all three of these categories was Agree (2).

The survey data indicated most of the survey participants believed that being a teaching building level administrator would increase credibility with teachers, parents, students, and community members about their ability to run an effective school. The survey participants again believed the greatest impact of their teaching experience would be on teachers.

Surveys with Intermediate Unit Number 20 and

Intermediate Unit Number 21 Principals: Improved Relationships are a Benefit of Being a Teaching Principal

Questions 33-36 (Appendix B) were asked of each survey participant in reference to possible benefits of being a teaching principal. The specific question referred to improved relationships with _____ is a benefit of being a teaching principal (Table 7). Question 33: Referred to teachers; Question 34: Referred to parents; Question 35: Referred to students; and, Question 36: Referred to community members. Table 7 presents the statistical analysis of the data.

Table 7

Improved Relationships with _____ are a Benefit of Being a Teaching Principal

Question	N	Mean	Mode	Median	Range	Variance	Standard Deviation
Teachers	86	1.9	1	2	4	1.1	1.0
Parents	86	2.4	2	2	3	1.1	1.0
Students	86	2.0	2	2	4	1.1	1.0
Community Members	86	2.6	2	3	4	1.3	1.1

“An improved relationship” with teachers was a benefit of being a teaching principal had a mean score of 1.9. The response of Strongly Agree (1) was the response selected most often. “An improved relationship” with parents was a benefit of being a teaching principal had a mean score of 2.4. “An improved relationship” with students was a benefit of being a teaching principal had a mean score of 2. “An improved relationship” with community members was a benefit of being a teaching principal each had a mean score of 2.6. The mode for all three of these categories was Agree (2).

The survey data indicated that most of the survey participants believed that a benefit of being a teaching building level administrator would be “improved relationships” with teachers, parents, students and community members. The survey participants believed the greatest impact of their teaching experience once again would be on teachers.

Surveys with Intermediate Unit Number 20 and
Intermediate Unit Number 21 Principals: An Increase in
Confidence as an Educational Leader is a
Benefit of Being a Teaching Principal

Questions 37-40 (Appendix B) were asked of each survey participant in reference to possible benefits of being a teaching principal. The specific question referred to an increase in confidence as an educator with _____ is a benefit of being a teaching principal (Table 8). Question 37: Referred to parents; Question 38: Referred to parents; Question 39: Referred to students; and, Question 40: Referred to community members. Table 8 is the statistical analysis of the data.

Table 8

Increase in Confidence as an Educational Leader with _____ is a Benefit of Being a Teaching Principal

Question	N	Mean	Mode	Median	Range	Variance	Standard Deviation
Teachers	86	2.0	1	2	3	1.0	1.0
Parents	86	2.3	2	2	3	1.0	1.0
Students	86	2.3	2	2	4	1.2	1.1
Community Members	86	2.6	2	3	4	1.0	1.0

“An increase in confidence as an educator” with teachers was a benefit of being a teaching principal had a mean of 2. The response of Strongly Agree (1) was the response that was selected the most often. “An increase in confidence as an educational leader” with parents and students is a benefit of being a teaching principal. Each had a mean score of 2.3. “An increase in confidence as an educational leader” with community members was a benefit of being a teaching principal had a mean of 2.6. The mode for all three of these categories was Agree (2).

The survey data indicated that most of the survey participants believed that a benefit of being a teaching building level administrator would be “an increase in confidence as an educational leader” with teachers, parents, students, and community members. The survey participants again believed the greatest impact of their teaching experience would be on teachers.

Surveys with Intermediate Unit Number 20 and

Intermediate Unit Number 21 Principals: Increased Credibility

About the “Classroom” Instructional Initiative Introduced

by the Principal is a Benefit of Being a Co-Teaching Principal

Questions 41-44 (Appendix B) were asked of each survey participant in reference to possible benefits of being a teaching principal. The specific question referred to increased credibility on the part of _____ about the “classroom” instructional initiative introduced by the principal is a benefit of being a co-teaching principal (Table 9). Question 41: Referred to teachers; Question 42: Referred to parents; Question 43: Referred to students; and, Question 44: Referred to community members. Table 9 is the statistical analysis of the data.

Table 9

Increased Credibility on the Part of _____ About the “Classroom” Instructional Initiatives Introduced by the Principal is a Benefit of Being a Co-Teaching Principal

Question	N	Mean	Mode	Median	Range	Variance	Standard Deviation
Teachers	85	1.7	1	2	4	0.8	0.9
Parents	84	2.3	2	2	3	1.0	1.0
Students	84	2.3	2	2	4	1.1	1.0
Community Members	84	2.5	2	2	4	1.0	1.0

“Increased credibility on the part of teachers about the “classroom” instructional initiative introduced by the principal” was a benefit of being a co-teaching principal had a mean of 1.7. The response of Strongly Agree (1) was the response that was selected the most often. “Increased credibility on the part of parents and students about the “classroom” instructional initiative introduced by the principal” was a benefit of being a co-teaching principal both had mean scores of 2.3. “Increased credibility on the part of community members about the “classroom” instructional initiatives introduced by the principal” was a benefit of being a co-teaching principal both had mean scores of 2.5. The mode for all three of these categories was Agree (2).

The survey data indicated that most of the survey participants believed that being a co-teaching building level administrator would “increase credibility with teachers, parents, students, and community members about “classroom” instructional initiatives that they introduce.” However, survey participants believed the greatest impact of their co-teaching experience would be on teachers.

Surveys with Intermediate Unit Number 20 and

Intermediate Unit Number 21 Principals: Increased Credibility

About the Principal’s Ability to Lead an Effective School is a

Benefit of Being a Co-Teaching Principal

Questions 45-48 (Appendix B) were asked of each survey participant in reference to possible benefits of being a co-teaching principal. The specific question referred to increased credibility with _____ about the principal’s ability to lead an effective school is a benefit of being a teaching co- principal (Table 10). Question 45: Referred to teachers; Question 46: Referred to parents; Question 47: Referred to students; and,

Question 48: Referred to community members. Table 10 is the statistical analysis of the data.

Table 10

Increased Credibility with _____ About the Principal's Ability to Lead an Effective School is a Benefit of Being a Co-Teaching Principal

Question	N	Mean	Mode	Median	Range	Variance	Standard Deviation
Teachers	86	1.8	1	2	3	0.8	0.9
Parents	86	2.3	2	2	4	1.0	1.0
Students	86	2.3	2	2	4	1.1	1.0
Community Members	86	2.5	2	2	4	1.1	1.1

“Increased credibility on the part of teachers about the principal’s ability to lead an effective school” was a benefit of being a teaching principal had a mean of 1.8. The response of Strongly Agree (1) was the response that was selected the most often.

“Increased credibility on the part of parents and students about the principal’s ability to lead an effective school” was a benefit of being a co-teaching principal both had mean scores of 2.3. “Increased credibility on the part of community members about the principal’s ability to lead an effective school” was a benefit of being a co-teaching principal both had mean scores of 2.5. The mode for all three of these categories was Agree (2).

The survey data indicated that most of the survey participants believed that being a co-teaching building level administrator would “increase credibility with teachers, parents, students, and community members about their ability to run an effective school.” The survey participants again believed the greatest impact of their co-teaching experience would be on teachers.

Surveys with Intermediate Unit Number 20 and

Intermediate Unit Number 21 Principals: Improved

Relationships are a Benefit of Being a Co-Teaching Principal

Questions 49-52 (Appendix B) were asked of each survey participant in reference to possible benefits of being a co-teaching principal. The specific question referred to improved relationships with _____ is a benefit of being a co-teaching principal (Table 11). Question 49: Referred to teachers; Question 50: Referred to parents; Question 51: Referred to students; and, Question 52: Referred to community members. Table 11 presents the statistical analysis of the data.

Table 11

Improved Relationships with _____ are a Benefit of Being a Co-Teaching Principal

Question	N	Mean	Mode	Median	Range	Variance	Standard Deviation
Teachers	86	1.8	1	2.0	3	0.9	1.0
Parents	86	2.5	3	2.5	3	1.1	1.0
Students	86	2.0	1	2.0	4	1.1	1.0
Community Members	86	2.6	3	3.0	4	1.1	1.1

“An improved relationship” with teachers was a benefit of being a co-teaching principal had a mean score of 1.8. The response of Strongly Agree (1) was the response that was selected most often. “An improved relationship” with students was a benefit of being a teaching principal. It had a mean score of 2. The response of Strongly Agree (1) was the response that was selected most often. “An improved relationship” with parents and community was a benefit of being a teaching principal. Each one had a mean score of 2.5 and 2.6 respectfully. The mode for these two categories was Undecided (3).

The survey data indicated that most of the survey participants believed that a benefit of being a co-teaching building level administrator would be “improved relationships” with teachers and students. The survey participants’ responses indicated they were undecided about the impact their teaching experience would have the on parents and community members.

Surveys with Intermediate Unit Number 20 and
Intermediate Unit Number 21 Principals: An Increase in
Confidence as an Educational Leader is a
Benefit of Being a Co-Teaching Principal

Questions 53-56 (Appendix B) were asked of each survey participant in reference to possible benefits of being a teaching principal. The specific question referred to an increase in confidence as an educational leader with _____ is a benefit of being a teaching principal (Table 12). Question 53: Referred to parents; Question 54: Referred to parents; Question 55: Referred to students; and, Question 56: Referred to community members. Table 12 presents the statistical analysis of the data.

Table 12

An Increase in Confidence as an Educational Leader with _____ is a Benefit of Being a Teaching Principal

Question	N	Mean	Mode	Median	Range	Variance	Standard Deviation
Teachers	86	2.1	1	2	4	1.3	1.1
Parents	86	2.5	2	2	4	1.2	1.1
Students	86	2.4	2	2	4	1.4	1.2
Community Members	86	2.7	3	3	4	1.2	1.1

“An increase in confidence as an educational Leader” with teachers was a benefit of being a co-teaching principal had a mean of 2.1. The response of Strongly Agree (1) was the response selected the most often. “An increase in confidence as an educational Leader” with parents and students was a benefit of being a co-teaching principal each had a mean score of 2.5 and 2.4 respectively. The mode for these two was (2) Agree. An increase in confidence as an educator with community members was a benefit of being a co-teaching principal had a mean of 2.7. The mode was (3) Undecided.

The survey data indicated that most of the survey participants believed that a benefit of being a teaching building level administrator would be “an increase in confidence as an educational leader” with teachers, parents, and students. The survey participants again believed the greatest impact of their teaching experience would be on teachers. The survey participants’ responses indicated they were undecided about whether the building level administrators co-teaching experience would increase community members’ confidence in them as an educational leader.

Surveys with Intermediate Unit Number 20 and

Intermediate Unit Number 21 Principals: Increased Teacher

Morale is a Benefit of Being a Teaching Principal

Question 57 (Appendix B) was asked of each survey participant in reference to teacher morale. Question 57 referred to increased teacher morale is a benefit of being a teaching principal (Table 13). Table 13 presents the statistical analysis of the data:

Table 13

Increased Morale is a Benefit of Being a Teaching Principal

Question	N	Mean	Mode	Median	Range	Variance	Standard Deviation
57	86	2.3	2	2	3	1.0	1.0

“Increased teacher morale” was a benefit of being a teaching principal had a mean of 2.3. The response of Agree (2) was the response that was selected the most often.

The survey participants’ responses showed they believe a benefit of being a building level administrator who teaches was “increased teacher morale.”

Surveys with Intermediate Unit Number 20 and

Intermediate Unit Number 21 Principals: Increased Empathy for Teacher Responsibilities is a Benefit of Being a Teaching Principal

Question 58 (Appendix B) was asked of each survey participant in reference to teacher empathy. Question 58 referred to increased empathy for teacher responsibilities is a benefit of being a teaching principal (Table 14). Table 14 presents the statistical analysis of the data.

Table 14

Increased Empathy for Teacher Responsibilities is a Benefit of Being a Teaching Principal

Question	N	Mean	Mode	Median	Range	Variance	Standard Deviation
58	86	2.1	1	2	4	1.3	1.1

“Increased empathy for teacher responsibilities” was a benefit of being a teaching principal had a mean of 2.1. The response of Strongly Agree (1) was the response that was selected the most often.

The survey participants' responses showed they believe a benefit of being a building level administrator who teaches would be increased empathy for teacher responsibilities.

Qualitative Data

The interview questions for the study were designed to discover perceived impediments that prevent a building level administrator from teaching, discover the supports that they believe need to be in place for a principal to consider teaching on a reoccurring basis, and to examine the building level administrators' perceptions whether teachers and their own perception of themselves as an instructional leader changed because they taught. "Co-teaching" was one of the supports that was specifically examined.

The researcher called and/or sent e-mails to every school district located in the state of Pennsylvania searching for building level administrators who currently taught or had recently taught as part of their work day. Seven teaching building level administrators were found in the state of Pennsylvania. One teaching principal from the state of Oregon responded to an e-mail that was intended for a school district in Pennsylvania. All eight building level administrators were invited to participate in the interview process.

Each interview began with the researcher collecting demographic data from each interviewee. The demographic data collected included ranges of age, a range of the total number of years in education, a range of the size of the student population of the district, a range of the building student enrollment, the capacity that they serve the school (principal or assistant principal), and a range of the number of years as a principal and or assistant principal.

Demographic Data of Interview Participants

There were eight total current or recent teaching building level administrators who became interview participants. The researcher collected demographic data from the eight participants who volunteered to be interviewed by the researcher. The demographic data collected included the participants' administrative capacity (principal or assistant principal), their age, total number of years in education, years of experience as an administrator, the student population of their district, and the student population of the school where they are a building level administrator.

The demographic information confirmed that five individuals of the building level administrators interviewed were principals and three were assistant principals. Dominant demographic information of these building level administrators included 3 or 37% of the building level administrators were between the ages of 45 and 54.9. The largest number of survey respondents (4 or 50%) had 11 years to 20 years of experience in education. The data collected gave evidence that 7 or 87% of the survey respondents had 10 years of administrative experience or less. A majority of the survey participants (5 or 62%) worked in a school district that had a student population of 2,500 to 4,999. Half of the building level administrators who were interviewed (4 or 50%) worked in schools that had student populations of 499 to 749. A demographic breakdown can be found in Table 15.

Table 15

Demographic Data of Interview Participants

Administrative Capacity	Principal		Assistant Principal		
Age	5 (63%) 25 to 34.9 1 (13%)	35 to 44.9 2 (25%)	3 (37%) 45 to 54.9 3 (37%)	55+ 2 (25%)	
Total Years in Education	10 or less 0 (0%)	11 to 20 4 (50%)	21 to 30 2 (25%)	31 to 40 2 (25%)	40+ 0 (0%)
Years of Administrative Experience	5 or less 4 (50%)	6 to 10 3 (37%)	11 to 15 0 (0%)	16 to 20 1 (13%)	20+ 0 (0%)
District Student Population	Less than 2,500 1 (13%)	2,500 to 4,999 5 (62%)	5,000 to 7,499 0 (0%)	7,500+ 2 (25%)	
School Student Population (15%)	Less than 250 3 (37%)	250 to 499 1 (13%)	499 to 749 4 (50%)	750 to 999 0 (0%)	1,000+ 0 (0%)

Interviews with Current or Recent Teaching
Principals: Impediments that Prevent Building
Level Administrators from Teaching

Six of eight building level administrators interviewed indicated “the lack of time to plan effective instruction” could be an impediment to being a teaching principal. Interviewee “E” felt teaching and serving as a principal would equate to having two full-time jobs. Interviewee “D” indicated the time needed to significantly plan for effective instruction would take a huge chunk out of the work day.

All eight building level administrators interviewed indicated “a heavy management workload” could be an impediment to being a teaching principal. Interviewee “B” responded, “It takes a lot of work to stay on top of things with your teaching as well as your administrative tasks.” Interviewee “H” replied “Time is a big factor. If a principal had either a difficult staff or student population it could eat up a lot of valuable time.”

Five of eight building level administrators interviewed indicated “the lack of supports” could be an impediment to being a teaching principal. These five interviewees each indicated it was critical to have the support of the superintendent; Interviewee “H” added, “Central administration needs to take our teaching schedule into consideration. They will need to schedule district meetings and trainings to accommodate the teaching schedule.”

Four of eight building level administrators interviewed indicated “having no interest in teaching” could be an impediment to being a teaching principal. “A desire to no longer wish to teach or to work in a classroom setting” was two of the replies of

Interviewee “D” and Interviewee “F.” Interviewee “A” replied “Most principals I know do NOT want to teach.”

Only one of the eight building level administrators interviewed indicated an impediment to being a teaching principal would be “the lack of confidence to be an effective teacher.” Interviewee “C” responded, “If they teach and do a poor job they could lose face on both sides.”

There were no building level administrators interviewed who indicated “the lack of knowledge about effective teaching practices” would be an impediment to being a teaching principal.

The interview process with the eight building level administrators identified “the lack of time to plan effective instruction” and “a heavy management workload” as the two greatest impediments that could prevent a building level administrator from teaching. A majority of the eight building level administrators interviewed also indicated “the lack of supports” could be an impediment to being a teaching principal. Four of the interviewees mentioned that “having no interest in teaching” could be an impediment to being a teaching principal. One interviewee mentioned having “a lack of confidence to be an effective teacher” could be an impediment. None of the building level administrators who were interviewed indicated “the lack of knowledge about effective teaching practices” would be an impediment to being a teaching principal.

Interviews with Current or Recent Teaching Principals:

Supports Needed to be in Place for You to

Consider Teaching One Class Per Day

There were no teaching building level administrators interviewed who indicated that “having additional clerical office support” would be a support they would need to consider teaching one class per day. Six of the eight administrators pointed out that they already had the necessary support in place to allow them to teach. Interviewee “D” informed the researcher that having an extra secretary is not a factor. He already has more than one secretary and they know when I am scheduled to teach. It is important to have a secretary to gauge what is urgent and very important. Interviewee “B” and “H” did specify that they did not need extra office help because they either use the Instructional Support Teacher or the guidance counselor helped out when needed.

Six of the eight building level administrators interviewed indicated “having additional administrative office support” would help building level administrators consider teaching one period per day. Interviewee “C” and Interviewee “B” responded it depends on the size of the school. Interviewee “B” then stated that because his building had a small student population he would not get additional administrative support. However, he added, “Larger buildings, especially those buildings with 500+ students, additional office support would help principals consider teaching.” Interviewee “A” suggested, “The two principals could share the positions. Both could teach half time and be an administrator half time.”

Seven of eight building level administrators interviewed indicated “additional central administrative office support” would help building level administrators consider

teaching one period per day. Interviewee “A” responded, “Central office support is imperative, without that, any program would likely fail.” Interviewee “G” suggested the central administrative office could support a teaching building level administrator by scheduling their meetings opposite the time you taught. Interviewee “E” implied that not having to attend administrative meetings during the teaching day would help principals who would like to teach. Interviewee “E” and Interviewee “B” were able to secure the administrative jobs because they were willing to teach as part of their regular work day.

Six of eight building level administrators interviewed indicated they would consider teaching one period per day if they could “exchange roles with another teacher.” Interviewee “H” thought it was a great idea. He replied, “It could help both the teacher and the administrator. The teacher would get a better understanding of the responsibilities of a principal and the principal wouldn’t have to worry about what was going on in the building while teaching.” Interviewee “F” responded that he saw it as a viable option to get the principal in the classroom. The principal added that it would be a good idea if the teacher with whom the exchange occurred would be working toward an administrative degree. Interviewee “G” commented, “The teaching principal would not have to worry about what is going on in the building.”

Six of eight building level administrators interviewed indicated that “co-teaching” with another teacher would be a support that would allow them to consider teaching one period per day. Interviewee “B” replied, “I would enjoy doing it. I am looking to do something like that during the second semester.” Interviewee “H” believed co-teaching would be a good option to get a principal into the classroom. He said, “If the principal had to leave the classroom for any reason, the class would still go on.” Interviewee “D”

indicated, “Not only could you leave the class when it was necessary, you could also build a relationship with the teacher with whom you are co-teaching.”

The interviews with the recent or current teaching building level administrators determined that “having additional administrative office support,” “having central administrative office support,” “exchanging roles with another teacher” and “co-teaching” with another teacher would all be elements that would support principals or assistant principals who want to teach. There were no teaching building level administrators who were interviewed who indicated “having additional clerical office support” would be a support principals or assistant principals would need to consider teaching.

Interviews with Current or Recent Teaching

Principals: Increased Credibility About the “Classroom”

Instructional Initiative Introduced by the Teaching Principal

Seven out of eight interviewees agreed that “increased credibility with teachers about the classroom instructional initiatives introduced by the principal” would be a benefit of being a teaching principal. Interviewee “D” said that teachers perceive you as someone who is able to “talk-the-talk and walk-the-walk.” Interviewee “B” indicated, “Teachers actually see you doing it with them. This is an advantage with allows you to push them to do new initiatives.” Interviewee “G” shared, “Teachers know I have tried the same things they are expected to implement. They respond well when I make suggestions and ask them if they have tried something related to their teaching.”

Five of the eight building level administrators interviewed concurred that “increased credibility with parents about the classroom instructional initiatives introduced

by the principal” would be a benefit of being a teaching principal. Interviewee “A” added that at meetings the discussions about initiatives/changes with parents were positive. Interviewee “F” shared, “It would help establish you as an educational leader who could be a model for parents as well as the teaching staff.”

Four of the eight interviewees agreed that “increased credibility with students about the classroom instructional initiatives introduced by the principal” would be a benefit of being a teaching principal. Interviewee “A” responded, “I am looked at as a fully qualified principal by students, parents, and teachers.” Interviewee “E” said, “Kids see me in a different role because I can verbalize an understanding of the curriculum.”

Four of the eight interviewees indicated that “increased credibility with community members about the classroom instructional initiatives introduced by the principal” would be a benefit of being a teaching principal. Interviewee “F” included, “People in the community would know the principal talks-the-talk and can walk-the-walk.” Interviewee “A” replied, “The community accepts my dual role as a teacher with a good teaching reputation and now accept that I am as effective as an instructional leader.”

The interviews with the recent or current teaching building level administrators determined that “increased credibility with teachers and parents about the classroom instructional initiatives introduced by the principal” would be the strongest benefit of being a teaching principal. The interviews also concluded that although the reaction of the interviewees was not as strong, increased credibility with students and community members about the classroom instructional initiatives introduced by the principal would also be a benefit of being a teaching principal.

Interviews with Current or Recent Teaching Principals:

Increased Credibility About the Principal's Ability to Lead an Effective School is a Benefit of Being a Teaching Principal

Six of the eight interviewees had the same opinion that a possible benefit of being a teaching principal is “increased credibility with teachers about the principal’s ability to lead an effective school.” Interviewee “B” included, “Teachers know you are keeping current with the educational and initiatives and reforms that they are expected to implement.” Interviewee “F” said, “It helps establish you as an educational leader. Teachers can’t pull the wool over your eyes.”

Four of the eight interviewees indicated that a possible benefit of being a teaching principal is “increased credibility with parents about the principal’s ability to lead an effective school.” Interviewee “A” responded, “Parents are able to separate my two roles. They confide in me as their child’s teacher and respect me as the school leader.” Interviewee “D” replied, “There are parents that have a misconception that principals don’t teach. It can only help build confidence when a principal makes suggestions, guides instruction or models the learning process.”

Two of the eight interviewees implied that a possible benefit of being a teaching principal is “increased credibility with students about the principal’s ability to lead an effective school.” Interviewee “E” indicated, “Students understand that I want them to be successful. I can verbalize an understanding of what needs to be done to improve scores on the 4Sight, PSSA and other curriculum assessments.”

Three of the eight interviewees responded that a possible benefit of being a teaching principal is “increased credibility with community members about the

principal's ability to lead an effective school." Interviewee "A" responded, "I am looked at as a fully qualified principal by the community." Interviewee "F" answered, "People in the community would know the principal talks-the-talk and can walk-the-walk."

The interviews with the recent or current teaching building level administrators determined the greatest benefit of being a teaching principal was "an increased credibility with teachers about the principal's ability to lead an effective school." Although not as strong a possible benefit of being a teaching principal was also "increased credibility with parents about the principal's ability to lead an effective school." The interviews with the recent and current teaching building level administrators pointed out that being a teaching principal "would not be a benefit with students and community members about their ability to lead an effective school."

Interviews with Current or Recent Teaching Principals:

Improved Relationships is a Benefit of Being a Teaching Principal

Seven out of eight building level administrators interviewed indicated "improved relationships" with teachers was a benefit of being a teaching principal. Interviewee "E" talked about how his teachers do respect that he made his decisions on what is best for kids first. Interviewee "B" pointed out, "My teachers have developed a respect for me which also lead to me to have a stronger rapport with them. The teachers knew that I was in the trenches with them."

Five of eight building level administrators responded that a possible benefit of being a teaching principal was "an improved relationship" with parents. Interviewee "D" responded, "Teaching helped me develop a better relationship with the students which

resulted in me having a better relationship with the parents of my students. The parents would hear from their children what type of person I was.” Interviewee “C” responded, “I have a better relationship with parents because I was teaching their child. Parents viewed me as one of the classroom teachers and not just a person that sits in the office.”

Five out of the eight building level administrators interviewed indicated “improved relationships” with students is a benefit of being a teaching principal. Interviewee “B” indicated, “I am able to build a good relationship with students by making sure they understand I want them to be successful. I give them praise when they are doing something well.” Interviewee “D” implied his teaching allowed him to make a connection with a larger chunk of kids.

All eight of the building level administrators did not give a reply about “having improved relationships” with community member as a benefit to being a teaching principal. Interviewee “C” and Interviewee “D” concluded that teaching did not have much of an impact on their relationship with community members at all.

The interviews with the recent or current teaching building level administrators determined the greatest benefit of being a teaching principal was “an improved relationship” with teachers. The interviews also indicated that “improved relationships” with parents and students were a benefit of being a teaching principal. The lack of responses from the interviewees and the comments of two interviewees is an indication that being a teaching principal is not believed to “improve their relationship” with community members.

Interviews with Current or Recent Teaching Principals:

An Increase in Confidence as an Educational Leader is a

Benefit of Being a Teaching Principal

Seven of the eight building level administrators interviewed agreed that “an increase in confidence as an educational leader” with teachers was a benefit of being a teaching principal. Interviewee “A” stated, “It helps build confidence when a principal makes suggestions, guides instruction or models the learning process.” Interviewee “G” offered, “Teachers respond well when I make a suggestion and ask them if they have tried something related to their teaching.” Interviewee “E” responded, “Teachers see me as someone who is trying to streamline things to make them better.”

Four of the eight building level administrators interviewed agreed that “an increase in confidence as an educational leader” with parents is a benefit of being a teaching principal. Interviewee “A” shared that she is looked at as a fully qualified principal by the parents. Interviewee “G” responded, “Parents are impressed that I not only know the research but, I can get in and actually do those things.”

There were no responses from the eight building level administrators who were interviewed that would reflect an agreement that “an increase in confidence as an educational leader” with students is a benefit of being a teaching principal.

Two of the eight building level administrators indicated they agreed that “an increase in confidence as an educational leader” with community members is a benefit of being a teaching principal. Interviewee “A” responded, “The community accepts my dual role, they knew me for a long time as a teacher with a good reputation and now accept that I am as effective as an administrator.” Interviewee “A” also added, “The

people in the community would know the principal talks-the-talk and can walk-the-walk.”

The interviews with the recent or current teaching building level administrators determined the greatest benefit of being a teaching building level administrator is “an increase in confidence as an educational leader with teachers.” The interviewees also concluded another benefit of being a teaching building level administrator is “an increase in confidence as an educational leader” with parents. In addition the interviews indicated students and community members would not experience “an increase their confidence of the building level administrator as an educational leader.

Interviews with Current or Recent Teaching Principals:

Increased Teacher Morale is a Benefit of Being a Teaching Principal

Six of the eight building level administrators interviewed agreed that “an increase in teacher morale” was a benefit of being a teaching principal. Interviewee “H” reflected, “Being a teaching principal changed my relationship with teachers in a good way.” Interviewee “D” disclosed that being a teaching principal promotes a team spirit. Interviewee “A” revealed, “Good administrators should welcome the opportunity to be their staff’s cheerleaders.”

The interviews revealed that a majority of the building level administrators believed that “an increase in teacher morale” was a benefit of being a teaching principal.

Interviews with Current or Recent Teaching Principals:

Increased Empathy for Teacher Responsibilities is a Benefit of Being a Teaching Principal

Seven out of the eight building level administrators agreed that a benefit of being a teaching principal was “an increased empathy for teacher responsibilities.” Interviewee “E” indicated teaching allowed him to relate to the “stuff” his teachers were doing. Interviewee “A” indicated, “Some administrators are out of touch with the reality of the classrooms today. Teaching would ground their thinking and let them see and use theory in action.” Interviewee “A” also responded it let her keep in touch with the classroom and allows her to learn about pitfalls related to curriculum and initiatives.

The interviews revealed that a majority of the building level administrators believed that a benefit of being a teaching principal was “an increase of empathy for teacher responsibilities.”

Case Study

The researcher of this study performed a case study to compare the survey and interview results with his own teaching experience. The teaching experience lasted eight weeks. During the eight week period, the researcher was scheduled to teach five days per week. Each of the teaching experiences lasted one hour in length each day. The researcher recorded his daily experiences on an administrator daily reflection sheet (Appendix L). The log included the obstacles he was able to overcome and the obstacles he was not able to overcome. The daily reflection sheet also documented the co-teaching classroom experience and included other significant reflections about the preparation of classroom work, planning, creating activities, correcting assessments, comments made by

teachers, etc. A product of the case study was a four/eight week reflection sheet (Appendix L) which documented the obstacles he was able to overcome, the obstacles he was not able to overcome, the co-teaching classroom experience and included other significant reflections about the preparation of classroom work, planning, creating activities, correcting assessments, comments made by teachers, etc. in chronological order. After the eight week period the researcher compared his co-teaching with the results of the survey and interviews.

Case Study: Impediments that Prevent a Building

Level Administrator from Co-Teaching

The case study results indicated the researcher did not experience “a lack of time to plan effective instruction.” The researcher and his co-teaching partner followed the sequence of lessons provided in the research based reading program that had been adopted by the school district. The researcher met with his co-teaching partner after school each week to organize the lessons.

The researcher himself did not experience “a heavy management workload” as an impediment. The data gathered while the researcher was engaged in the case study indicated “having a heavy workload” could be an impediment to being a teaching principal. The researcher’s obligations included having to attend administrative meetings, parent meetings, and district training sessions. Administrative meetings occur during certain scheduled times each month early during the school day. Parent meetings happen upon either a parent request or a request made by school personnel. The student population of the researcher’s school was 360 students during the case study experience. During the case study he experienced only six discipline referrals. The researcher was

able to schedule his teaching experience during a part of the day that was opposite to the administrative meetings. Doing this allowed him to attend administrative meetings. Parent meetings were arranged during available times within his work schedule. The teaching time was blocked out. The researcher also was able to miss district training sessions if he reviewed the recorded sessions at another time.

“The lack of supports” could be an impediment to a building level administrator teaching. Before he began his case study, he had the approval of the superintendent, assistant superintendent of human resources and support services, and the assistant superintendent of curriculum to co-teach during his work day. However, on two different occasions the researcher was asked to attend a meeting and a training session during the scheduled time he was to co-teach. He had to remind central office administrators (directors) that he was teaching each afternoon. The directors accommodated his co-teaching schedule by permitting him to miss the session and view a recording that was made.

“Having no interest in teaching” was not an impediment to the researcher. The information recorded in the researcher’s case study journal showed that the researcher made every attempt to be in the classroom to teach during the eight week period. The researcher experienced several positive encounters with his students. The researcher also got to experience several celebrations and also witnessed the academic improvement of several students who found reading very challenging.

The case study indicated “the lack of confidence to be an effective teacher” would not be an impediment to the researcher being a co-teaching principal. Several journal entries indicate that the researcher had confidence to step in and plan with his co-teaching

partner. He also was able to use different co-teaching approaches to enhance the lessons. Also, on a couple occasions, he was able to direct the lesson with the substitute teacher who was filling in for the co-teaching partner.

Case study results demonstrate “the lack of knowledge about effective teaching practices” was not an impediment to the researcher being a co-teaching principal. On several occasions the researcher and his co-teaching partner had conversations about the structure of the lessons and how to make them better. The researcher was able to share his expertise about effective teaching practices. One specific conversation included planning how to work with a specific student who needed help with his writing. I suggested the use of a graphic organizer to help him organize his thoughts before writing.

Case Study: Supports Needed to be in Place for a
Building Level Administrator to Consider Teaching
One Period Per Day

The case study suggested “additional clerical office support” would not be a support needed to allow the researcher to consider teaching one period per day. The researcher already has two secretaries as part of his clerical support staff. The researcher’s personal secretary always knew when and where he was teaching. She was able to hold calls and redirect discipline the few issues to another time. These actions helped protect the teaching time of the researcher.

“Additional administrative office support” was not needed during this case study. The student population of the researcher’s school was 360 students during the case study experience. During the case study he also experienced only six discipline referrals. In addition, the researcher was able rearrange some of the scheduled duties of his guidance

counselor and Instructional Support Teacher (IST) person so they would be available to handle minor incidents when he was teaching.

The data from the case study indicated that “having central administrative office support” was a very important aid that allowed him to consistently teach one period per day. The researcher had the approval of the superintendent, assistant superintendent of human resources and support services, and the assistant superintendent of curriculum to co-teach during his work day. On two different occasions the researcher was asked to attend a meeting and a training session during the scheduled time he was to co-teach. Because he had the support of the central office administrators, the directors accommodated his co-teaching schedule by permitting him to miss the session and view a recording that was made.

During the case study, “having a teacher with whom they could exchange roles” was not an option of the researcher. Although some parallels could be made with the researchers co-teaching experience, exchanging roles with a teacher was not a focus of the case study. However, exchanging jobs with a teacher could be a recommendation for further study.

An end result of this case study was the discovery that “co-teaching” could be a support that would enable a building level administrator to return to the classroom to participate in the teaching process. The sharing of responsibilities such as planning, grading, and discipline helped make the co-teaching experience positive. There were few instances when the researcher had to leave the room. However, because there was another teacher in the room the instruction of the students did not have to stop. This was the same when the researcher had to attend an out of district training. No substitute

teacher had to be called to replace the researcher. The instruction was carried on by the co-teaching partner.

Case Study: Possible Benefits of Being a Teaching Principal:

Increased Credibility About the “Classroom” Instructional Initiative Introduced by the Principal

The data collected from the case study lead the researcher to agree that “increased credibility with teachers about the classroom instructional initiatives introduced by the principal” would be a benefit of being a teaching principal. The researcher co-taught a class that used a research based reading program as a tool to deliver the strategies, concepts, and content to the students. During the 40 days of the case study, he had several opportunities to interact with his co-teaching partner and other members of his teaching staff about the strength and weakness of program being used. There was also a noticeable difference in the depth of the conversations between his co-teaching partner and him in relation to the research based reading program as related to student performance. As the researcher progressed through the 40 day co-teaching experience, inactions with other members of his teaching staff during data team meetings and conversations with individual teachers gave him a sense of credibility.

The researcher experienced several conversations during the 40 day case study experience that gave evidence that “increased credibility with parents about the classroom instructional initiatives introduced by the principal” was a benefit of being a teaching principal. The researcher had the opportunity to attend and converse with parents about the strength of the research based reading program during scheduled

parent/teacher conferences. One parent commented that it was amazing that the principal could talk about the reading program being used to teach the students.

During the 40 day case study the researcher experienced several opportunities to draw the conclusion that “increased credibility with students about the classroom instructional initiatives introduced by the principal” would be a benefit of being a teaching principal. The third grade students in the class that he co-taught experienced the researcher helping to deliver reading and writing instruction through the use of research based programs. The researcher had several opportunities to help guide students while the teacher was absent. During these times, researcher was able to reinforce the major strategies, skills, and content of the program.

The researcher’s co-teaching experience during the case study showed that “increased credibility with community members about the classroom instructional initiatives introduced by the principal” would be a benefit of being a teaching principal. The researcher had a chance to interact with the husband of a teacher on his staff who owns a large business in the community. His reaction was positive. He said he believed that the other teachers in the building who were using the programs to teach would have confidence that I could make suggestions to improve how it is delivered.

Case Study: Possible Benefits of Being a Teaching Principal:

Increased Credibility About the Principal’s Ability to Lead an

Effective School is a Benefit of Being a Teaching Principal

The researcher’s case study indicated a possible benefit of being a teaching principal was “increased credibility with teachers about the principal’s ability to lead an effective school.” On several occasions the researcher was able to have a conversation

with his co-teaching partner about the staff development needs of our teachers. The needs of the teachers centered on the instruction of reading and writing. This was also apparent when he attended a third grade building focus meeting where a discussion and problem solving efforts focused on the process of reading instruction for those students who were not meeting specific district benchmarks. The dialogue between the teachers and the researcher was positive and the teachers agreed to use some of the researcher's suggestions.

The information collected during the 40 day case study showed a possible benefit of being a teaching principal was "increased credibility with parents about the principal's ability to lead an effective school." At a Parent Teacher Association (PTA) meeting, I shared that I would be co-teaching with a third grade teacher. The responses were all very good. One PTA parent responded that it was a great way to demonstrate to the teachers and students that education is important. During American Education Week 18 parents visited the room where I was co-teaching. During this visit I was able to casually interject how their children were doing academically. One parent responded that it was good to know a principal can talk-the-talk and walk-the-walk.

A review of the case study data illustrated a possible benefit of being a teaching principal was "increased credibility with students about the principal's ability to lead an effective school." Although the researcher believes many of the third grade students in the classroom in which he was co-teaching were too young to comprehend this benefit, the journal entries indicated they enjoyed having him in class and responded to his teaching suggestions.

The researcher's lack of information in his review of the case study indicated that it was not determined that a possible benefit of being a teaching principal is "increased credibility with community members about the principal's ability to lead an effective school." The lack of information in reference to increased creditability experienced by community members leads the researcher to suggest this as possible recommendation for further study.

The case study performed by the researcher determined the greatest benefit of being a teaching principal was "an increased credibility with teachers about the principal's ability to lead an effective school." A second possible benefit of being a teaching principal was "increased credibility with parents about the principal's ability to lead an effective school." The case study indicated that being a teaching principal might not be as much of a benefit with students and community members about their ability to lead an effective school.

Case Study: Improved Relationships as a Possible Benefit of Being a Teaching Principal

The researcher's 40 day experience highlighted conversations with teachers in his building that lead him to conclude that "improved relationships" with teachers was a benefit of being a teaching principal. These conversations were held with his co-teaching partner and her third grade colleagues. Also, the union representative for the researcher's building stated to her class that it was very "cool" that the researcher was a teaching principal. Other conversations included the building's IST commenting that she heard several good comments from teachers and parents about the researcher and the effect his co-teaching experience had on teachers.

The researcher's co-teaching experience indicated that a possible benefit of being a teaching principal was an "improved relationship" with parents. The data was collected through his daily journal. The positive comments made by PTA members at a PTA Executive Board Meeting were a good indication that a benefit of being a teaching principal was improved relationships with parents. Positive comments consisted of "More principals should be teaching," "The kids will love that" and "What a good way to show the kids that education is important."

The case study results indicated an "improved relationship" with students was a benefit of being a teaching principal. The researcher experienced an "improved relationship" with students in the class that he co-taught. Early in the case study experience as he was leaving the class he asked the students if they wanted him to continue to co-teach. All the students gave me a unanimous "Yes." Two unsolicited comments were received from two different parents who informed the researcher that their children enjoyed having him co-teach with their classroom teacher. Both comments were given on two separate occasions.

Throughout the 40 day co-teaching experience the researcher did not experience any conversations that would have indicated a benefit to being a teaching principal would be having an "improved relationship" with community members. The lack of information in reference to increased relationships experienced by teaching principals with community members leads the researcher to suggest this as another possible recommendation for further study.

The case study data confirms the belief that being a teaching principal will enhance a building level administrator's relationship with teachers. The case study also

confirmed that a teaching building level administrator would experience “improved relationships” with parents and students. There were no experiences during the 40 day case study that would lead the researcher to believe “improved relationships” with community members would be a benefit of being a teaching building level administrator.

Case Study: An Increase in Confidence as an Educational

Leader is a Benefit of Being a Teaching Principal

Data collected during the researcher’s co-teaching experience specified that “an increase in confidence as an educational leader” with teachers was a benefit of being a teaching principal. The journal entries pointed out that the researcher’s co-teaching partner eventually began to include him in on planning the lessons. On several occasions toward the latter half of the 40 day co-teaching experience, the co-teaching partner came to him to seek guidance about altering a lesson they had already planned. Also during a third grade building focus meeting the researcher participated in a discussion and problem solving effort that focused on developing an improvement plan for those students who were not meeting specific reading and math district benchmarks. The dialogue between the teachers and the researcher was positive and the teachers agreed to implement some of the researcher’s ideas.

Data from the 40 day case study implied that “an increase in confidence as an educational leader” with parents was a benefit of being a teaching principal. This was apparent during the scheduled parent/teacher conference. The researcher was able to interject how the students were performing academically and socially. On one occasion a parent was cautious about a suggestion made by the researcher’s co-teaching partner.

The researcher was able to give his opinion about the situation. It seemed that the parent valued his input. She changed her mind and agreed to the teacher's remedy.

The 40 day case study results reflect an agreement that "an increase in confidence as an educational leader" with students was a benefit of being a teaching principal. During the lessons involving writing, several students in the class that the building level administrator co-taught sought him out for his help. Another indication that students showed "an increase of confidence in the researcher as an educational leader" included their reaction to his statements about "What a reader should do when preparing to read a selection." The researcher observed most of the students in the class follow the prerequisite reading strategies he suggested.

The 40 day co-teaching experience found that it was inconclusive that "an increase in confidence as an educational leader" with community members was a benefit of being a teaching principal. There was no data collected that served as proof either way.

The case study data determined the greatest benefit of being a teaching building level administrator was "an increase in confidence as an educational leader" with teachers. The interviewees also concluded another benefit of being a teaching building level administrator was "an increase in confidence as an educational leader" with parents and students. The case study indicated there was not enough information to determine if community members would experience "an increase their confidence of the building level administrator as an educational leader" as a result of him teaching.

Case Study: Increased Teacher Morale is a
Benefit of Being a Teaching Principal

The 40 day co-teaching experience indicated a benefit of being a co-teaching building level administrator was “an increase in teacher morale.” The data from the journal entries showed that the co-teaching partner was pleased that he could help work with some of the students in the class. She liked that it demonstrated to her and the teaching staff that he practiced what he preached. A second example was a conversation with the IST who said both the parents and the other teachers were happy that the researcher was experiencing the delivery of the researched based reading program.

Case Study: Increased Empathy for Teacher Responsibilities
is a Benefit of Being a Teaching Principal

The data from the case study suggested that a benefit of being a teaching principal was “an increase in empathy for teacher responsibilities.” During the researcher’s experience he developed a profound understanding of the amount of time, preparation, and work it takes for a teacher to get ready for parent/teacher conferences and American Education Week. The researcher was also impressed with the focus and persistence of the teachers while they check the progress of each student in their classroom. Equally impressive was their ability to monitor the strengths and weakness of each student and use the information to adjust their lessons.

Summary of Impediments that Prevent a Building

Level Administrator from Teaching

Through the quantitative data a significant number of building level administrators indicated “a lack of time to effectively plan” was an impediment to enter the classroom as a teacher. This perception was supported by the majority of the administrators surveyed in this study. The researcher did not experience having difficulty planning for the lessons that he co-taught. Although the researcher’s co-teaching partner was not inclined to share the planning responsibilities at the beginning of the case study, she eventually did share those responsibilities. The researcher met with his co-teaching partner after school each week to organize the lessons. Kohler-Evans (2006) believes a minimum of 45 minutes to plan instruction each week is a must.

The survey information indicated “a heavy management workload” was an even larger impediment than the lack of time to prepare for effective instruction. All eight interview participants strongly agreed with this perception. This is only one of two identified impediments that all eight administrators had the same perception. However, the researcher did not experience having “a heavy management load” in his case study. The student population of the researcher’s school was 360 students during the case study experience. During the case study he also experienced only six discipline referrals. To help lessen his workload, the researcher solicited the help of his IST and guidance counselor to resolve any school conflicts that might occur during the time he was in the classroom co-teaching. Also, the researcher was able to schedule his teaching experience during a part of the day so that he could attend administrative meetings.

In reference to “the lack of supports” as an impediment the data gathered through the surveys and the interview responses both indicated the results were the same. This impediment was not perceived to be a strong reason not to teach. The researcher found “the lack of support” could be an impediment in being able to teach. However, the results of the case study, the quantitative and qualitative data show this issue was not perceived as a very strong impediment. He had the approval of the superintendent, assistant superintendent of human resources and support services, and the assistant superintendent of curriculum to co-teach during his work day. The support of the central office administration allowed his co-teaching experience to take place.

In reference to not “having the desire to teach,” the survey participants, the interviewees, and the researcher of this study experienced the opposite attitude. The researcher had a very strong desire to teach and gave every effort to teach everyday therefore reducing the impact of such an impediment. The case study data indicated the researcher enjoyed teaching, planning the lessons, and learning about the strengths and weakness of the research-based reading program being used by his school district. The researcher also took pleasure in developing a closer bond with his co-teaching partner and their students.

The quantitative data indicated a considerable number of building level administrators believed “the lack of confidence to be an effective teacher” and “the lack of knowledge about effective teaching strategies” would not be an impediment for them to enter the classroom as a teacher. These perceptions were supported by the majority of the administrators surveyed in this study. Only one of eight building level administrators interviewed proposed “the lack of confidence to be an effective teacher” as a possible

impediment. There were no interview participants who identified “the lack of knowledge about effective teaching strategies” to be an impediment for them. The case study results agreed with both the quantitative and qualitative data. Several of the researcher’s journal entries indicated that the researcher had confidence to step in, plan, and teach with his co-teaching partner. The case study journal used by the researcher showed he was able to use different co-teaching approaches to enhance the lessons. The journal also showed on several occasions he was able to cover important reading strategies when a substitute teacher was filling in for the co-teaching partner.

Summary of the Supports Needed to be in Place for a Building Level

Administrator to Consider Teaching One Period Per Day

The quantitative data showed a significant number of building level administrators indicated that “additional clerical office support” would not be an element needed that would get them to consider teaching one period per day. All eight building level administrators interviewed agreed that “additional clerical support” was not needed. The researcher’s case study experience agreed with the survey and interview data. “Having additional clerical office support” would not influence the researcher’s decision to teach. Like several of the interviewees, the researcher felt that there already was enough clerical support to be able to teach. It can be noted that he already had two secretaries. Both secretaries knew when he taught and they made sure there were no interruptions unless it was absolutely necessary. In addition, as was the case with several of the interviewees, he rearranged some of the duties of his guidance counselor and IST person so they were available to handle minor incidents when he was teaching.

In reference to “additional administrative office support,” the data gathered through the interviews was similar to the survey responses. The data gathered showed the building level administrators who completed the surveys and participating teaching building level administrators agreed that “additional administrative office support” would be a support that would influence them if they were to consider teaching one period per day. The researcher’s case study journal suggested that he agreed “having additional administrative office support” could play an important role in allowing a principal to teach. However, during his co-teaching experience, the researcher did not experience the need to have any “additional administrative office support.” This was due to having an extensive amount of administrative experience, having a small student population of 360 students, and having very limited discipline issues to handle each day.

The survey information indicated a majority of the building level administrators who completed the survey agreed that “having additional central administrative office support” would allow them to consider teaching one period per day. A majority of the teaching building level administrators concurred. The 40 day co-teaching experiences of the researcher lead him to agree that “having the support of the central office administrator” was an important support that allowed him to teach. The researcher had the direct approval of the superintendent and the assistant superintendent of human resources to conduct his study which included a co-teaching experience. At the beginning of his teaching experience, the researcher witnessed several interruptions to his teaching that were caused by other central office administrators. Upon reminding them that the researcher was teaching at a specific time of the school day, they were able to schedule several meetings and training opportunities opposite the teaching time. This in

itself demonstrated how important “having the support of the central office administrators” was in permitting the researcher to teach on a reoccurring basis.

The quantitative data indicated a considerable number of building level administrators agreed that “having a teacher with whom they could exchange roles” was a support that could influence their decision to teach. Most of the building level administrators who were interviewed agreed. The researcher had no evidence that exchanging jobs would be a viable solution in helping a principal find time to teach. This would be a recommendation for further study. However, even though the researcher’s case study co-teaching experience did not focus on this support structure, parallel conclusions could be drawn from the teaching experience through the comments of several of the interviewees. To assist the researcher’s teaching schedule, he had the cooperation of the secretaries, IST and guidance counselor to handle any situation that might occur during the time he was teaching. The research also agreed with the response of a teaching building level administrator who was interviewed that “exchanging jobs with a teacher” who is working toward an administrative certificate would be a great opportunity for both individuals.

The survey and interview results about “co-teaching” being a support that would enable a building level administrator to teach were very similar. Both the building level administrators who completed the survey and the teaching building level administrators who were interviewed agreed that “co-teaching” would be a viable solution. The researcher’s positive case study experiences lead him to also agree. The researcher was able to work with a very good teacher who had a similar philosophy about teaching and discipline. This concurred with a comment made by one of the interviewees that for “co-

teaching” to work well both the building level administrator and the teacher should have the same philosophy and beliefs about discipline. Friend (2005) agreed that for co-teaching to be successful, the framework should include a shared system of beliefs, prerequisite skills, collaboration, classroom practice, and administrative roles.

During the 40 day co-teaching experience, the researcher had a great experience teaching. He experienced few interruptions while in the classroom teaching that pulled him out of the classroom as he was teaching. Even though the researcher did not have to leave the classroom very often, the researcher agreed with a comment made by one interview candidate. The comment was that if the administrator had to suddenly leave the classroom to take care of an administrative matter, he/she would not have to find a substitute to cover the class. Also, the instruction would continue for the students because the co-teaching partner could carry on with the lesson. The researcher also agreed with an interviewee who stated that teaching was a great opportunity to be with students and learn more about the curriculum.

Summary of Possible Benefits of Being a Teaching Principal:

Increased Credibility About the “Classroom” Instructional

Initiative Introduced by the Principal

The survey data indicated a majority of the building level administrators who completed the survey agreed that a principal would experience “increased credibility with teachers about the classroom instructional initiatives introduced.” A majority of the teaching building level administrators had the same opinion. The researcher agreed that this would be a benefit of being a teaching principal. Lare (1995) experienced the same results in his study. During the researcher’s teaching experience, he had several

conversations about the different strengths and weaknesses of the current research based reading program being used in the researcher's district with different grade level teachers. These conversations were a good indication of an increase in credibility.

In reference to possible benefits of being a teaching principal or co-teaching principal, "increased credibility on the part of parents about the 'classroom' instructional initiatives introduced by the principal," the data gathered through the interviews was similar to the survey responses. The data gathered showed the building level administrators who participated by completing the surveys and teaching building level administrators agreed that a principal would experience increased credibility with parents about the classroom instructional initiatives introduced. The case study confirmed the quantitative and qualitative data collected. During the case study, the researcher attended the parent/teacher conferences of the students in the class that the researcher co-taught. The researcher received positive feedback from parents about his knowledge of the current reading program being used in the researcher's district.

The quantitative data indicated a considerable number of building level administrators believed a benefit of being a teaching principal or co-teaching principal was "increased credibility on the part of students about the 'classroom' instructional initiatives." Half of the building level administrators who were interviewed agreed. The case study confirmed that increased credibility would be a benefit of being a teaching principal especially with older children. During the 40 day case study, the researcher noticed the students enjoyed having him in the room. They greeted him every day with a smile and made positive comments about him. The researcher targeted and worked with some of the lower achieving students. They thanked the researcher for helping them.

The survey data illustrated that a majority of principals agreed that a benefit of being a teaching principal or co-teaching principal was “increased credibility on the part of community members about the ‘classroom’ instructional initiatives.” The interview data was not as strong. Only half of the principals interviewed mentioned this as a benefit of being teaching principal. Throughout the 40 day case study, the researcher did not collect any information related to an increase in credibility on the part of community members.

Summary of Possible Benefits of Being a Teaching Principal:

Increased Credibility About the Principal’s Ability to Lead an

Effective School is a Benefit of Being a Teaching Principal

The quantitative and qualitative data both agreed that a possible benefit of being a teaching principal is “increased credibility with teachers about the principal’s ability to lead an effective school.” The researcher believed the case study developed while co-teaching helped increase the researcher’s credibility with the researcher’s teaching staff. During the researcher’s 40 day co-teaching experience, the researcher had several conversations with different staff members about how to continue the academic excellence currently being exhibited in the classroom and on district and state assessments.

The quantitative data indicated a considerable number of building level administrators believe a possible benefit of being a teaching principal was “increased credibility with parents about the principal’s ability to lead an effective school.” Half of the building level administrators interviewed were in agreement. Results of the case study showed a teacher who was a member of the school’s staff shared that several

parents of the students in the class he was co-teaching commented favorably about the researcher's ability to lead their school.

The survey data showed that the survey participants agreed that a possible benefit of being a teaching principal is "increased credibility with students about the principal's ability to lead an effective school." Only two of eight building level administrators interviewed indicated an agreement with this belief. The case study data showed that "increased credibility with students about the principal's ability to lead an effective school would not be a benefit of being a teaching principal." However, the case study does not. The researcher believes the age of the students would be a factor. The researcher believes he did not experience this during the case study because the k-3 students in the researcher's study were not old enough to understand the issue.

The survey information indicated a majority of the building level administrators who completed the survey agreed a possible benefit of being a teaching principal is "increased credibility with community members about the principal's ability to lead an effective school." Four of the eight building level administrators interviewed also agreed. The researcher of this study was not able to collect any data related to community members during the 40 day case study. This would be a recommendation for further study. Therefore, the researcher of this study did not comment in reference to a benefit of teaching being increased credibility with community members about the principal's ability to lead an effective school.

Summary of Possible Benefits of Being a Teaching

Principal: Improved Relationships is a Benefit of

Being a Teaching Principal

The quantitative data and qualitative data showed the building level administrators who participated in this study agreed that a possible benefit of being a teaching principal is “improved relationships with teachers.” The researcher also agreed that one benefit of the researcher’s case study was “an improved relationship” with several of his teachers. Although the researcher believed he had a good relationship with his teaching staff before his case study began. The researcher felt the case study showed the one teacher with whom he had an improved relationship was the teacher who shared the co-teaching experience. During the co-teaching experience, the researcher felt his knowledge about effective reading, writing practices, and his work ethic aligned with the practices of his co-teaching partner. As the researcher and his co-teaching partner progressed through the 40 day case study, the co-teaching partner felt less reluctant to ask him to do some of the management and clerical tasks related to teaching.

The quantitative data indicated a considerable number of building level administrators agreed “improved relationships” with parents would be a benefit of being a teaching principal. Most of the building level administrators who were interviewed agreed. The data collected during the researcher’s co-teaching experience showed “improved relationships” with parents would be a benefit of being a teaching principal. The researcher was able to establish a good rapport with most of the parents in his school. As one of the interviewees shared, the act of co-teaching a third grade class enabled him to improve his relationship with the students in that class. A result of the 40 day co-

teaching experience was the researcher having “an improved relationship” with the students in the researcher’s class. The researcher believed the “improved relationship” with those students resulted in him indirectly having an even better relationship with the parents of his students. The researcher heard positive comments from parents during parent/teacher conferences and American Education Week.

The quantitative and qualitative data both agreed that a possible benefit of being a teaching principal was “an improved relationship” with students. Even though the researcher already had a favorable rapport with most of the students in the school where he is the principal, the 40 day case study shows that his teaching experience led to “an improved relationship” with the students in the class he co-taught. During the researcher’s teaching experience he got to know every student’s name and learned about some of their individual interests. The researcher used these interests to start conversations and at times used these interests to correlate or draw parallels to the skills, strategies and concepts being taught.

The survey data indicated the building level administrators who participated agreed that a possible benefit of being a teaching principal was “an improved relationship” with community members. This was different from the input of building level administrators who were interviewed. There were no positive responses from the interviewees. The researcher’s co-teaching experience was similar to the interviewees, input. There was no data collected that could be related to an improved relationship with community members.

Summary of Possible Benefits of Being a Teaching

Principal: An Increase in Confidence as an Educational

Leader is a Benefit of Being a Teaching Principal

The quantitative data and qualitative data indicated a majority of the building level administrators who participated in this study agreed that “an increase in confidence as an educational leader” with teachers is a possible benefit of being a teaching principal. The researcher’s experience in the case study confirmed this. During his 40 day co-teaching experience, the researcher taught the subject of reading with another teacher using a researched-based reading program to instruct their students. The case study data indicated the co-teaching experience increased his teachers’ confidence in him as an educational leader. During a third grade building focus meeting the researcher participated in a discussion and problem solving effort that focused on developing an improvement plan for those students who were not meeting specific reading and math district benchmarks. The dialogue between the teachers and the researcher was positive and the teachers agreed to implement some of the researcher’s ideas.

The quantitative data indicated a majority of the building level administrators who completed the survey agreed “an increase in confidence as an educational leader” with parents is a possible benefit of being a teaching principal. Four of the eight building level administrators interviewed also agreed. The researcher agreed with both the survey and interview participants. During his 40 day case study, the researcher received positive feedback from parents after American Education Week where parents got to witness his co-teaching experience personally. The positive feedback showed the parents experience

of seeing the researcher teaching increased their confidence in him as the leader of their child's school.

The quantitative data showed many of the building level administrators who participated in the study agreed that “an increase in confidence as an educational leader” with students is a possible benefit of being a teaching principal. This was different from the input of building level administrators who were interviewed. There were no responses from the interviewees that referred to this topic. Case study results show that during lessons involving writing, several students in the class co-taught sought the researcher out for his help. Another example includes different teaching experiences where the researcher observed most of the students in the class following prerequisite reading strategies he suggested.

The quantitative data indicated many of the building level administrators who participated in the study were undecided about “an increase in confidence as an educational leader” with community members is a possible benefit of being a teaching principal. Only two of the eight interviewees responded with a favorable comment. The researcher collected data over a 40 day period. There was little data that would support the belief that “an increase in confidence as an educational leader” with community members would be a result of his teaching experience. Actually, many community members may not have known of his teaching experience. Therefore, they would not be influenced by the researcher's teaching experience.

Summary of Possible Benefits of Being a Teaching Principal:

Increased Teacher Morale is a Benefit of Being a Teaching Principal

The quantitative data and qualitative data indicated a majority of the building level administrators who participated in this study agreed a benefit of being a teaching principal is “increased teacher morale.” The researcher agreed with the results of the quantitative and qualitative data. The data from the journal entries showed that the researcher’s co-teaching partner was pleased that he could help work with some of the students in the class. She liked that it demonstrated to her and the teaching staff that the researcher practiced what he preached.

Summary of Possible Benefits of Being a Teaching Principal:

Increased Empathy for Teacher Responsibilities is a Benefit of Being a Teaching Principal

The quantitative data and qualitative data indicated a majority of the building level administrators who participated in this study agreed a benefit of being a teaching principal is “increased empathy for teacher responsibilities.” The researcher’s experience in this case study confirmed this. The researcher’s schedule included teaching one 60 minute period per day, 5 days a week, over a 40 day period. Even though this was a relatively short period of time, he did develop a respect for the planning, organization, and day-to-day responsibilities that the researcher’s teachers deal with though out the school year. The researcher was also impressed with the focus and persistence of the teachers while they check the progress of each student in their classroom.

Summary

A goal of this study was to identify the impediments which prevent building level administrators from becoming a teaching or co-teaching building level administrator. The quantitative and qualitative data in this study established that building level administrators believed that “a large management workload” would be the greatest impediment preventing them from teaching or co-teaching during the administrative work day. “The lack of time to plan for effective instruction” was also identified as another primary impediment that would keep them from the act of teaching and co-teaching. Both the survey and interview data showed that the building level administrators felt that “the lack of supports,” “having no interest in teaching,” “the lack of confidence to be an effective teacher,” and “the lack of knowledge about effective teaching and co-teaching strategies” were not identified as significant impediments that would prevent them from teaching or co-teaching during the work day. In addition the case study conducted by the researcher supports a parallel conclusion.

A second goal of this study was to determine what elements need to be in place to allow a building level administrator the time to teach or co-teach on a recurring basis. Together the quantitative and qualitative data in this study both determined “additional administrative office support,” “central office support,” “a teacher with whom they could exchange roles,” and “having the ability to co-teach with another teacher” were all elements that if in place would allow a building level administrator the time to teach or co-teach on a recurring basis. The data from both the survey and interviews concluded that the building level administrators did not believe that “having additional clerical office support” was an element that would allow them the time to teach on a reoccurring

basis. The researcher's 40 day case study experience supports the quantitative and qualitative results in reference to the second goal.

The final goal of this study was to ascertain if building level administrators believed their teachers' perceptions of them would change if they either taught or co-taught. The quantitative data, qualitative data, and case study results indicated the participants of this study agreed that all of the following are benefits of being a teaching or co-teaching building level administrator include: (1) increased credibility for the building level administrator when introducing "classroom" instructional initiatives to teachers; (2) increased credibility with teachers about the building level administrator's ability to lead an effective school; (3) improved relationships with teachers; and, (4) an increase in confidence as an educator with teachers.

CHAPTER V

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

Changes in the role of building level administrator began to take place toward the end of the 19th century. Outside forces influenced these changes. These influences began early in the 20th century and continue to the present. The *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* (Public Law 107-110), commonly known as NCLB, reauthorized a number of federal programs aimed to improve the performance of primary and secondary schools in the United States. NCLB continued to be a prominent focus by President Barak Obama's administration in his Race to the Top (RTTT) initiative under the *American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009* (Public Law 111-5).

NCLB changed the expectations of the role of the principal. The NCLB legislation placed unprecedented pressure on principals in an effort to raise student achievement. In order to improve student achievement the principal, whose previous role was a school manager, needed to change. Building level administrators are expected to be instructional leaders.

Instructional leadership is the notion that learning should be given top priority while everything else revolves around the enhancement of learning which undeniably is characteristic of any educational endeavor (Phillips, 2010). As building level administrators developed their new leadership roles, they included specific behaviors such as making suggestions, giving feedback, modeling effective instruction, soliciting opinions, supporting collaboration, providing professional development opportunities, and giving praise for effective teaching (Blase & Blasé, 2000). To show their

commitment and increase their credibility as an instructional leader, there were those educators who suggested that the principal should also be a practicing teacher (Phillips, 2010).

Building level administrators who regularly taught in a building could have a positive influence on teachers who are asked to make continuous changes to their instructional practices in a positive manner. A positive side effect of a building level administrator, who taught, included changes in instructional practices that were needed to raise student achievement. However, for building level administrators to be able to become a “teaching principal,” impediments needed to be identified and certain supports needed to be developed.

The primary purpose of this dissertation was to examine what elements prevented a principal from teaching and identify supports that helped a building level administrator find time in his busy schedule to regularly teach a subject. A secondary purpose of this dissertation was to examine the principal’s beliefs about what effect a teaching principal had on teachers’ perceptions and attitudes of the building level administrator as an instructional leader.

This dissertation incorporated a quantitative and qualitative mixed methods approach to examine the working elements and impact of the teaching building level administrator. Over a four month period, the researcher collected data through the use of surveys sent to k-6 principals in Northeastern Pennsylvania, interviews of teaching building level administrators located in Pennsylvania and one teaching building level administrator from the state of Oregon.

Quantitative data from the surveys was analyzed through the use of Microsoft

Office Excel software. The survey identified demographic data for each participant. Demographic data included: range of age; a range of the total number of years in education; a range of the size of the student population of the district; a range of the building student enrollment; the capacity that they serve the school (principal or assistant principal); and, a range of the number of years as a principal and/or assistant principal. The components of the demographic data were carefully reviewed and selected to reduce the probability of identifying a participant of the study through an analysis of the data. The second section of the survey identified impediments that prevented a building level administrator from teaching. The third section of the survey focused on impediments that prevented a building level administrator from co-teaching. The fourth section gathered data about the supports that needed to be in place for them to consider teaching one class per day. Finally, the last two sections collected data about possible benefits of being a teaching principal and the possible benefits of being a co-teaching principal.

The qualitative exercise performed by the researcher of this dissertation was to ensure that the findings accurately reflected people's perceptions. Each interview began with the researcher collecting demographic data from each interviewee. The demographic data collected included: range of age; a range of the total number of years in education; a range of the size of the student population of the district; a range of the building student enrollment; the capacity that they serve the school (principal or assistant principal); and, a range of the number of years as a principal and or assistant principal. The components of the demographic data were carefully reviewed and selected to reduce the probability of identifying a participant of the study through an analysis of the data.

The teaching building level administrators were then asked a set of questions related to their particular situation. The interview questions for the study were designed to discover perceived impediments that prevented a building level administrator from teaching, discover the elements that they believed needed to be in place for a principal to consider teaching on a regularly-scheduled basis, and to examine the building level administrators' perceptions whether teachers and their own perception of themselves as an instructional leader changed because they taught. One element that was specifically examined was co-teaching. Conducting qualitative research allowed the researcher to gain a total and complete picture of the building level administrators' teaching experience. Thus, the interview process examined specific elements that the teaching building level administrator considered to be viable solutions in aiding other principals in becoming a teaching principal. The interview concluded with the participant being allowed the opportunity to make any general comments about the role of a teaching principal.

This dissertation addressed the following questions about the teaching principal models:

1. What are the impediments that can be identified which prevent a principal or assistant principal from becoming a teaching or co-teaching building level administrator?
2. What elements need to be in place that would allow a principal or assistant principal the time to teach or co-teach on a recurring basis?
4. Do building level administrators believe teachers' perceptions of them will change if they teach or co-teach? If so, in what way(s)? Will the act of a

building level administrator teaching impact the perceptions of how he or she is perceived by teachers, parents, and community members?

Data Conclusions

What are the impediments that can be identified which prevent a principal or assistant principal from becoming a teaching or co-teaching building level administrator?

A heavy management workload was the greatest impediment which would prevent a building level administrator from both teaching and co-teaching. “A heavy management workload” was also identified by Kelley-Brockel (1998) and Flatt’s (1987) dissertations as an obstacle that would prevent principals from teaching. The survey information of k-6 building level administrators, interviews of current recently teaching building level administrators, and the results of the case study indicated the greatest impediment was “a heavy management workload.” The data from the 86 survey participants who replied found “a heavy management load” had a mean score which pointed toward an Agreed response. The mode was 1 which indicated the majority Strongly Agreed. All eight interview participants also agreed with this perception. “A heavy management workload” was one of two impediments upon which all eight interviewees agreed. During his 40 day co-teaching experience, the researcher did not experience “having a heavy management workload.” The researcher believes this was due to having a small k-3 student population, with very limited discipline issues and an extensive amount of administrative experience.

Another impediment that was identified which would prevent a building level administrator from both teaching and co-teaching was “the lack of time to plan effective

instruction.” The responses of 86 building level administrators had a mean score of 2.3 which indicated most of them chose the Agreed response. Another strong indicator was that a greater part of the building level administrators who completed the survey had selected Strongly Agree as their choice. Six of the eight teaching building level administrators interviewed also indicated “the lack of time to plan effective instruction” could be an impediment to becoming a teaching principal. During the case study, the researcher of this dissertation did not experience having difficulty planning for the lessons that he co-taught. The researcher would agree that if his student population was larger and he experienced additional student discipline and parent issues, the lack of time to plan for effective instruction could be an impediment that might prevent him from being a teaching or co-teaching building level administrator. However, Friend (2005), Walter-Thomas (1997), and Murawski (2008) suggested a solution could be for co-teaching partners to meet and plan during the summer and then to meet periodically during the school year. Stivers (2008) offers the recommendation that educators involved in co-teaching schedule a block of uninterrupted time, two to three hours each month to build new units of standards-based, differentiated lessons. Kohler-Evans (2006) believes a minimum of 45 minutes a week was required.

Data gathered through the survey and interview responses did not sustain “the lack of supports” as an impediment that would prevent them from teaching or co-teaching. The mean for “the lack of supports” indicated a response of Undecided with the mode also being a 4 (Undecided). The data indicated that “the lack of supports” would have little or no influence on the building level administrator teaching. Five of the eight teaching building level administrators interviewed indicated “the lack of supports”

could be an impediment to being a teaching principal. The five interviewees each indicated it was critical to have the support of the superintendent; one interviewee added that central administration would need to schedule district meetings and trainings to accommodate the teaching schedule. The researcher of this study did have the support of the superintendent and other central office administrators. During his co-teaching experience, to accommodate the administration meetings, he scheduled his teaching experience opposite the scheduled administrative meetings.

“Having no desire to teach” had survey responses that lead to a mean score with a response of Disagree. The mode for this impediment was also a 4 (Disagree). Four of the eight building level administrators interviewed indicated “having no interest in teaching” could be an impediment to being a teaching principal. Some principals have a desire to not want to teach or to work in a classroom setting were replies obtained from two separate interviewees during the interview process. Specifically one interviewee replied, “I believe I am the exception. Most principals I know do NOT want to teach.” The researcher also found the opposite was also true. Two of the interviewees who had recently been teaching building level administrators replied that they are searching for a way to support their desire to get back into the classroom to teach. “Having no desire to teach” was not an impediment for the researcher of this study. The results of the 40 day case study indicated the researcher’s desire to teach was very strong therefore reducing the impact of such an impediment.

There were two impediments listed in the survey that were indicated to have no impact on the building level administrators’ decision to teach or co-teach. “The lack of confidence to be an effective teacher” and “the lack of knowledge about effective

teaching strategies” each had a mean score that supported a response of Strongly Disagree. The mode for both of these impediments was a 5 (Strongly Disagree). Only one of the eight building level administrators interviewed indicated “having a lack of confidence to be an effective teacher” could be an impediment to being a teaching principal. The lone interviewee that responded indicated, “If they teach and do a poor job they could lose face on both sides.” None of the eight building level administrators interviewed indicated “the lack of knowledge about effective teaching practices” would be an impediment to being a teaching principal. The case study results agreed with both the quantitative and qualitative data collected. Throughout the length of the case study, the researcher experienced neither “the lack of confidence to be an effective teacher,” nor “the lack of knowledge about effective teaching strategies” as impediments. The researcher’s prior teaching experience and training on effective teaching strategies gave the researcher confidence to return to the classroom. On several different occasions, he was able to direct the lesson with the substitute teacher who was filling in for the co-teaching partner. The researcher and his co-teaching partner also had conversations about the structure of the lessons and how to make them better. He also shared his knowledge about the use of different co-teaching approaches to enhance the lessons.

What elements need to be in place that would allow a principal or assistant principal the time to teach or co-teach on a recurring basis?

The participants of this study identified four supports that would allow a building level administrator the time to teach or co-teach on a recurring basis. The quantitative and qualitative data indicated the building level administrators identified “having additional administrative office support” would help principals and assistant principals

contemplate teaching. A second support that could have a positive influence on their decision to teach was to “have a teacher with whom they could exchange roles.” “Co-teaching” was recognized as a third support that would make it possible for a building level administrator to teach. A fourth support “having the support of the central office” was deemed to be very important. The researcher believed “having additional administrative office support,” “exchanging jobs with another teacher,” and “co-teaching” were viable solutions to helping a principal find time to teach. The researcher considered “having central office support” to be imperative if a building level administrator wanted to teach. Even though the researcher’s teaching experience focused on “co-teaching” as the support structure, he was able to draw some parallel conclusions for “additional administrative office support” and “exchanging jobs with another teacher” to his teaching experience through the comments of several of the interviewees.

The building level administrators who participated in this study indicated that “having additional administrative office support” would help principals and assistant principals contemplate teaching. During the 40 day case study, he did not feel the need to “have additional administrative office support.” The researcher had a vast number of years of administrative experience. The student population of the researcher’s school was also considered small with 360 total students. The student population of the researcher’s school was comparable to the size of the schools in Flatt’s (1987) dissertation which studied five teaching principals in Tennessee. In addition, he experienced very few discipline issues on a regular basis. The researcher’s current administrative situation concurred with several teaching building level administrators who were interviewed. Several interviewees responded that it depended on the size of

the school. One interviewee commented that because his building had a small student population he would not get additional administrative support. However, he added that in larger buildings, especially those buildings with 500+ students, it would help principals to consider teaching.

Even though the researcher's case study did not focus on "exchanging jobs with a teacher," the data sources indicate that it could be a useful support that could benefit both individuals. A similar positive co-teaching experience led the researcher to agree with the building level administrators who were interviewed. The benefit of this support included the teacher experiencing some of the responsibilities of a principal and the principal did not have to worry about what was going on in the building while teaching. The researcher embraced the suggestion of one of the interviewees that it was a good idea if the teacher with whom the exchange would occur would also be working toward an administrative degree. The researcher is also including the specific topic of "exchanging jobs with a teacher" as a recommendation for further study.

Both the building level administrators who completed the survey and the teaching building level administrators who were interviewed agreed that "co-teaching" was a viable solution. The researcher's positive "co-teaching" experiences led him to also agree. The researcher was able to work with a very good teacher who had a similar philosophy about teaching and discipline. This idea concurred with a comment made by one of the interviewees that for "co-teaching" to work well, both the building level administrator and the teacher had to have equivalent philosophy and beliefs about discipline. Friend (2005) agreed and stressed that co-teaching partners needed to have the same teaching philosophies, teaching skills, beliefs and convictions about discipline.

During the 40 day teaching experience, the researcher exhibited few interruptions while in the classroom teaching. Even though the researcher did not have to leave the classroom, the researcher agreed with a comment made by one interview candidate that if the administrator had to suddenly leave the classroom to take care of an administrative matter, he/she would not have to find a substitute to cover the class, and student learning would continue for the students because the “co-teaching” partner could carry on with the lesson.

The building level administrators who completed the survey agreed that “having additional central administrative office support” would allow them to consider teaching. A majority of the teaching building level administrators concurred. The 40 day co-teaching experience of the researcher led him to agree that “having additional central administrative office support” was a very important support that allowed him to teach. The researcher had the direct approval of the superintendent and the assistant superintendent of support services to conduct his study which included a teaching experience. Without the support and cooperation of the central administrative office, the researcher would not have been able to teach. At the beginning of his teaching experience, the researcher witnessed several interruptions to his teaching that were caused by other central office administrators’ scheduled trainings and appointments during the time he planned to teach. Upon reminding the central administrative office personnel that the researcher was teaching at a specific time of the school day, they were able to reschedule several meetings and training opportunities opposite the teaching time. When there was no option to work around the researcher’s schedule, the researcher was permitted to miss or attend the training at another time.

Do building level administrators believe teachers' perceptions of them will change if they teach or co-teach? If so, in what way(s)? Will the act of a building level administrator teaching impact the perceptions of how he or she is perceived by teachers, parents, and community members?

The quantitative and qualitative data indicated that the building level administrators who participated in this study believed the positive benefits of teaching would include “Increased credibility about a ‘classroom’ instructional initiative introduced,” “Increased credibility about the principal’s ability to lead an effective school,” “Improved relations with the teachers in their school,” and “Increased confidence of the principal as an educational leader.” The results of the survey data showed that each category had a mean score that indicated a response of Agree. The mode for all four categories was a 1 (Strongly Agree).

The results of the case study conform with the results of the quantitative and qualitative data results about the benefits of being a teaching principal. The data from the surveys, interviews, and case study also indicated that building level administrators believed their credibility increased in relation to “classroom” instructional initiatives that were introduced. Additionally, “increased credibility about the principal’s ability to lead an effective school” was the result of this instructional leadership practice. Two additional benefits identified were “improved relationships with the teachers in their school” and “increased confidence in the principal as an educational leader.” The results about teacher perceptions of teaching principals were similar to the findings in Lare’s (1995) study involving teaching principals.

During the researcher's teaching experience, he had conversations about the different strengths and weaknesses of the current research based reading program being used in the researcher's district with different grade level teachers. The researcher's interaction had a positive outcome. The researcher believed his use of the research-based reading program during his co-teaching experience enhanced his credibility with his teachers.

The co-teaching experience gave the researcher several opportunities to interject his thoughts during conversations with different members of his teaching staff during data team meetings and district training sessions. The researcher believed as a result of his teaching experience, there was an increase in his credibility when he led a discussion about how the information would allow teachers to continue the academic excellence currently being exhibited on district and state assessments.

The researcher also agreed that a third benefit achieved through his teaching experience was "an improved relationship" with several of his teachers. Although the researcher believed he had a good relationship with his teaching staff before his case study began. During the researcher's case study, the researcher felt the one teacher with whom he directly strengthened his relationship was the teacher who shared the co-teaching experience. The co-teaching experience gave the researcher an opportunity to share responsibilities such as planning lesson and delivering instruction to students. When the teacher with whom he was co-teaching was absent, the researcher was able to work with the substitute teacher to ensure the main objectives of the lesson were met. On one occasion, the co-teacher said she enjoyed sharing knowledge and ideas about effective reading and writing practices with the researcher. The researcher also believes

an end result of his co-teaching experience was that his co-teaching partner and the other teachers in his building have developed an increased confidence in him as an educational leader.

Even though this dissertation focused primarily on teachers' perceptions related to a teaching building level administrator, this study also collected data associated with administrators' perceptions of parents, students, and community members' perceptions linked to a teaching building level administrator. The survey participants responses of the parent, student, and community members' perceptions related to a teaching principals had mean scores that indicated a response of Agree with a mode of 2 (Agree). The same can be noticed of all the survey participants responses about parent, student, and community members' perceptions as related to co-teaching except parent and community members' perceptions associated to "Improved Relationships" and community members perceptions in the category "Increased confidence as an educational leaders." The data illustrates the replies for these questions received a mean score closer to a response of Agree. However, the mode for these replies was a 3 (Undecided). The responses of the building level administrators who were interviewed about parents, students, and community members were not as strong as their perceptions of the positive influence a teaching principal would have on teachers. Finally, both the quantitative data and qualitative data indicated a majority of the building level administrators who participated in this study agreed "a benefit of being a teaching principal was increased teacher morale" and "an increased empathy for teacher responsibilities."

As a part of this study, the Superintendent and Assistant Superintendent of the School District "A" were asked to discuss the perceptions of various individuals directly,

and indirectly, associated with the researcher's case study. Prior to conducting the interviews, the participants were made aware that at no time would their name and/or any information that would directly relate a perception to a specific individual be shared with the researcher. Individuals in the interview process included board members, parents, PTA representatives, support personnel, and teachers.

The interviewees found the perceptions of individuals, in reference to teachers, to be very interesting. All interview participants felt the practice of an administrator teaching in the classroom to be very productive. Individuals felt the administrator would be more aware of what was going on in the classroom which would, in return, enable the administrator to be in a position to make better decisions. A teaching principal, from a teacher's perception, would also be able to identify, develop, and provide better professional development. Finally, from the teacher's view, a better understanding would be gained as far as the current workload of the classroom teacher.

The parents' perceptions were rather parallel to the teachers. Parents felt this exercise would give the teaching principal a more in-depth perception of what was actually taking place in the classroom. Two very interesting concerns were expressed, when discussing this process. First, parents expressed a concern that there needed to be a balance in the process, to avoid a situation in which an administrator was not capable of performing his or her administrative duties due to the time spent preparing and actually teaching within the classroom. A second concern expressed from parents was the limited number of students that this activity may have. Only the students within the actual classroom would be impacted by the teaching principal. It was suggested by one parent

that the administrator consider developing a rotating schedule, to teach throughout the entire building for several cycles within the school year.

Finally, although no students were interviewed in the process, all of the interviewees felt a teaching principal would have a much greater positive impact on students. Ironically, one parent noted that this would depend on the personality and the ability for the administrator to teach. She quickly noted that not all administrators were good teachers. The teaching principal would give the students the opportunity to see their principal in a different role and, therefore, would allow them to approach the individual from a different capacity. Again, narrowing the activity to one classroom would limit the exposure from more students, and an alternating teaching assignment was suggested to benefit a greater portion of the school population.

All interview participants felt the researcher of this study did an excellent job by implementing such an activity. Numerous individuals expressed their happiness that he was continuing the practice of co-teaching.

Recommendations for Further Study

There are very few studies performed on the subject of teaching principals. This study identified impediments, support, and looked at principals' perceptions of the benefits derived from having a building level administrator who taught on a reoccurring basis. Like the past studies by Flatt (1987), Lare (1995), and Kelley-Brockel (1998), this dissertation only examined a small population of building level administrators. The survey portion of this dissertation is limited to kindergarten through sixth grade elementary principals and assistant principals located in two Intermediate Units located in

Northeastern Pennsylvania. The recommendations for further study are based on this study's results:

1. Since this dissertation focused on k-6 elementary principals and assistant principals, questions might be raised whether the findings of this dissertation are valid in a middle school or high school setting. A recommendation for further study would be to implement the same study in a grade 7 through a grade 12 environment.
2. The focus of this dissertation has been building level administrator. A recommendation for further study would be the same study with a focus on central administration.
3. This study did not include non-public school administrators. A study in the non-public school arena may provide different results.
4. An additional recommendation for further study would be to implement the study on a larger demographic parameter or to select a "large school/small school" or "urban school/rural school" comparison.
5. Although specific demographic information was collected as a part of this study; no correlation statistics were implemented which may demonstrate another perspective on individuals' perceptions. A recommendation for further study would be to examine specific demographic traits such as administrative capacity (principal or assistant principal), their age, total years in education, years of experience as an administrator, the student population of their district, or the student population of the school where they are a building level administrator in relationship to recent or current teaching building level

administrators.

6. With the emphasis on high stakes testing, revisit Lare's (1995) study and recruit several building level administrators to conduct individual case studies to determine the impact of a co-teaching building administrator upon faculty/administrator relationships, student/administrator relationships, administrator job satisfaction, and raising student achievement.
7. This dissertation included the researcher co-teaching with one teacher over an eight week period of time. A recommendation for further study is to have the researcher co-teach with different teachers in different grade levels over a longer span of time to examine the impact a co-teaching building level administrator will have and to determine if it has the same or different results of this study. This was a suggestion discovered as a result of the interview of elementary School B community members by the superintendent and assistant superintendent of human resource and support services.
8. A study of teaching principals to compare those who choose the role of a building level administrator and those who were hired to be teaching building level administrators. The focus could be to compare the perceived and actual benefits and barriers of being a teaching building level administrator.
9. One of the interviewees of this study indicated that when he was a principal of a high school, he and both of his assistants taught a class on a reoccurring basis. A recommendation for further study is to perform a re-creation of this case study in a setting where all the building level administrators of a middle school or high school become teaching principals.

10. Recruit four building level administrators to perform individual case studies on exchanging jobs with a classroom teacher. The focus would be to determine if exchanging jobs with a classroom teacher would be a viable support to allow a building level administrator to teach on a reoccurring basis. This study could also seek information about how this job exchange would impact different teacher, student, parent, and other community member's perceptions of the building level administrator as an instructional leader.

Summary

This study examined impediments that could be a barrier to a building level administrator teaching on a reoccurring basis. The study also identified elements that would support a building level administrator's decision to teach. Finally, this study investigated principals' perceptions of the effect the act of teaching would have primarily on teachers.

The results of this study indicated that having a heavy management workload and the lack of time to plan for effective instruction were two key impediments that would prevent a building level administrator from teaching or co-teaching on a reoccurring basis. The identified elements that would support an administrators' decision to teach included: additional administrative office support; central office administrative support; a teacher with whom the principal could exchange roles and the act of co-teaching with another teacher. The data also indicated that principals believed: increased credibility about a "classroom" instructional initiative introduced; increased credibility about the principal's ability to lead an effective school; improved relations with the teachers in their school; and, increased confidence in the principal as an educational leader are all

benefits that can result from a building level administrator who chooses to teach on a reoccurring basis.

However, it should also be noted that being a teaching building level administrator may not be for every principal. Those building level administrators who do not have a strong desire to teach because they lack confidence or do not possess an adequate knowledge about effective teaching skills should be cautious about returning to the classroom to teach. Doing a poor job teaching could have a detrimental effect on a principal's ability to lead his or her school.

With teachers being asked to continuously improve their teaching practice by learning and then implementing new research-based programs, having a building level administrator who teaches on a reoccurring basis would positively affect the teachers' morale and willingness to continue to improve their practice. A principal who teaches on a reoccurring basis would also experience the same challenges that his or her teachers face daily. The act of teaching would give the administrator insight into the different types of training that would be beneficial to his or her staff. Finally, in today's economic situation, school districts may need to place administrators into a teaching setting. It is this researcher's prediction that the educational pendulum may be returning to the time in educational history when the leader of a school may be required to serve in a dual role of master teacher and building manager by becoming a teaching building level administrator. If teaching principals become a realization of our educational future, the data and information contained in this dissertation would prove extremely valuable in promoting a successful transition.

REFERENCES

- Achilles, C. M. (1987). A vision of better schools. In W. Greenfield (Ed.), *Instructional leadership: Concepts, issues, and controversies*. Newton, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Barth, R. (1988). School, a community of leaders. In A. Lieberman (Ed), *Building a professional culture in schools* (pp. 129-147). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Barth, R. (1990). *Improving school from within: Teachers, parents, and principals can make a difference*. San Francisco and Oxford: Jossey-Bass.
- Bearse, G. A. (1985). The principal as a master teacher. *NASSP Bulletin*, 69(480), 96-97.
- Beck, L. G., & Murphy, J. (1993). *Understanding the principalship: Metaphorical Themes 1920s-1990s*. New York: Teacher College Press.
- Becker, H. (1989). Tricks of the trade. *Studies in Symbolic Interaction*, 10, 481-490.
- Bennis, W. (1989). *On becoming a leader*. New York: Addison-Wesley.
- Blasé, J., & Blasé, Jo. (2000). Effective instructional leadership: Teachers' perspectives on how principals promote teaching and learning in school. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 38(2), 130-141.
- Blumberg, A ., & Greenfield, W. (1986). *The effective principal: Perspectives on school leadership*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon Inc.
- Boleman, L., & Deal, T. (1991). *Reforming organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bredeson, P. V. (1985). An analysis of metaphorical perspectives on school principals. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 21, 29-59.
- Brookover, W., & Lezotte, L. (1982). *Creating effective schools*. Holmes Beach, FL: Learning Publication.
- Burrello, L. (Producer), Burrello, J. (Producer), & Friend, M. (Producer and Writer). (2005). *The power of 2: Making a difference through co-teaching* [DVD]. United States: Elephant Rock Productions.
- Bush, T. (1995). *Theories of educational management*. London: Paul Chapman.

- Campbell, R. F., Fleming, T., Newell, L. J., & Bennion, J. W. (1987). *A history of thought and practice in educational administration*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Callahan, R. (1962). *Education and the cult of efficiency*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. (1986). *A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century*. Washington DC: The Task Force on Teaching as a Profession. ED 268 120.
- Conderman, G., & Bresnahan, V. (2007). Co-teaching that works. *New Teacher Advocate*. Indianapolis, IN: Kappa Delta Pi.
- Conderman, G., Johnson-Rodriguez, S., & Hartman, P. (2009). Communicating and collaborating in co-taught classrooms. *Teaching Exceptional Children Plus*, 5(5) Article 3. Retrieved October 15, 2009 from <http://escholarship.bc.edu/tecplus/vol5/iss5/art3>
- Cook, L., & Friend, M. (1995). Co-teaching guidelines for creating effective practices. *Focus on Exceptional Children*, 28 (2), 1-12.
- Cook, L., & Friend, M. (1996). *Interactions: Collaborative skills for school professionals* (2nd ed.). White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Cubberley, E. P. (1934). *Public education in the United States: A study and interpretation of American educational history* (rev. ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Culbertson, J. A. (1988). A century's quest for a knowledge base. In N. J. Boyan (Ed), *Handbook of research on educational administration* (pp. 3-26). New York: Longman.
- Day, C. (2000). Effective leadership and reflective practice. *Reflective Practice*, 1(1), 113-128.
- Deal, T. E. (1987). Effective school principals: Counselors, engineers, pawnbrokers, poets... or instructional leaders? In W. Greenfield (Ed.), *Instructional leadership: Concepts, issues, and controversies*. Newton, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Dembrowski, F. (2007). The changing roles of leadership and management in educational administration education commission of the states task force on education for economic growth (1983). *Action for excellence: A comprehensive plan to improve our nation's schools*. Washington, DC: Education Commission of the States.

- Denzin, N., & Lincoln, Y. (1998). Introduction: Entering the field of qualitative research. In Norman Denzin & Yvonna Lincoln (Eds.), *The landscape of qualitative research: theories and issues* (pp.1-34). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- DuFour, R. (2002). The learning-centered principal. *Educational Leadership*, 59(8), 12-15.
- Education Commission of the States. Task force on education for economic growth. (1983). *Action for excellence: A comprehensive plan to improve our nation's schools*. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.
- Elmore, R. (1997). *Investing in teacher learning: Staff development and instructional improvement in community school district #2, New York City*. New York: National Commission on Teaching and America's Future.
- Flatt, J. Y. (1987). A descriptive analysis of the task behavior of elementary school teaching principals (Doctoral dissertation, Vanderbilt University, 1987). *Dissertation Abstract International*, 48, AAT8723886.
- Flath, B. (1989). The principal as instructional leader. *APA Magazines*, 69(4), 19-49
- Frase, L., & Hetzel, R. (1990). *School management by wandering around*. Lancaster, PA: Technomic.
- Fraser, J. W. (1997). *Reading writing and justice: School reform as if democracy matters*. New York: State University of New York.
- Friedman, T. (2005). *The world is flat: A brief history of the twenty-first century*. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux.
- Friend, M. (2005). *Power of 2, Second Edition video*. The Forum on Education at Indiana University.
- Friend, M., & Cook, L. (2007). *Interactions: Collaboration skills for school professionals* (5th ed.). Boston: Pearson.
- Fullan, M. (1991). *The new meaning of educational change*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Gately, S., & Gately, F. (2001). Understanding coteaching components. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 33(4), 40-47
- Gay, L. R., & Airasian, P. (2000). *Educational leadership*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Giles, H. H. (1945). *What group planning means. In groups planning in education*. Washington, DC: NEA.

- Grady, M. L. (1990). The teaching principal. *Research in Rural Education*, 6(3), 49-52.
- Griffin, G. A. (1988). The future of teaching: Imperatives and possibilities. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 65(3), 74-87.
- Goldring, D. B., & Rallis, S. F. (1993). *Principals of dynamic schools: Taking charge of change*. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press.
- Goleman, D., Boyatziz, R., & McKee, A. (2002). *Primal leadership: Realizing the power of emotional intelligence*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- Guba, E. (1981). Criteria for assessing the trustworthiness of naturalistic inquiries. *Educational Communication and Technology Journal*, 2, 75-92.
- Hackman, D. G., & Berry, J. E. (2000). Understanding coteaching components. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 33(4), 40-47.
- Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. F. (1986). Instructional leadership in effective schools. *Elementary School Journal*, 86(2), 217-247.
- Hildenbrand, S. M. (2009). Designing effective experiences for preservice inclusion teachers for co-teaching: An action research study (Doctoral dissertation, University of Rochester, 2009). *Dissertation Abstract International*, 70, AAT3367263.
- Jamentz, K. (2002). *Isolation is the enemy of improvement: Instructional leadership To support standards-based practice*. San Francisco: WestEd.
- Keefe, E., Moore, V., & Duff, F. (2004). The four “knows” of collaborative teaching. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 36(5), 36-41.
- Kelley-Brockel, K. F. (1998). A study of teaching principals in public education. (Doctoral dissertation, Lehigh University, 1998). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 60, AAT9916056.
- Knezevich, S. J. (1975). *Administration of public education*. New York: Harper & Row.
- King, D. (2002). The changing shape of leadership. *Educational Leadership*, 59(8), 61-63.
- Kohler-Evans, P. (2006). Co-teaching: How to make this marriage work in front of the kids. *Education*, 127 (2), 260-264
- Kowalski, T. J., & Reitzug, U. C. (1993). *Contemporary school administration: An Introduction*. New York: Longman Publishing Group.

- Lare, D. (1995). The teaching principal in public schools: A qualitative study of the impact based upon selected measures (Doctoral dissertation, Lehigh University, 1995). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 56, AA19519842.
- Lashway, L. (2002). *Developing instructional leaders*. Eric Digest, ERIC Clearinghouse on Educational Management, Eugene, OR. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 305 134)
- Leithwood, K. A., & Montgomery, D. J. (1982). The role of the principal in program development. *Review of Educational Research*, 52(3), 309-339.
- Lévi-Strauss, C. (1963). *La "pensée sauvage" et le structuralisme*. Paris: Esprit.
- Lipham, J. M., & Hoeh, J. A. (1974). *The principalship: Foundations and functions*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Little, J. W., & Bird, T. (1987). Instructional leadership “close to the classroom” in secondary schools. In W. Greenfield (Ed.) *Instructional leadership: Concepts, issues, and controversies* (pp 118-138). Newton, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- Louis, K. S., Kruse, S., & Marks, H. M. (1996). School-wide professional community: Teachers work, intellectual quality and commitment . In F. W. Newmann (Ed.), *Authentic achievement: Restructuring schools for intellectual quality* (pp. 179-203). San Francisco: Jossey –Bass.
- MacGilchrist, B., Myers, K., & Reed, J. (1997). *The intelligent school*. London: Paul Chapman.
- Marshall, K. (1993). Teachers and school-what makes the difference: A principal’s perspective. *Daedalus*, 122. 209-241.
- Mastropieri, M., Scruggs, T. Graetz, J., Norland, J., Gardizi, W., McDuffie, K. (2005). Case studies in co-teaching in the content areas: Successes, failures, and challenges. *Intervention in School & Clinic*, 40(5), 260-270.
- McREL (2005). *Final Report: High-Needs Schools – What Does it Take to Beat the Odds?* (Technical Report). Aurora, CO: Mid-continent for Education and Learning.
- McRobbie, J. (1990). *The rural teaching principal: Meeting the challenges of multiple roles*. San Francisco: Far West Lab for Educational Research and Development. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 305 134)
- Mottier, V. (2005). The interpretive turn: History, memory, and storage in qualitative research. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 6(2), Art. 33.

- Murawski, W. (2008). Five keys to co-teaching in inclusive classrooms. *School Administration*, 65(8), 29-29.
- Murphy, J. F. (1994). Redefining the principalship in restructuring schools. *NASSP Bulletin*, 78(560), 94-99.
- Murphy, J. F., Hallinger, P., Weil, M., & Mitman, A. (1983). Instructional leadership. A conceptual framework. *Planning and Changing*, 14(3), 137-149.
- National Commission on Excellence in Educational Administration. (1987). *Leaders for America's schools*. Tempe, AZ: University Council for Educational Administration.
- Neil, P., Carlisle, K., Knipe, D., & McEwen, A. (2001). Principals in action: An analysis of school leadership. *Research in Education*, 66, 40-53.
- Parker, D. C. (1986). *From conventional wisdom to concept: School administration text 1934-1945*. Danville, IL: Interstate.
- Phi Delta Kappan. (1982). *The role of the principal*. Bloomington, IN: Author.
- Phillips, J. (2010). *Manager-administrator to instructional leader: Shift in the role of the school principal*. Retrieved May 5, 2010 from <http://peoplelearn.homestead.com/PrincipalInstrucLeader.htm>
- Pierce, P. R. (1935). *The origin and development of the public school principalship*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Reeves, D. B. (2004). *Accountability for learning*. Alexandria: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Ripley, S. (1997). *Collaboration between general and special education teachers*. (Report No. EDO-SP-56-5). Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research and Improvement. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 409 317)
- Robinson, G. E. (1985). *Effectives schools research: A guide to school improvement*. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service.
- Roe, W. H., & Drake, T. L. (1974). *The principalship*. New York: Macmillan.
- Samuels, C. A. (2008). Managers help principals balance time. *Education Week*, 27 (23), 1, 18-19.
- Schmoker, M. J., & Wilson, R. B. (1993). *Total quality education: Profiles of schools that demonstrate that power of Deming's management principals*. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappan.

- Scruggs, T., Mastropieri, M., & McDuffie, K. (2007). Co-teaching in inclusive classrooms: A metasynthesis of qualitative research. *Exceptional Children*, 73(4), 392-416.
- Sergiovanni, T. J., & Carver, F. D. (1973). *The new school executive: A theory of administration*. New York: Dodd, Mead.
- Sergiovanni, T. J., & Corbally, J. E. (Eds.). (1984). *Leadership and organizational culture: New perspectives on administrative theory and practice*.
- Stivers, J. (2008). Strengthening your co-teaching relationship. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, 44(2), 121-125.
- Solow, S. S. (1995). *The nature and scope of curricular roles and responsibilities of elementary principals: A case study of principals with district-wide curriculum leadership functions* (Doctorial Dissertation, Lehigh University, 1995). Dissertation Abstracts International, 56, AAI9531007.
- Sorcher, M., & Brant, J. (2002). Are you picking the right leaders? *Harvard Business Review*, 80(2), 78-85, 128.
- Tichy, N. (1997). *The leadership engine: How winning companies build leaders at every level*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Tomasetti, B. W. (2007). Instructional leadership: Pennsylvania principals' self perception in times of legislated accountability (Doctorial dissertation, East Stroudsburg University and Indiana University of Pennsylvania, 2007). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 68, AAT3259382.
- Tyack, D. B., & Hansot, E. (1982). *Managers of virtue: Public school leadership in America, 1920-1980*. New York: Basic Books.
- United States Department of Education, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education. (2002). *Title I—Improving the academic achievement of the disadvantaged; 34 CFR part 200, final regulations*. Federal Register 67, No. 231.
- Walther-Thomas, C. (1997). Co-teaching experiences: The benefits and problems that teachers and principals report over time. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 30(4), 395-407 .
- Villa, R. A., Thousand, J. S., & Nevin, A. I. (2004). *A guide to co-teaching: Practical tips for facilitating student learning*. California: Corwin Press.
- Weaver, T. W. (1971). The delphi forecasting method. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 52, 267-272.

- Weindling, D. (1990). The secondary school head teacher: New principals in the United Kingdom. *National Association of secondary Scholl Principals Bulletin*, 74(526), 40-45.
- Welsh, M., Brownell, K., & Sheridan, S. (1999). What's the score and game plan on teaming in schools? A review of the literature on team teaching and school-based problem-solving teams. *Remedial & Special Education*, 20(1), 36-49.
- Whitaker, T. (2003). *What great principals do differently: Fifteen things that matter most*. New York: Eye On Education, Inc.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

School District “A” Elementary Principal Position Description

SCHOOL DISTRICT “A” ELEMENTARY PRINCIPAL POSITION DESCRIPTION

Title: Elementary Principal

Reports to: Superintendent

Supervises: Directly:
Indirectly:

Position Goal: Serve as the educational leader at the Elementary school. Manage all aspects of building operations for staff, parents, students, and community. Oversee the building budgeting, discipline, instruction, communication, supervision of facilities, and carry out state, federal, and School Board mandates.

Primary Duties and Responsibilities:

1. Oversee the selection, supervision and evaluation of building staff.
2. Oversee the building budget preparation and expenditures of school funds.
3. Schedule and coordinate curricular and co-curricular activities and preparation of calendar.
4. Oversee building safety and security procedures.
5. Prepare and submit all reports and required paperwork appropriate to administration of the school on a timely basis.
6. Foster a positive learning environment for staff and students.
7. Oversee administration of contracts and policy as it relates to school personnel.
8. Maintain good public relations and open communications with the community.
9. Provide leadership for professional improvement by maintaining an awareness of current trends through memberships in professional organizations, journal subscriptions, and attendance of workshops and conferences.
10. Maintain good discipline standards in the school and on the school bus.
11. Participate as a member of the school district administrative team and support and facilitate school district goals.

12. Participate in the school district's administrative staff professional development program.

ADDITIONAL RESPONSIBILITIES: Performs other duties as assigned by the Superintendent.

TERMS OF EMPLOYMENT: 12 month, Administration, Act 93, exempt

QUALIFICATIONS: Proper Pennsylvania administrative certification is necessary. A minimum of five (5) years experience in public education, including elementary or secondary school instruction. Building level leadership experience preferred. Excellent communication skills.

PHYSICAL CAPABILITIES: Position requires sitting, standing, walking, moving throughout the district, often for extended periods of the workday. Must be able to hear (40 decibel loss maximum), verbally communicate and see with near acuity of 20 inches or less and far acuity of 20 feet or more with a depth perception, accommodation and field of vision. Performs a variety of duties, able to make judgments and work under high levels of stress. Subject to environmental conditions.

REVISED: May, 2007

APPENDIX B

Survey Instrument

Demographic Information

The following questionnaire has been created to gather information related to teaching and non-teaching principals. Please select a response for each question based on your experience as an administrator. The survey should be placed in the self-addressed/stamped envelope provided with the survey and returned upon completion. In order to maintain confidentiality, please do not return any other documents with the survey. Thank you.

1. Age

25 to 34.9 35 to 44.9 45 to 54.9 55 or above

2. Total number of years in education

10 years or fewer 11 to 20 21 to 30 31 to 40 above 40

3. In what capacity do you serve your school system?

Principal Assistant Principal

4. Total number of years as a principal and or assistant principal

5 years or fewer 6 to 10 11 to 15 16 to 20 above 20

5. Student enrollment (Please refer to the next page to properly identify your district's overall student population. Please do not make any markings on the reference page.)

less than 2500 2500 to 4999 5000 to 7499 7500 or above

6. Student enrollment of building

less than 250 250 to 499 499 to 749 750 to 999 1000 or above

Reference Page

Please refer to this page to properly identify your district's overall student population. Enrollment projections have been prepared by the Pennsylvania department of Education in July 2008. Please do not make any markings on this page.

Intermediate Unit #20:	Enrollment:
Bangor Area School District	3,593
Bethlehem Area School District	15,306
Delaware Valley School District	5,830
East Stroudsburg Area School District	8,241
Nazareth Area School District	4,732
Northampton Area School District	5,741
Pen Argyl Area School District	1,924
Pleasant Valley School District	6,399
Pocono Mountain School District	11,506
Saucon Valley School District	2,444
Stroudsburg Area School District	5,910
Wilson Area School District	2,285
Intermediate Unit #21:	Enrollment:
Allentown School District	17,892
Catasauqua Area School District	1,664
East Penn School District	8,069
Jim Thorpe Area School District	2,105
Lehigh Area School District	2,568
Northern Lehigh School District	2,059
Northwestern Lehigh School District	2,378
Palmerton School District	1,995
Panther Valley School District	1,695
Parkland School District	9,186
Salisbury Township School District	1,795
Southern Lehigh School District	3,101
Weatherly Area School District	737
Whitehall-Copley School District	4,352

SURVEY QUESTIONS:

1. Have you ever taught a course in the building while simultaneously serving as a principal?
Yes No (If you picked “No”. Please continue skip to question 8)
2. Are you currently teaching and what content area?
Yes No Subject _____
3. In what capacity/capacities do/did you teach?
Substitute Tutor Subject teacher Co-teacher Teaching Assistant
4. How many weeks during the school year do/did you teach?
Between 1-4 weeks 4-8 weeks 8-12 weeks 12-16 weeks more than 16 weeks
5. How many minutes per day do/did you teach?
30-45 minutes per day 45 minutes to 1 hour per day 1 – 2 hours per day
more than 2 hours per day
6. How many days per week do/did you teach?
1 2 3 4 5
7. How many course/subjects do/did you teach per day?
1 2 3 4 or more

Impediments that prevent you from teaching

Please respond to the series of survey questions using the following Likert scale options:

A: Strongly Agree, **B:** Agree, **C:** Undecided, **D:** Disagree, **E:** Strongly Disagree

An impediment that prevents me from teaching:

- | | |
|--|------------------|
| 8. The lack of time to plan for effective instruction. | A B C D E |
| 9. A heavy management workload. | A B C D E |
| 10. The lack of supports. | A B C D E |
| 11. Having no interest in teaching. | A B C D E |
| 12. The lack of confidence to be an effective teacher. | A B C D E |
| 13. The lack of knowledge about effective teaching strategies. | A B C D E |

Impediments that prevent you from co-teaching

Please respond to the series of survey questions using the following Likert scale options:

A: Strongly Agree, **B:** Agree, **C:** Undecided, **D:** Disagree, **E:** Strongly Disagree

An impediment that prevents me from co-teaching:

- | | |
|---|------------------|
| 14. The lack of time to plan for effective instruction. | A B C D E |
| 15. A heavy management workload. | A B C D E |
| 16. The lack of supports. | A B C D E |
| 17. Having no interest in co-teaching. | A B C D E |
| 18. The lack of confidence to be an effective co-teacher | A B C D E |
| 19. The lack of knowledge about effective co-teaching strategies. | A B C D E |

Supports needed to be in place for you to consider teaching one class per day

Please respond to the series of survey questions using the following Likert scale options:

A: Strongly Agree, **B:** Agree, **C:** Undecided, **D:** Disagree, **E:** Strongly Disagree

I would consider teaching one class per day if:

- | | |
|---|------------------|
| 20. I had additional clerical office support. | A B C D E |
| 21. I had additional administrative office support. | A B C D E |
| 22. I had additional central administrative office support. | A B C D E |
| 23. I had a teacher with whom I could exchange roles. | A B C D E |
| 24. I could co-teach with another teacher. | A B C D E |

Possible benefits of being a teaching principal

Please respond to the series of survey questions using the following Likert scale options:

A: Strongly Agree, **B:** Agree, **C:** Undecided, **D:** Disagree, **E:** Strongly Disagree

Increased credibility on the part of _____ about the “classroom” instructional initiatives introduced by the principal is a benefit of being a teaching principal.

- | | |
|-----------------------|------------------|
| 25. teachers | A B C D E |
| 26. parents | A B C D E |
| 27. students | A B C D E |
| 28. community members | A B C D E |

Increased credibility with _____ about the principal's ability to lead an effective school is a benefit of being a teaching principal.

- | | |
|-----------------------|-----------|
| 29. teachers | A B C D E |
| 30. parents | A B C D E |
| 31. students | A B C D E |
| 32. community members | A B C D E |

Improved relationships with _____ are a benefit of being a teaching principal.

- | | |
|-----------------------|-----------|
| 33. teachers | A B C D E |
| 34. parents | A B C D E |
| 35. students | A B C D E |
| 36. community members | A B C D E |

An increase in confidence as an educational leader with _____ is a benefit of being a teaching principal.

- | | |
|-----------------------|-----------|
| 37. teachers | A B C D E |
| 38. parents | A B C D E |
| 39. students | A B C D E |
| 40. community members | A B C D E |

Possible benefits of being a co-teaching principal

Please respond to the series of survey questions using the following Likert scale options:

A: Strongly Agree, **B:** Agree, **C:** Undecided, **D:** Disagree, **E:** Strongly Disagree

Increased credibility on the part of _____ about the "Classroom" instructional initiatives introduced by the principal is a benefit of being a co-teaching principal.

- | | |
|-----------------------|-----------|
| 41. teachers | A B C D E |
| 42. parents | A B C D E |
| 43. students | A B C D E |
| 44. community members | A B C D E |

Increased credibility with _____ about the principal's ability to lead an effective school is a benefit of being a co-teaching principal.

- | | |
|-----------------------|-----------|
| 45. teachers | A B C D E |
| 46. parents | A B C D E |
| 47. students | A B C D E |
| 48. community members | A B C D E |

Improved relationships with _____ are a benefit of being a co-teaching principal.

49. teachers A B C D E

50. parents A B C D E

51. students A B C D E

52. community members A B C D E

An increase in confidence as an educational leader with _____ is a benefit of being a co-teaching principal.

53. teachers A B C D E

54. parents A B C D E

55. students A B C D E

56. community members A B C D E

Teacher Morale/Teacher Empathy

Please respond to the series of survey questions using the following Likert scale options:

A: Strongly Agree, **B:** Agree, **C:** Undecided, **D:** Disagree, **E:** Strongly Disagree

57. *Increased teacher morale is a benefit of being a teaching principal.*

A B C D E

58. *Increased empathy for teacher responsibilities is a benefit of being a teaching principal.*

A B C D E

APPENDIX C

Superintendent/District Letter of Approval

SUPERINTENDENT/DISTRICT LETTER OF APPROVAL

**Examining the Work Elements and Impact of the Teaching Building Level
Administrator**

An East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania and Indiana University of Pennsylvania
Doctorial Dissertation
Gregory E. Shoemaker, Principal of Bushkill Elementary School, Nazareth Area School
District

July 2010

NAME
SCHOOL DISTRICT
Address

Dear _____,

My name is Gregory Shoemaker. I currently serve as the Principal of the Bushkill Elementary School in the Nazareth Area School District. Educationally, I have been working on obtaining my doctoral degree at East Stroudsburg University in collaboration with Indiana University of Pennsylvania. I am in the process of obtaining permission to gather data in reference to my study and would greatly appreciate if you would set aside a few minutes of what I know is valuable time to review this entire document. I am hopeful that you will support my research by approving for (DISTRICT'S NAME) administrators to participate in this study. If so, please sign the informed consent form and return it to my attention in the self-addressed stamped envelope.

Sincerely,

Gregory E. Shoemaker
Principal of Bushkill Elementary School
Nazareth Area School District
Educational Leadership Doctorial Student
East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania
Indiana University of Pennsylvania

This project has been approved by East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania
Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects

Dr. Shala Davis, IRB Administrator, (570) 422-3536 x3336
Dr. Joseph Miele, IRB Chair, (570) 422-3536 x3345

APPENDIX D

Superintendent/District Informed Consent Form

SUPERINTENDENT/DISTRICT CONSENT FORM

Research Description:

There is no question that Building Level Administrators play a critical role in creating and maintaining environments that support school improvement. The principal who once visited classrooms once or twice a year to determine if and how teachers are covering the curriculum are proving to be insufficient in raising student achievement. The No Child Left Behind legislation has influenced schools to implement different researched-based programs. Building level administrators are expected to lead their staff to make the necessary changes. Principals and assistant principals can expect some teacher resistance, which is a natural part of the change process. A staffs' confidence in the building level administrator's instructional ability can have a positive effect on the implementation of these researched-based programs. Currently, there are very few principals or assistant principals who teach a class as a regular part of their administrative day. Research indicates building level administrator's have the capacity to influence teachers to change their instructional practices. Some researchers believe the return of a principal to the classroom could be a possible solution. Perceived benefits of a building level administrator who teaches might include being able to create a more "academically successful" school. The act of the building level administrator teaching could also demonstrate to teachers, parents, community members and in some cases even students that they can model and perform the very same tasks that they expect their teachers to perform. Studies show that a building level administrator's work schedule is already packed with many tasks. The researcher of this study wants to identify impediments that prevent a building level administrator from teaching along with elements that would allow the building level administrators the ability to teach.

The sample population participants will be building level administrators currently employed within an intermediate unit located in Northeastern Pennsylvania. Building level administrators are defined as an individual with more than one semester as a principal and/or assistant principal. The research I will be conducting will be quantitative and qualitative in nature. Quantitatively, sample population participants will be asked to complete a survey. Questions in the survey are designed specifically to find out what principals beliefs are about a principal teaching. The survey should take less than 30 minutes to take. Qualitatively, current teaching building level administrators will be asked to take part in an interview. The interview will focus directly on the same questions found in the survey and should take no more than one hour to complete. The interview participants will determine the location of the interview. Once the quantitative and qualitative data has been reviewed and charted, the researcher will perform a case study by becoming a co-teaching principal. He will co-teach a third grade reading class five days a week for 30 to 40 minutes each day at Elementary School "B" for an eight week period. The researcher will then compare his experience as a teaching principal against the results of the quantitative and qualitative data and summarize the findings.

Risks and Benefits:

There are no foreseeable risks to the building level administrators who are involved in this study by completing the surveys and interviews. There is a potential risk for the teacher with whom the researcher will co-teach. The researcher of this study recognizes

that since the researcher is the principal of the building where he will co-teach, the teacher with whom the researcher will be co-teaching may be uncomfortable about being evaluated by the researcher who is her principal. To avoid any conflicts and to prevent the teacher from being uncomfortable about being evaluated by the researcher, the teacher will be evaluated by another district administrator during the current school year. There are several benefits of this study. The research will provide valuable information about the perceived effects the act of teaching will have on a principal. The results of the analysis of the data can be useful to administrators who are considering the act of teaching during the student day. It could also be useful to administrative educational programs when designing future preparation courses. The results will also be beneficial to principals and assistant principals such as you to incorporate into the selection and mentoring/monitoring process of new building level administrators.

Compensation

There is no compensation involved in any component of the research design.

Confidentiality:

The data for the use in this study will be kept strictly confidential with sample population participants, identities of the schools and school districts remaining confidential. Survey participants are not to disclose their name, school and school district anywhere on the survey material. A separate self-addressed, stamped envelope will be provided to return the survey separately from any other material. Individuals willing to participate in the qualitative component of the study will be asked to indicate so in a separate reply. Again, during the interview process the identities of the participant, school and school district will remain confidential. Individuals seeking the results of the study will be asked to complete a separate self-addressed, stamped envelope indicating their desire to receive the study material. Through separate mailings for the survey, willingness to participate in the interview process, and request for study results; confidentiality will be maintained.

All data will be kept securely locked in a file cabinet with the respective identification codes kept in a separate location. At the conclusion of the study, the code sheet will be destroyed.

For More Information:

For answers to questions in reference to the research you may contact the Principal Investigator of the Research Study, Gregory E. Shoemaker at 610-759-1118; gshoemaker@nazarethasd.org. If you have a concern with the study, please contact Dr. Douglas Lare, ESU co-chair at 570-422-3431; dlare@po-box.esu.edu

Voluntary Participation/Right to Withdraw:

Your participation in the study is voluntary; refusal to participate will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled to. The subjects may withdraw at any time without penalty. You may discontinue participating at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

☐ Yes, I agree to have my school district participate in this doctoral research study.

☐ No, I do not agree to have my school district participate in this doctoral research study.

Signature

Title

Date

Witness Signature

Title

Date

APPENDIX E

Description of the Study

RESEARCH DESCRIPTION

Rationale: There is no question that Building Level Administrators play a critical role in creating and maintaining environments that support school improvement. The principal who once visited classrooms once or twice a year to determine if and how teachers are covering the curriculum are proving to be insufficient in raising student achievement. The No Child Left Behind legislation has influenced schools to implement different research-based programs. Building level administrators are expected to lead their staff to make the necessary changes. Principals and assistant principals can expect some teacher resistance, which is a natural part of the change process. A staffs' confidence in the building level administrator's instructional ability can have a positive effect on the implementation of these research-based programs. Currently, there are very few principals or assistant principals who teach a class as a regular part of their administrative day. Building level administrators have the capacity to influence teachers to change their instructional practices. Some researchers believe the return of a principal to the classroom could be a possible solution. Perceived benefits of a building level administrator who teaches might include being able to create a more "academically successful" school. The act of the building level administrator teaching could also demonstrate to teachers, parents, community members and in some cases even students that they can model and perform the very same tasks they expect their teachers to do. Studies show that a building level administrator's work schedule is already packed with many tasks. The researcher of this study wants to identify impediments that prevent a building level administrator from teaching along with elements that would allow the building level administrator the ability to teach.

Procedures: The research being conducted will be quantitative and qualitative in nature. Quantitatively, sample population participants will be asked to complete a survey. Questions in the survey are designed specifically to find out what principals beliefs are regarding a principal teaching. The survey should take less than 30 minutes to take. Since the survey is completed in an anonymous manner, the return of the completed survey will be evidence that the participant gave consent to participate in this study. Qualitatively, participants who are current teaching building level administrators will be asked to take part in an interview. The interview will focus directly on the same questions found in the survey and should take no more than one hour to complete. The interview participants will determine the location of the interview. Once the quantitative and qualitative data has been reviewed and charted, the researcher will perform a case study by becoming a co-teaching principal. He will co-teach a third grade reading class five days a week for 30 to 40 minutes each day at Elementary School "B" for an eight week period. The researcher will keep a daily log to document obstacles that were successfully overcome and obstacles that were unable to be overcome. Each log will include documentation of the co-teaching classroom experience. In addition, other significant issues relevant to the co-teaching experience such as planning and preparation for each lesson, assessments correction, etc will be documented. The researcher will summarize the documentation at the midpoint and at the end of the co-teaching experience. The researcher will then analyze the results of his experience as a teaching principal and compare the results of his teaching experience against the findings of the quantitative and qualitative data and summarize the findings.

Subject Population: Approximately 210 building level administrators in buildings that hold any of the grade levels kindergarten to 6th grade in the two intermediate units located in Northeastern Pennsylvania will have the opportunity to receive the survey. Seven to ten current building level administrators from Pennsylvania and other parts of the United States will be asked to take part in an interview. The researcher will then co-teach a third grade reading class five days a week. Each class shall be 30 to 40 minutes in length each day at Elementary School "B" and will take place over an eight week period to create a case study. The documentation will include the obstacles overcome, not overcome, the classroom co-teaching experience, and reflections of the prep work, planning, assessment work, etc.

Potential Risks: There are no foreseeable risks to the building level administrators who are participating in this study by the use of the surveys and interviews. There is a potential risk for the teacher with whom the researcher will co-teach.

Consent Procedures: An approval to conduct the study will be delivered to each superintendent in two intermediate units located in Northeastern Pennsylvania, those superintendents of districts located in Pennsylvania or other parts of the United States who have building level administrators who are currently teaching, and the superintendent of the School District "A" where the researcher will co-teach with a third grade teacher. The informed consent document will fulfill the requirements of the East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects. The informed consent document will introduce the principal investigator of the research study and provide a brief description of the study. The risks and benefits of the study are outlined. The compensation features and confidentiality procedures will be reviewed. The superintendents will be directed to individuals associated with the study in the event additional information is needed and will be reinforced that the study is voluntary and individuals have the right to withdraw at any time without penalty. A self-addressed, stamped envelope will be provided for the return of the approval to conduct the study document. Superintendents that do not respond will be contacted by telephone and sent a second request. If there is still no response after the second attempt, the researcher of this study will set up an appointment with the superintendent to discuss the study and deliver the request.

Upon receiving permission from consenting superintendents for building level administrators to complete the survey, the individual in charge of human resources for each participating school district will be contacted by telephone to obtain the names, specific positions and mailing addresses of individuals being asked to participate in this study.

Identified administrators taking the survey will be mailed a survey packet. The packet will be forwarded to the individual's office and will include:

- A description of the study.
- A letter requesting the recipient to participate in the study with an attached self

addressed, stamped envelope.

- A survey including a self addressed, stamped envelope to return the survey independently from other documents.
- A request to receive the results of the study with a self addressed, stamped envelope.

Upon receiving permission from consenting superintendents located in Pennsylvania or other parts of the United States who have building level administrators who are currently teaching; each teaching building level administrator will be sent:

- A description of the study.
- A letter requesting the recipient to participate in the study with an attached self addressed, stamped envelope.
- An informed consent document for interview participants as prescribed by the Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects Guidelines.
- A copy of the interview questions.
- A request to receive the results of the study with a self addressed, stamped envelope.

A consent form will be mailed to the Superintendent of the School District “A” requesting permission to co-teach with a teacher at Elementary School “B”. Once permission has been attained from the superintendent, the researcher will give a third grade teacher:

- A description of the study.
- A letter asking the superintendent for permission for the researcher to co-teach with the third grade teacher.
- A letter to the teacher asking for permission for the researcher to co-teach with her.
- An informed consent document for co-teaching participant as prescribed by the Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects Guidelines.
- A request to receive the results of the study with a self addressed, stamped envelope.

The teacher will indicate her willingness to participate by returning the completed Informed Consent-Co-Teaching Participant form.

Safeguarding the Subjects: Survey and Interview Participants: The data from this study will be kept strictly confidential. The sample population participants, identities of the schools and school districts will also remain confidential. Survey participants are not to disclose their name, school and school district anywhere on the survey material. A separate self-addressed, stamped envelope will be provided to return the survey separately from any other material. Since the survey is completed in an anonymous manner, the return of the completed survey will be evidence that the participant gave consent to participate in this study. Individuals willing to participate in the qualitative component of the study will be asked to indicate so in a separate reply. Again, during the interview process the identities of the participant, school and school district will remain

confidential. Individuals seeking the results of the study will be asked to complete a separate self-addressed, stamped envelope indicating their desire to receive the study material. Through separate mailings for the survey, willingness to participate in the interview process and request for study results; confidentiality will be maintained. Co-teaching Participant - The teacher with whom the researcher will be co-teaching will be evaluated by another administrator during the year of the study.

All data will be kept securely locked in a file cabinet with the respective identification codes kept in a separate location. At the conclusion of the study, the code sheet will be destroyed.

Benefits of Study: The research will provide valuable information about the perceived effects the act of teaching will have on a principal. The results of the analysis of the data can be useful to administrators who are considering the act of teaching during the student day. It could also be useful to administrative educational programs when designing future preparation courses. The results will also be beneficial to principals and assistant principals who wish to incorporate the results of the study into the selection and mentoring/monitoring process of new building level administrators.

APPENDIX F

Letter for Principals to Participate in the Study

LETTER FOR PRINCIPALS TO PARTICIPATE IN THE STUDY

DATE
NAME OF PRINCIPAL
SCHOOL
ADDRESS

Dear _____,

I am writing this letter to request your voluntary assistance in a study I am conducting at East Stroudsburg University, in East Stroudsburg, PA, as a requirement for completion of my doctoral dissertation. Your response to this survey will be much appreciated and valued by the researcher. This study is entitled, "Examining the Work Elements and Impact of the Teaching Building Level Administrator." All kindergarten to sixth grade building level administrators leading schools located in the Intermediate Unit #20 and #21 are an essential part of this study. Therefore, I am asking you to participate in this study.

The purpose of this study is to examine the working elements and impact of the teaching building level administrator. Specifically the study will explore potential impediments that would prevent a principal or assistant principal from teaching and elements that may help a principal or assistant principal find time to regularly teach a subject.

Enclosed you will find a survey with instructions and a stamped self-addressed envelope for return by DATE. Your response will be kept strictly confidential. Your anonymity will be protected, if you agree to participate in the research.

This study is being conducted with the support of the East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects. For answers to questions in reference to the research you may contact the Principal Investigator of the Research Study, Gregory E. Shoemaker at 610-759-1118; gshoemaker@nazarethasd.org.

Questions about this study can also be answered by Dr. Douglas Lare, ESU chair at 570-422-3431; dlare@po-box.esu.edu, Dr. Angelo Senese ESU co-chair at 570-422-3193; asenese@po-box.esu.edu or Dr. Kelli Kerry-Moran IUP co-chair at 412-237-4501; kjkmoran@iup.edu. Any concerns regarding this study may be reported to Dr. Shala Davis, IRB Administrator, (570) 422-3536 x3336 or Dr. Joseph Miele, IRB Chair, (570) 422-3536 x3345 of the East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects.

Sincerely,
Gregory E. Shoemaker
E-mail: gshoemaker@nazarethasd.org
fax number: 610-759-0454, phone number: 610-759-1118 (w) or 610-838-6604 (h)

APPENDIX G

Letter to Request to Receive the Results of the Study

LETTER REQUESTING TO RECEIVE THE RESULTS OF THE STUDY

**Examining the Work Elements and Impact of the Teaching Building Level
Administrator**

An East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania and Indiana University of Pennsylvania
Doctorial Dissertation
Gregory E. Shoemaker, Principal of Bushkill Elementary School, Nazareth Area School
District

July 2010

Dear Mr. Shoemaker,

- ☐ Yes, I am interested in receiving a copy of the results of your study.
☐ No, I am not interested in receiving a copy of the results of your study.

_____	_____
Name	School
_____	_____
Address	Phone Number

This project has been approved by East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania
Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects

Dr. Shala Davis, IRB Administrator, (570) 422-3536 x3336
Dr. Joseph Miele, IRB Chair, (570) 422-3536 x3345

APPENDIX H

Interview Questions

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

1. Can you identify some impediments that would prevent principals from becoming a teaching building level administrator? Which would be the greatest impediment that would keep them from being a teaching building level administrator?
2. What types of supports do you believe would help you continue to be a teaching principal or other principals who would like to teach as part of their work week?
3. To what degree would co-teaching with another classroom teacher, exchanging jobs/positions with a teacher, rearranging the duties of the building office professionals, having an extra administrative support in the form of an assistant principal help a building level administrator find time to teach? Why?
4. What do you perceive are some of the reasons teaching building level administrators would support the option to teach?
5. How do you perceive the role of being a teaching principal/assistant principal would effect your teachers', parents', community's, or students' perception of you as an educational leader trying to increase student achievement?
6. In what ways do you perceive the act of a principal/assistant principal teaching will effect a building level administrator's relationship with their teachers, parents, students, and community?
7. What do you perceive are some of the reasons non-teaching building level administrators would elect not to support the option of becoming a teaching principal/assistant principal?
8. Are there any other comments you would like to make about the role of a teaching building level administrator?

APPENDIX I

Superintendent/District Letter of Approval to Interview Building Level Administrators
Who Teach

SUPERINTENDENT/DISTRICT LETTER OF APPROVAL TO INTERVIEW
BUILDING LEVEL ADMINISTRATORS WHO TEACH

**Examining the Work Elements and Impact of the Teaching Building Level
Administrator**

An East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania and Indiana University of Pennsylvania
Doctorial Dissertation
Gregory E. Shoemaker, Principal of Bushkill Elementary School, Nazareth Area School
District

July 2010

NAME
SCHOOL DISTRICT
Address

Dear _____,

My name is Gregory Shoemaker. I currently serve as the Principal of the Bushkill Elementary School in the Nazareth Area School District. Educationally, I have been working on obtaining my doctoral degree at East Stroudsburg University in collaboration with Indiana University of Pennsylvania. I am in the process of obtaining permission to gather data in reference to my study and would greatly appreciate if you would set aside a few minutes of what I know is valuable time to review this entire document. I am hopeful that you will support my research by allowing your building level administrator who teaches to participate in an interview as part of this study. If so, please sign the informed consent form and return it to my attention in the self-addressed stamped envelope.

Sincerely,

Gregory E. Shoemaker
Principal of Bushkill Elementary School
Nazareth Area School District
Educational Leadership Doctorial Student
East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania
Indiana University of Pennsylvania

This project has been approved by East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania
Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects

Dr. Shala Davis, IRB Administrator, (570) 422-3536 x3336
Dr. Joseph Miele, IRB Chair, (570) 422-3536 x3345

APPENDIX J

Letter to Principal to Participate in Study by Being Interviewed

LETTER TO PRINCIPAL TO PARTICIPATE IN STUDY BY BEING INTERVIEWED

DATE
NAME OF PRINCIPAL
SCHOOL
ADDRESS

Dear _____,

I am writing this letter to request your voluntary assistance in a study I am conducting at East Stroudsburg University, in East Stroudsburg, PA, as a requirement for completion of my doctoral dissertation. You have been identified as a building level administrator who teaches on a regular basis. Therefore, I am asking you to participate in this study. Your participation in being interviewed will be much appreciated and valued by the researcher. This study is entitled, "Examining the Work Elements and Impact of the Teaching Building Level Administrator." Kindergarten to sixth grade building level administrators leading schools located in northeastern Pennsylvania completed the first part of this study by completing a survey. The second part of this study involves interviewing building level administrators who currently or have recently taught as part of their administrative day.

The purpose of this study is to examine the working elements and impact of the teaching building level administrator. Specifically the study will explore potential obstacles that would prevent a principal or assistant principal from teaching and elements that may help a principal or assistant principal find time to regularly teach a subject.

Enclosed you will find a list of the interview questions. You will have the option of having the interview conducted in a multitude of settings. Interview options may include the researcher coming to the participant's office, the interview taking place at the researcher's office, the interview taking place at a location independent of either office, or the interview being conducted over the phone. Your response will be kept strictly confidential. Your anonymity will be protected, if you agree to participate in the research.

This study is being conducted with the support of the East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects. For answers to questions in reference to the research you may contact the Principal Investigator of the Research Study, Gregory E. Shoemaker at 610-759-1118; gshoemaker@nazarethasd.org.

Questions about this study can also be answered by Dr. Douglas Lare, ESU chair at 570-422-3431; dlare@po-box.esu.edu, Dr. Angelo Senese ESU co-chair at 570-422-3193; asenese@po-box.esu.edu or Dr. Kelli Kerry-Moran IUP co-chair at 412-237-4501; kjkmoran@iup.edu. Any concerns regarding this study may be reported to Dr. Shala Davis, IRB Administrator, (570) 422-3536 x3336 or Dr. Joseph Miele, IRB Chair, (570) 422-3536 x3345 of the East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects.

Sincerely,
Gregory E. Shoemaker
E-mail: gshoemaker@nazarethasd.org
fax number: 610-759-0454, phone number: 610-759-1118 (w) or 610-838-6604 (h)

APPENDIX K

Informed Consent - Interview Participant

INFORMED CONSENT – INTERVIEW PARTICIPANT

Examining the Work Elements and Impact of the Building Level Administrator

An East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania and Indiana University of Pennsylvania
Doctoral Dissertation

Gregory E. Shoemaker, Principal of Bushkill Elementary School, Nazareth Area School
District

Research Description:

There is no question that Building Level Administrators play a critical role in creating and maintaining environments that support school improvement. The principal who once visited classrooms once or twice a year to determine if and how teachers are covering the curriculum are proving to be insufficient in raising student achievement. The No Child Left Behind legislation has influenced schools to implement different researched-based programs. Building level administrators are expected to lead their staff to make the necessary changes. Principals and assistant principals can expect some teacher resistance, which is a natural part of the change process. A staffs' confidence in the building level administrator's instructional ability can have a positive effect on the implementation of these researched-based programs. Currently, there are very few principals or assistant principals who teach a class as a regular part of their administrative day. Research indicates building level administrator's have the capacity to influence teachers to change their instructional practices. Some researchers believe the return of a principal to the classroom could be a possible solution. Perceived benefits of a building level administrator who teaches might include being able to create a more "academically successful" school. The act of the building level administrator teaching could also demonstrate to teachers, parents, community members and in some cases even students that they can model and perform the very same tasks that they expect their teachers to perform. Studies show that a building level administrator's work schedule is already packed with many tasks. The researcher of this study wants to identify impediments that prevent a building level administrator from teaching along with elements that would allow the building level administrators the ability to teach.

The sample population participants will be building level administrators currently employed within two intermediate units located in Northeastern Pennsylvania. Building level administrators are defined as an individual with more than one semester as a principal and/or assistant principal. The research I will be conducting will be quantitative and qualitative in nature. Quantitatively, sample population participants will be asked to complete a survey. Questions in the survey are designed specifically to find out what principals beliefs are about a principal teaching. The survey should take less than 30 minutes to take. Qualitatively, current teaching building level administrators will be asked to take part in an interview. The interview will focus directly on the same questions found in the survey and should take no more than one hour to complete. The interview participants will determine the location of the interview. Once the quantitative and qualitative data has been reviewed and charted, the researcher will perform a case study by becoming a co-teaching principal. He will co-teach a third grade reading class five days a week for 30 to 40 minutes each day at Elementary School "B" for an eight

week period. The researcher will keep a daily log to document obstacles that were successfully overcome and obstacles that were unable to be overcome. Each log will include documentation of the co-teaching classroom experience. In addition, other significant issues relevant to the co-teaching experience such as planning and preparation for each lesson, assessments correction, etc will be documented. The researcher will summarize the documentation at the midpoint and at the end of the co-teaching experience. The researcher will then analyze the results of his experience as a teaching principal and compare the results of his teaching experience against the findings of the quantitative and qualitative data and summarize the findings.

Risks and Benefits:

There are no foreseeable risks to the building level administrators who are involved in this study by completing the surveys and interviews. There is a potential risk for the teacher with whom the researcher will co-teach. The researcher of this study recognizes that since the researcher is the principal of the building where he will co-teach, the teacher with whom the researcher will be co-teaching may be uncomfortable about being evaluated by the researcher who is her principal. To avoid any conflicts and to prevent the teacher from being uncomfortable about being evaluated by the researcher, the teacher will be evaluated by another district administrator during the year of the study.

There are several benefits of this study. The research will provide valuable information about the perceived effects the act of teaching will have on a principal. The results of the analysis of the data can be useful to administrators who are considering the act of teaching during the student day. It could also be useful to administrative educational programs when designing future preparation courses. The results will also be beneficial to principals and assistant principals such as you to incorporate into the selection and mentoring/monitoring process of new building level administrators.

Compensation:

There is no compensation involved in any component of the research design.

Confidentiality:

The data for the use in this study will be kept strictly confidential with sample population participants, identities of the schools and school districts remaining confidential. Survey participants are not to disclose their name, school and school district anywhere on the survey material. A separate self-addressed, stamped envelope will be provided to return the survey separately from any other material. Individuals willing to participate in the qualitative component of the study will be asked to indicate so in a separate reply. Again, during the interview process the identities of the participant, school and school district will remain confidential. Individuals seeking the results of the study will be asked to complete a separate self-addressed, stamped envelope indicating their desire to receive the study material. Through separate mailings for the survey, willingness to participate in the interview process, and request for study results; confidentiality will be maintained.

All data will be kept securely locked in a file cabinet with the respective identification codes kept in a separate location. At the conclusion of the study, the code sheet will be destroyed.

For More Information:

For answers to questions in reference to the research you may contact the Principal Investigator of the Research Study, Gregory E. Shoemaker at 610-759-1118; gshoemaker@nazarethasd.org. If you have a concern with the study, please contact Dr. Douglas Lare, ESU co-chair at 570-422-3431; dlare@po-box.esu.edu, Dr. Angelo Senese; asenese@po-box.esu.edu or IUP co-chair at Dr. Kelli Kerry-Moran; kjkmoran@iup.edu.

This project has been approved by the East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania
Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects

Dr. Shala Davis, IRB Administrator, (570) 422-3536 x3336
Dr. Joseph Miele, IRB Chair, (570) 422-3536 x3345

Voluntary Participation/Right to Withdraw:

Your participation in the study is voluntary; refusal to participate will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. The subjects may withdraw at any time without penalty. You may discontinue participating at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

I agree to participate in this doctoral research study.

Signature

Title

Date

Witness Signature

Title

Date

APPENDIX L

Administrator Daily Reflection Sheet/Administrative Four/Eight Week Reflection Sheet

ADMINISTRATOR DAILY REFLECTION SHEET
and
ADMINISTRATOR FOUR/EIGHT WEEK REFLECTION SHEET

Site: Elementary School “B”

Setting: Third Grade Reading Class

Researcher: Greg

Week: Ending

Reflection about the classroom teaching experience

Obstacles able to overcome (able to co-teach):

Obstacles not able to overcome (unable to co-teach):

Co-teaching Classroom Experience (30 – 40 minutes):

Other Significant Reflections (Preparation of classroom work, planning, creating activities, correcting assessments, comments made by teachers, etc.):

APPENDIX M

Superintendent/District Letter of Approval to Co-Teach

SUPERINTENDENT/DISTRICT LETTER OF APPROVAL TO CO-TEACH

**Examining the Work Elements and Impact of the Teaching Building Level
Administrator**

An East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania and Indiana University of Pennsylvania
Doctorial Dissertation
Gregory E. Shoemaker, Principal of Bushkill Elementary School, Nazareth Area School
District

July 2010

Name of Superintendent
School District
Address
City, State Zip Code

Dear Name of Superintendent,

As you are aware, I currently serve as the Principal of the Elementary School “B” in the School District “A”. Educationally, I have been working on obtaining my doctorial degree at East Stroudsburg University in collaboration with Indiana University of Pennsylvania. I am in the process of obtaining permission to gather data in reference to my study and would greatly appreciate if you would set aside a few minutes of what I know is valuable time to review this entire document. I am hopeful that you will support my research by giving me permission to co-teach with a third grade teacher at Elementary School “B”. If so, please sign the informed consent form and return it to my attention in the self-addressed stamped envelope.

Sincerely,

Gregory E. Shoemaker
Principal of Bushkill Elementary School
Nazareth Area School District
Educational Leadership Doctorial Student
East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania
Indiana University of Pennsylvania

This project has been approved by East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania
Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects

Dr. Shala Davis, IRB Administrator, (570) 422-3536 x3336
Dr. Joseph Miele, IRB Chair, (570) 422-3536 x3345

APPENDIX N

Superintendent Informed Consent - Co-Teaching

SUPERINTENDENT INFORMED CONSENT – CO-TEACHING

Examining the Work Elements and Impact of the Teaching Principal

An East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania and Indiana University of Pennsylvania
Doctoral Dissertation

Gregory E. Shoemaker, Principal of Bushkill Elementary School, Nazareth Area School
District

Research Description:

There is no question that principals play a critical role in creating and maintaining environments that support school improvement. The principal who once visited classrooms once or twice a year to determine if and how teachers are covering the curriculum are proving to be insufficient in raising student achievement. The No Child Left Behind legislation has influenced schools to implement different researched-based programs. Principals are expected to lead their staff to make the necessary changes. Principals can expect some teacher resistance, which is a natural part of the change process. A staffs' confidence in the principal's instructional ability can have a positive effect on the implementation of these researched-based programs. One way to address the perceived need for instructional leadership to increase their influence bringing about educational changes is to have building level administrators teach on a regular basis, much as they did over 100 years ago. Currently, there are very few principals who teach a class as a regular part of their administrative day. Principals have the capacity to influence teachers to change their instructional practices. Some researchers believe the return of the principal to the classroom could be a possible solution. Perceived benefits might include a principal who teaches might be able to create more "academically successful" school. The act of the principal teaching could demonstrate to teachers, parents, community members and in some cases even students that they can model and perform the very same tasks that they expect their teachers to do. Having a principal who teaches could give teachers in a building a boost in confidence in implementing instructional changes required under NCLB. The act of teaching might also give a principal insight to some of the difficulties teachers may have in implementing best practices.

The sample population participants will be building based administrators currently employed within two intermediate units located in Northeastern Pennsylvania. Building level administrators are defined as an individual with more than one semester as an assistant principal and/or principal. The research I will be conducting will be quantitative and qualitative in nature. Quantitatively, sample population participants will be asked to complete a survey. Questions in the survey are designed specifically find out what principals beliefs are about a principal teaching. The survey should take less than 30 minutes to take. Qualitatively, sample population participants will be asked to take part in an interview. The interview will focus directly on the same questions found in the survey and should take no more than one hour to complete. The interview participants will determine the location of the interview. Once the quantitative and qualitative data has been reviewed and charted, the researcher will perform a case study by becoming a co-teaching principal. He will co-teach a third grade reading class five days a week for

30 to 40 minutes each day at Elementary School "B" for an eight week period. The researcher will keep a daily log to document obstacles that were successfully overcome and obstacles that were unable to be overcome. Each log will include documentation of the co-teaching classroom experience. In addition, other significant issues relevant to the co-teaching experience such as planning and preparation for each lesson, assessments correction, etc will be documented. The researcher will summarize the documentation at the midpoint and at the end of the co-teaching experience. The researcher will then analyze the results of his experience as a teaching principal and compare the results of his teaching experience against the findings of the quantitative and qualitative data and summarize the findings.

Risks and Benefits:

There is a potential risk for the teacher with whom the researcher will co-teach. The researcher of this study recognizes that since the researcher is the principal of the building where he will co-teach, the teacher with whom the researcher will be co-teaching may be uncomfortable about being evaluated by the researcher who is her principal. To avoid any conflicts and to prevent the teacher from being uncomfortable about being evaluated by the researcher, the teacher will be evaluated by another district administrator during the current school year.

There are several benefits for performing this research. The research will provide valuable information about the perceived effects the act of co-teaching will have on a principal. The results of the analysis of the data can be useful to administrators who are considering the act of teaching or co-teaching during the student day. It could also be useful to administrative educational programs when designing future preparation courses. The results will also be beneficial to principals and assistant principals such as your self to incorporate into the selection and mentoring/monitoring process of new building level administrators.

Compensation:

There is no compensation involved in any component of the research design.

Confidentiality:

The data for the use in this study will be kept strictly confidential with sample population participants, identities of the schools and school districts remaining confidential. Survey participants are not to disclose their name, school and school district anywhere on the survey material. A separate self-addressed, stamped envelope will be provided to return the survey separately from any other material. Individuals willing to participate in the qualitative component of the study will be asked to indicate so in a separate reply. Again, during the interview process the identities of the participant, school and school district will remain confidential. Individuals seeking the results of the study will be asked to complete a separate self-addressed, stamped envelope indicating their desire to receive the study material. Through separate mailings for the survey, willingness to participate in the interview process, and request for study results; confidentiality will be maintained.

All data will be kept securely locked in a file cabinet with the respective identification

codes kept in a separate location. At the conclusion of the study, the code sheet will be destroyed.

For More Information:

For answers to questions in reference to the research you may contact the Principal Investigator of the Research Study, Gregory E. Shoemaker at 610-759-1118; gshoemaker@nazarethasd.org. If you have a concern with the study, please contact Dr. Douglas Lare, ESU co-chair at 570-422-3431; dlare@po-box.esu.edu, Dr. Angelo Senese; asenese@po-box.esu.edu or IUP co-chair at Dr. Kelli Kerry-Moran; kjkmoran@iup.edu.

This project has been approved by the East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects

Dr. Shala Davis, IRB Administrator, (570) 422-3536 x3336

Dr. Joseph Miele, IRB Chair, (570) 422-3536 x3345

Voluntary Participation/Right to Withdraw:

Your participation in the study is voluntary; refusal to participate will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. The subjects may withdraw at any time without penalty. You may discontinue participating at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

I agree to participate in this doctoral research study.

_____ Signature	_____ Title	_____ Date
_____ Witness Signature	_____ Title	_____ Date

APPENDIX O

Co-Teaching Letter to Third Grade Teacher

CO-TEACHING LETTER TO THIRD GRADE TEACHER

DATE
NAME OF TEACHER
SCHOOL
ADDRESS

Dear _____,

I am writing this letter to request your voluntary assistance in a study I am conducting at East Stroudsburg University, in East Stroudsburg, PA, as a requirement for completion of my doctoral dissertation. Your participation will be much appreciated and valued by the researcher. This study is entitled, "Examining the Work Elements and Impact of the Teaching Principal." After surveying principals in two intermediate units located in Northeastern Pennsylvania and interviewing teaching principals and charting and reviewing the data, I plan to perform a case study by becoming a co-teaching principal. I would like to co-teach with you five days a week for 30 to 40 minutes for an eight week period during the 2010-2011 school year. I will then compare my experience as a teaching principal against the results of the quantitative and qualitative data and summarize the findings.

The purpose of this study is to examine the working elements and impact of the teaching principal. Specifically the study will explore potential obstacles that would prevent a principal from teaching: elements that may help a principal find time to regularly teach a subject; the act of co-teaching as a possible support that can be used by a principal who desires to teach during the workday; how the act of teaching might influence the teachers' perception and attitude about a teaching principal being an instructional leader; and how the act of teaching impacts the perception of the administrator's ability to be an instructional leader.

Enclosed you will find a co-teaching consent form. My experiences while co-teaching with you will remain confidential and your anonymity will be protected, if you agree to participate in the research.

This study is being conducted with the support of the East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects. For answers to questions in reference to the research you may contact the Principal Investigator of the Research Study, Gregory E. Shoemaker at 610-759-1118; gshoemaker@nazarethasd.org.

Sincerely,
Gregory E. Shoemaker
E-mail: gshoemaker@nazarethasd.org
fax number: 610-759-0454, phone number: 610-759-1118 (w) or 610-838-6604 (h)

APPENDIX P

Informed Consent - Co-Teaching Participant

INFORMED CONSENT FORM – CO-TEACHING PARTICIPANT

Examining the Work Elements and Impact of the Teaching Principal

An East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania and Indiana University of Pennsylvania
Doctoral Dissertation
Gregory E. Shoemaker, Principal of Bushkill Elementary School, Nazareth Area School
District

Research Description:

There is no question that principals play a critical role in creating and maintaining environments that support school improvement. The principal who once visited classrooms once or twice a year to determine if and how teachers are covering the curriculum are proving to be insufficient in raising student achievement. The No Child Left Behind legislation has influenced schools to implement different researched-based programs. Principals are expected to lead their staff to make the necessary changes. Principals can expect some teacher resistance, which is a natural part of the change process. A staffs' confidence in the principal's instructional ability can have a positive effect on the implementation of these researched-based programs. One way to address the perceived need for instructional leadership to increase their influence bringing about educational changes is to have building level administrators teach on a regular basis, much as they did over 100 years ago. Currently, there are very few principals who teach a class as a regular part of their administrative day. Principals have the capacity to influence teachers to change their instructional practices. Some researchers believe the return of the principal to the classroom could be a possible solution. Perceived benefits might include a principal who teaches might be able to create more "academically successful" school. The act of the principal teaching could demonstrate to teachers, parents, community members and in some cases even students that they can model and perform the very same tasks that they expect their teachers to do. Having a principal who teaches could give teachers in a building a boost in confidence in implementing instructional changes required under NCLB. The act of teaching might also give a principal insight to some of the difficulties teachers may have in implementing best practices.

The sample population participants will be building based administrators currently employed within two intermediate units located in Northern Pennsylvania. Building level administrators are defined as an individual with more than one semester as an assistant principal and/or principal. The research I will be conducting will be quantitative and qualitative in nature. Quantitatively, sample population participants will be asked to complete a survey. Questions in the survey are designed specifically find out what principals beliefs are about a principal teaching. The survey should take less than 30 minutes to take. Qualitatively, sample population participants will be asked to take part in an interview. The interview will focus directly on the same questions found in the survey and should take no more than one hour to complete. The interview participants will determine the location of the interview. Once the quantitative and qualitative data

has been reviewed and charted, the researcher will perform a case study by becoming a co-teaching principal. He will co-teach a third grade reading class five days a week for 30 to 40 minutes each day at Elementary School "B" for an eight week period during the year of the study. The researcher will keep a daily log to document obstacles that were successfully overcome and obstacles that were unable to be overcome. Each log will include documentation of the co-teaching classroom experience. In addition, other significant issues relevant to the co-teaching experience such as planning and preparation for each lesson, assessments correction, etc will be documented. The researcher will summarize the documentation at the midpoint and at the end of the co-teaching experience. The researcher will then analyze the results of his experience as a teaching principal and compare the results of his teaching experience against the findings of the quantitative and qualitative data and summarize the findings.

Risks and Benefits:

There is a potential risk for the teacher with whom the researcher will co-teach. The researcher of this recognizes that since the researcher is the principal of the building where he will co-teach. It is understood that the teacher with whom the researcher will be co-teaching may be uncomfortable about being evaluated by the researcher who is also her principal. To avoid any conflicts and to prevent the teacher from being uncomfortable about co-teaching and being evaluated by the researcher, the teacher will be evaluated by another district administrator during the year of the study.

There are several benefits for performing this research. The research will provide valuable information about the perceived effects the act of co-teaching will have on a principal. The results of the analysis of the data can be useful to administrators who are considering the act of teaching or co-teaching during the student day. It could also be useful to administrative educational programs when designing future preparation courses. The results will also be beneficial to principals and assistant principals such as your self to incorporate into the selection and mentoring/monitoring process of new building level administrators.

Compensation:

There is no compensation involved in any component of the research design.

Confidentiality:

The data for the use in this study will be kept strictly confidential with sample population participants, identities of the schools and school districts remaining confidential. Survey participants are not to disclose their name, school and school district anywhere on the survey material. A separate self-addressed, stamped envelope will be provided to return the survey separately from any other material. Individuals willing to participate in the qualitative component of the study will be asked to indicate so in a separate reply. Again, during the interview process the identities of the participant, school and school district will remain confidential. Individuals seeking the results of the study will be asked to

complete a separate self-addresses, stamped envelope indicating their desire to receive the study material. Through separate mailings for the survey, willingness to participate in the interview process, and request for study results; confidentiality will be maintained.

All data will be kept securely locked in a file cabinet with the respective identification codes kept in a separate location. At the conclusion of the study, the code sheet will be destroyed.

For More Information:

For answers to questions in reference to the research you may contact the Principal Investigator of the Research Study, Gregory E. Shoemaker at 610-759-1118; gshoemaker@nazarethasd.org. If you have a concern with the study, please contact Dr. Douglas Lare, ESU co-chair at 570-422-3431; dlare@po-box.esu.edu, Dr. Angelo Senese; asenese@po-box.esu.edu or IUP co-chair at Dr. Kelli Kerry-Moran; kjkmoran@iup.edu.

This project has been approved by the East Stroudsburg University of Pennsylvania Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects

Dr. Shala Davis, IRB Administrator, (570) 422-3536 x3336
Dr. Joseph Miele, IRB Chair, (570) 422-3536 x3345

Voluntary Participation/Right to Withdraw:

Your participation in the study is voluntary; refusal to participate will involve no penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. The subjects may withdraw at any time without penalty. You may discontinue participating at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

I agree to participate in this doctoral research study.

_____ Signature	_____ Title	_____ Date
_____ Witness Signature	_____ Title	_____ Date

APPENDIX Q

Elementary School "B" Community Interview Perception Questions

Elementary School "B" Community Interview Perception Questions

Possible benefits of being a co-teaching principal

Please respond to the questions using: Strongly Agree, Agree, Undecided, Disagree, Strongly Disagree. Please feel free to expand your thoughts about each question.

Mr. Shoemaker's teaching experience will increase his credibility with _____ about "Classroom" instructional initiatives introduced by him.

1. teachers
2. parents
3. students
4. community members

Mr. Shoemaker's -teaching experience will increase his credibility with _____ about his ability to lead a successful school.

5. teachers
6. parents
7. students
8. community members

Mr. Shoemaker's teaching experience will improve his relationship with _____.

9. teachers
10. parents
11. students
12. community members

Mr. Shoemaker's teaching experience will help increase the confidence of _____ about his ability to be an educational leader.

13. teachers
14. parents
15. students
16. community members

17. ***Mr. Shoemaker's teaching experience will increase teacher morale.***

18. ***Mr. Shoemaker's teaching experience should increase his empathy for teacher responsibilities.***

19. ***Do you have any additional comments you would like to make about Mr. Shoemaker's teaching experience.***