

Principal Time Management Skills: Explaining Patterns in Principals' Time Use and Effectiveness

Jason A. Grissom
Vanderbilt University

Susanna Loeb
Stanford University

Hajime Mitani
Vanderbilt University

Abstract

Purpose: Time demands faced by school principals make principals' work increasingly difficult. Building on research from outside education suggesting that effective time management can improve job performance, this article investigates whether principals' time management skills are associated with different allocations of time across job task areas and higher measures of job performance. **Research Methods:** Time management skills were measured using an inventory administered to 287 principals in Miami-Dade County Public Schools, the fourth-largest school district in the United States. These measures were combined with time-use data collected during in-person observations, subjective assessments of principal performance obtained from assistant principals and teachers, and administrative data on staff and students provided by the district, which were used to construct measures of "value-added" to student learning during each principal's tenure. Time management relationships with time use and test score-based and subjective assessments of job performance were examined using regression analysis. **Findings:** Principals with better time management skills allocate more time to managing instruction in their schools. Time management is also associated with increased student test score growth in math. Subjective assessment results for elementary and middle schools are mixed, but both assistant principals and teachers rate high school principals' performance more positively when principals have better time management skills. **Implications:** Building principals' time management capacities may be a worthwhile strategy for increasing their focus on instructional leadership and pursuing school improvement.

In pursuit of a more nuanced understanding of school leadership practice and the connection between leadership practice and school improvement, several recent studies have focused on how principals allocate their time within the work day (e.g., Goldring et al., 2008; Horng, Klasik, & Loeb, 2010; Spillane, Camburn, & Pareja, 2007; Spillane & Hunt, 2010;

Grissom, Loeb, & Master 2013). These studies highlight the large and diverse set of school functions with which principals engage on a daily basis, spanning instruction, personnel, budgeting, student services, external relations, and a host of other areas. Time is a scarce resource, and principals must make decisions about how to allocate their time among these competing demands. Time-use decisions are important for effective leadership, as evidenced by the relationship between principal time use and school outcomes (e.g., Grissom, Loeb, & Master, 2013; Horng, Klasik, & Loeb, 2010).

The connection between time use and performance motivates the present study. We proceed from the expectation that—just as some portfolio managers in the financial sector have a greater capacity for investing money in ways that produce profits—some principals will have a greater capacity for spending their time in productive ways. This greater capacity for using time effectively is known both colloquially and in a relatively large literature in psychology and organizational behavior as *time management*. That literature suggests that better time management skills—which include the ability to set achievable goals, identify priorities, monitor one’s own progress, and remain organized (Claessens et al., 2007)—can lead to more effective time use and ultimately more positive individual outcomes in some settings (e.g., Britton & Tesser, 1991). Time management and its relationship to time use and job performance, however, have not been investigated in the context of school leadership.

This paper examines these relationships empirically using data from Miami-Dade County Public Schools (M-DCPS), the nation’s fourth-largest school district. We draw on four data sources. The first is an original survey of M-DCPS principals we conducted during the spring of 2011. This survey included a time management inventory we used to measure four components of time management skills among respondents (N = 287). Second, also in spring 2011, we

employed trained observers to conduct daylong in-person observations of a subset of principals using a time use protocol. From these observational data, we create measures of principals' time allocations across job demands. The third source is a survey given to assistant principals and teachers in the same schools targeted by the principal survey. For this study, we use assistant principals' and teachers' responses to a set of questions about their principals to construct subjective measures of principal performance. Lastly, we merge each of these data elements with comprehensive administrative data covering all schools and personnel in the district provided to us by M-DCPS. In particular, the administrative data allow us to construct estimates of schools' "value-added" to student learning during each principal's tenure—measured by growth on Florida's standardized tests—in both math and reading.

We use this rich data source to answer three research questions. First, how are time management skills distributed across M-DCPS principals, particularly with respect to school and principal characteristics? Second, how do time management skills predict observed principal time use? And finally, to what degree, if any, are time management skills associated with measures of principal effectiveness? The next section grounds these questions in existing research on time management and the connections psychologists and scholars of organizational behavior have made between time management and personal and organizational outcomes. We then describe the data sources, construction of measures, and estimation approach before presenting our results. The final section discusses the implications of our results for school leadership practice.

How Can Time Management Behaviors Improve Outcomes?

High demands on one's time are characteristic of many professions. As Britton and Glynn (1989, 429) put it, "intellectually productive people usually have more things that they would like to do, or need to do, than they have time." This description certainly applies to the job of most school principals, who entail responsibility for the time-intensive tasks of managing school operations, overseeing instructional programs, building relations among staff members, and so forth (Horng, Klasik, & Loeb, 2010). In such professions, becoming more productive means finding ways to accomplish more given limited time resources. Managing one's time more ably is one way to fulfill this goal.

Time management means those behaviors "that aim at achieving an effective use of time while performing certain goal-directed activities" (Claessens et al., 2007, 262). Although little work has examined time management in the context of school administration, a relatively large literature has investigated the concept in the management of organizations more broadly. We draw on this literature in describing the characteristics of positive time management behaviors in schools and developing expectations about the role of time management among school principals in affecting their capacity to promote school improvement.

Components of Good Time Management

Managing time or making effective use of time requires techniques and good planning behaviors. Past studies and numerous how-to books suggest that one can use time efficiently and productively by setting short-term and long-term goals, keeping time logs, prioritizing tasks, making to-do lists and scheduling, and organizing one's workspace. (Claessens et al, 2007; Macan, 1994). These time management techniques and behaviors tend to share some underlying traits in common and can be classified into several groups. Britton and Tesser (1991) proposed

three facets of time management: short-range planning, long-range planning, and time attitudes. Short-range planning is the ability to set out and organize tasks in the short run (e.g., within a day or a week). Long-range planning is the capacity to manage tasks over a longer time horizon (e.g., in a quarter or a year) by setting goals, keeping track of important dates and limiting procrastination. Positive time attitudes indicate that a person is oriented towards using their time constructively and maintaining agency over how their time is spent.

Similarly, Macan (1994) identified three components of time management: (1) setting goals and priorities, (2) mechanics (i.e., making lists and scheduling), and (3) preference for organization. The first includes such behaviors as setting goals one wants to accomplish and prioritizing tasks to achieve these goals. The second includes behaviors associated with managing time such as making to-do lists and scheduling. The final factor includes one's preference for organization in his or her workspace and approach to projects. While this categorization differs somewhat from Britton and Tesser's (1991), the themes of goal-setting, prioritization, and organization are common to both schema.

People vary in their time management behaviors and techniques. For example, Macan et al. (1990) compared time management behaviors across demographic groups in a sample of undergraduate students. While time management behaviors did not differ by race, older and female subjects were more likely to be good time managers. Older students also had greater preference for organization. Other studies of undergraduate students found similar results (Truman & Hartley, 1996; Misra & McKean, 2000). Researchers have also explored the relationship between time management and other dispositional characteristics such as self-esteem, sense of purpose in life, polychronicity (i.e., multi-tasking), and impatience, and propensity to procrastinate (e.g., Bond & Feather, 1988; Francis-Smythe & Robertson, 1999).

For example, Lay & Schouwenburg (1993) found that students prone to procrastination exercised fewer time management techniques while also tending to be further behind on work and to study fewer hours.

Time Management and Performance

Several studies demonstrate that time management predicts job performance. For example, car salesmen with better time management skills have higher sales (Barling et al., 1996). College students with better time management skills report higher grade point averages (Britton & Tesser, 1991; Macan et al., 1990). County extension directors with better time management skills are rated higher by their superiors (assistant regional directors) (Radhakrishna, Yoder, & Baggett, 1991).

To understand the association between time management and job performance, researchers have investigated a series of possible linkages. Most clearly, time management helps improve job efficiency by enabling professionals to allocate adequate time to their job's most important tasks (Hall & Hirsch, 1982; Orpen, 1994; Schuler, 1979). This greater attention to high-priority work areas improves worker outcomes. The expectation that increased time management will increase worker productivity by enabling employees to "work smarter" has driven widespread investment in time management training in the private sector (Green & Skinner, 2005).

Effective time management also reduces job stress, which can be an important impediment to job performance (e.g., Jamal, 1984). An important source of job stress in the workplace is the perception for an individual that what he or she needs to accomplish outpaces the time available (Schuler, 1979). Time management can help reduce this discrepancy. Using

path analysis, Macan (1994) found that subjects with better time management skills perceived that they had greater control over their time and how they spend it, which was in turn associated with both reduced feelings of job-induced tension and lower reports of *somatic tension*, or physical symptoms of stress such as insomnia and headaches. Job-induced stress was then negatively correlated with self-assessed job performance. Claessens et al. (2004) documented similar paths from time management to perceived time control to reduced work strain and higher job performance in a study of engineers in a semiconductor manufacturer. Other studies have documented the positive association between time management and employee health, mediated by other factors such as perceived control and conflicts between the demand between work and family (e.g., Adams & Jex, 1999).

Time management is also predictive of other factors that might influence job performance. Professionals who manage time better report lower emotional exhaustion, the most important dimension of job burnout (Peeters & Rutte, 2005). They also report higher overall job satisfaction (Macan et al., 1990). Participants in time management training also report greater work/home balance (Green & Skinner, 2005). A long literature shows that satisfaction and satisfaction-related factors are contributors to employee performance (see Judge et al., 2001).

Of course, better time management need not lead to better job performance under all conditions. Increasing job performance requires engaging in more productive behaviors. According to Ajzen (1991), human behavior is a function in part of how much control one perceives he or she has over that behavior. Control is constrained by resources, including time and skills; time management increases perceptions of control by relaxing some of these constraints (Macan, 1994). Workers may face other kinds of constraints on their behavior, however, such as institutional limits on their autonomy, that time management can do little to

address. Moreover, behavior change requires intent (Ajzen, 1991). If workers do not intend to engage in new behaviors or do not know which behaviors will be more productive, we would not expect better time management to enhance performance.

Studies of Time in Educational Administration

Although overlooking time management specifically, research in educational administration has documented the importance of how principals organize and allocate their time. Studies of principal time use using in-person observations and daily logs show that principal time spent on organizational management (e.g., personnel, budgeting) and operations predicts student achievement and other school outcomes (Horng, Klasik, & Loeb, 2010; May, Huff, & Goldring, 2012). Studies also find that principals' time investments in some instruction-related tasks, including coaching and teacher professional development, are associated with more positive student outcomes (Grissom, Loeb, & Master, 2013; though see May, Huff, & Goldring, 2012). A long literature on instructional leadership suggests a connection between principals' involvement in instructional matters in their schools and positive school performance (see Robinson, Lloyd, & Rowe, 2008).

Yet studies also suggest that finding time to devote to tasks more closely associated with improving student learning is a consistent challenge. The principal work day is hectic, filled with frequent interruptions and problems that require attention (Blendinger & Snipes, 1996; Hallinger & Murphy, 2013). Principals are often called on to meet with parents or deal with parental concerns (Miller, 2001). They spend large portions of their days in planned and unplanned meetings and on completing administrative duties (Morris et al., 1981; Horng, Klasik, & Loeb, 2010). Manasse (1985) notes that "the nature and pace of events often appear to control

principals rather than the other way around” (p. 442). Indeed, Hallinger and Murphy (2013) identify finding time to lead in the face of principals’ job pressures as among the central challenges of leadership for school improvement.

Given the importance of principal investment in organizational management and instruction for school performance, a reasonable presumption is that principals who are able to overcome constraints imposed on their work day by other time demands would reallocate their time towards these areas. Insofar as greater time management skills provide a strategy for overcoming time pressures, we hypothesize that time management will be positively associated with time spent on management and instruction and negatively associated with time allocated to less “productive” tasks. Alongside other mechanisms identified in studies of other sectors—such as reduction of job stress—this greater investment in productive time use over the long run will also, we hypothesize, improve school outcomes. The next section details the data we use to test for relationships between time management time allocation and school performance.

Data, Measures, and Methods

Data for this study come from a comprehensive data collection undertaken in Miami-Dade County Public Schools (M-DCPS), a large urban district educating approximately 350,000 students each year. Nearly two-thirds of the M-DCPS student population is Hispanic, and three-fourths are eligible for the subsidized lunch program. The data include survey responses, observational measures, and administrative data on students, staff and schools.

Surveys. We measure of principals’ time management skills using an instrument (described below) embedded in a larger web-based survey of all principals of non-special schools in the district that we conducted in the spring of 2011. We received responses from 306

principals for a response rate of 91%, though because of missing data or incomplete responses the analytic sample for this study we are limited to 234 principals, a 70% response rate from the original population.

At the same time that we administered the principal survey, we also conducted surveys of all M-DCPS assistant principals (APs) and teachers. We received 485 responses to the AP survey for a response rate of 86%. Teacher response rates were much lower; we received partial or full responses from 8,164 teachers for a response rate of 53%. For this study, we make use of a three-item subjective assessment of the principal's performance included on both the AP and teacher survey. Because of high inter-item reliability (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.95$ for APs and 0.96 for teachers), we combined these items ("My principal is doing a good job," "I am pleased with the way my principal runs this school," and "I would be happy to continue working with my principal in the future") using factor analysis to form a single assessment of the principal for each AP and teacher respondent and standardized for ease of interpretation.

Observations. Next, we utilized data from in-person observations of a sample of M-DCPS principals that our research team also conducted in the spring of 2011. The sample included principals from each of the district's high schools plus a random sample of 30 elementary and 30 middle schools stratified by the district's administrative regions. For each of the 98 observed principals, trained observers used a standardized protocol (available from the authors upon request) to capture time on approximately 50 job-related tasks. Observations measured time use in five-minute increments over a full school day. We aggregated the observation data to capture time allocations across five broad areas according to the classification used by Grissom and Loeb (2011). These areas are: organizational management, instructional management, administration (e.g., compliance, scheduling), internal relations (i.e.,

maintaining positive relationships among staff), and external relations (i.e., making connections to outside stakeholders, such as parents). We also utilize measures of time spent transitioning from place to place around the school building and personal time, or time spent on non-work activities. For our analysis, we then calculated the percentage of the work day the principal spent in each area. Table 1 gives descriptive statistics for these variables. Principals spent the largest portion of their day on administration (33%), followed by internal relations (22%). Note that the percentages do not sum to 100 because observers could code more than one kind of task at a given time point.

Administrative Data. Lastly, we use comprehensive administrative data on district personnel and students provided to us by M-DCPS central staff for the years 2003-04 to 2010-11. Administrative data files are the source of a variety of control variables included in the analysis at both the personnel (e.g., gender, race, age, education level, tenure in school) and school (e.g., percent free/reduced lunch, percent Hispanic, enrollment size, Florida school accountability grade) levels. Table 1 provides descriptive statistics for the 2010-2011 school year for the principals included in our analysis and the schools in which they work (accountability grades are from the prior year).

We also use the student-level file from the district, which includes student scores on the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT) in math and reading over time. With these data, we construct measures of school value-added to student achievement during a principal's tenure. Following Grissom, Kalogrides, & Loeb (2012), we use two measures. The first is a measure of how much student learning growth there has been in the current school *over all years he or she has been the principal there*. We provide the empirical model in the Appendix, but to summarize, the equation models standardized student FCAT scores in the present year as a

function of last year's score, student demographic characteristics, classroom-aggregate demographic characteristics, and time-varying school characteristics, plus a principal-by-school fixed effect. The coefficients from these fixed effects are then shrunk using the Empirical Bayes method to account for measurement error; these shrunken estimates represent the value-added scores. Only the scores for the school in which the principal is working in 2011 are used for our analysis, though again, these measures represent growth in that school over up to 7 academic years. The second approach is identical to the first, only the empirical model includes a control for school value-added under the school's prior principal as a means of adjusting for the "starting point" for the current principal. Further details on both models are available in Grissom, Kalogrides, & Loeb (2012).

Measuring Principals' Time Management

To assess principals' time management skills, our principal surveys included a modified version of Britton and Tesser's (1991) Time Management Questionnaire (TMQ). The TMQ was developed to measure time management among college students, so we adjusted the wording of some items and dropped two others to make the instrument appropriate for school principals. In Britton and Tesser's (1991) study, factor analysis of the TMQ identified three dimensions of time management: short-range planning, long-range planning, and time attitudes. Hypothesizing that principals' positions as managers mean that—unlike college students—they may use delegation of tasks to others as a strategy for managing their time, we also added 4 original items to capture this construct. Table 2 describes the 21 items which were preceded by the prompt, "How frequently would you say you do each of the following?" Principals responded on a four-point scale (*never, sometimes, frequently, always*).

Exploratory factor analysis of our modified 21-item time management scale using varimax rotation uncovered four constructs, though differences in the item patterns from those described by Britton and Tesser (1991) necessitated a renaming of our constructs (Table 2). The first factor aligns closely with Britton and Tesser's (1991) *short-range planning* factor, so we maintain this nomenclature. The items that load highest on this factor are *planning your day before you start it* (factor loading = 0.83), *making a list of the things you have to do each day* (0.82), and *making a schedule of the activities you have to do on work days* (0.82).

We label the second dimension *poor time consciousness*. These items relate to not approaching time as a resource to be actively managed, such as *finding yourself working on assignments or reports the night before they are due* or *finding yourself being late for a meeting or event*. This dimension comes closest to what Britton and Tesser (1991) describe as *time attitudes*.

The third factor is a new factor, delegation, and all four survey items meant to measure the factor loaded well, as we expected. Among the items, three have factor loadings greater than 0.6: *asking your assistant principal to handle a situation so you can direct your attention elsewhere* (0.81), *delegating minor issues to an administrative assistant or other staff* (0.79), and *relying on an administrative assistant to screen out less important issues before they reach your desk* (0.62).

The final factor, which we label *focus*, reflects the degree to which principals are able to maintain concentration and control over how their time is spent. The items that load most highly onto this factor are *keeping your desk clear of everything other than what you are currently working on*, *making the most constructive use of your time*, *feeling you are in charge of your own*

time, and, negatively, *finding yourself getting diverted from the task at hand*. Each of these items loads onto this factor at approximately 0.6.

As a final summative measure capturing overall time management skills, we also created a single *time management* index via a factor analysis with only one factor. Inter-item reliability for this scale was high (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.76$). Loadings for this measure are shown to the right in Table 2, as are means for each of the items. We make use of both this aggregate time management measure and the four sub-measures in the analyses that follow.

Methods

The three research questions we ask require a mix of analytical approaches. For the first question, which asks how time management skills are distributed with respect to school and principal characteristics, we conduct *t*-tests for differences in time management skills by these characteristics. For the second and third questions, which ask how time management skills predict time allocation and whether time management skills are associated with principal effectiveness measures, we use a multivariate regression approach. In particular, we model outcomes—either time allocation or measures of principal effectiveness—as a function of time management and a set of school and principal control variables (shown in Table 1) obtained from administrative data.

Examining Time Management across Principals and Schools

Principals' time management behaviors could be different among principals with different personal characteristics or in different job settings (Claessens et al, 2007). To test for such differences, we conducted simple two-sided *t*-tests to compare principals' scores on each of

the five time management measures (the overall scale and the four subscales) by selected principal and school characteristics. Table 3 displays the results. The first column reports the result for the overall time management factor, while the remaining four columns report the findings for the subscales.

Among principal characteristics, only gender shows significant differences for the summary time management measure, with men reporting lower time management scores than women. However, using the subscale, while men score lower on short-range planning, they score higher on delegation. There are no significant differences in the subscales by race except that black principals score significantly higher on poor time consciousness than do white principals. Principals with only Bachelor's degrees score lower on focus relative to higher levels of education. Interestingly, a longer tenure in the same school is associated with higher degrees of delegation, whereas it is also associated with less short-range planning behavior.

Among school characteristics, we find no significant differences by past school performance (as proxied by the school accountability grade) or student demographics (not shown), though there are some differences by school level and size. In particular, principals in elementary schools and smaller schools report greater time management. Elementary and middle school principals report more short-range planning behavior than do high school principals. Small school principals report greater task focus, while principals at mid-size school score higher on short-range planning.

Time Management as a Predictor of Principal Time Allocation

To investigate whether principals with better time management skills allocate their time differently across different areas of job demands—and specifically towards areas more closely

associated with school performance—we rely on the in-person observation data. We aggregated the data on time spent on each of the approximately 50 possible tasks into seven broad categories (Grissom & Loeb, 2011; Horng, et al, 2010): organizational management, instructional management, administration, internal relations, external relations, transition time, and personal time. We then calculated the percentage of the work day the principal spent in each area as given at the bottom of Table 1.

To assess the relationship between time use and time management, we ran separate regression models with the percentage of time spent in each of the seven time-use categories as the dependent variable and including time management measures and school and principal controls as regressors. Table 4 gives the results for the overall time management score. Each column reports the findings from a regression model with both school and principal characteristics. After matching observations with survey responses, we retain a sample of 79 principals (out of the 98 for whom we collected observational data, an 81% coverage rate).

Our main interests are in time spent on organizational management and instruction. Results for the former show no evidence that principals exercising greater time management spend more time on organizational management tasks. They do, however, appear to spend more time on instruction in their schools. This category of tasks includes coaching, classroom walk-throughs, and planning teacher professional development. A one standard deviation increase in time management skills is associated with an increase of about 2% of the day spent on instruction management. Given that only about 13% of the average principal's day is spent on instruction-related tasks, this association is both statistically significant and practically meaningful.

In contrast, we find that a 1-s.d. time management associated with 4% *less* of the work day spent on internal relations in the school, suggesting internal relations is the area that the increase in time on instruction is traded off against. Tasks in this category include interacting socially with staff, attending school activities, and counseling staff and/or students. For no other time task category is time management statistically significant at conventional levels.

We next investigate the relationship between time management and instructional management and internal relations further by re-running the models replacing the time management summary measure with the four subscale measures. Table 5 provides the results, which show that principals with less poor time consciousness spend more time on instruction. We also find evidence that short-range planning skills are associated with more time on instruction ($p < 0.10$). Short-range planning skills primarily drive the decrease in time spent on internal relations ($\beta = -2.7, p < 0.10$).¹

Are Better Time Managers More Effective Principals?

Differences in time allocation for principals with strong time management skills suggests that time management can play a role in how the principal runs the school. Thus, time management may help explain principal effectiveness. To test the hypothesis that more effective principals manage their time better, we measure job performance in two ways, first as how much student test score growth occurs in the school under the principal, then using subjective assessments provided by APs and teachers via surveys.

Student Test Score Growth

¹ We also investigated whether other task categories were associated with the four subscale measures. The only significant finding from this analysis (not shown), is that short-range planning behaviors are negatively correlated with personal time ($\beta = -1.2, p < 0.10$).

Table 6 shows the value-added results using the overall time management variable. In these models, principals' value-added scores in math (columns 1 and 2) and reading (columns 3 and 4) are the dependent variables. The models control for principal characteristics (school characteristics are incorporated into the value-added measure itself). Even-numbered models use a value-added score that is adjusted for the performance of the school at the time the principal arrived; odd-numbered models do not include this adjustment.

In math, the results show a positive relationship between time management and student test score growth over the time the principal has worked in his or her current school, though only in the second model ($p < 0.10$). The coefficient suggests that a one standard deviation increase in principals' overall time management skills predicts a principal value-added score that is approximately 0.02 points higher, or about 0.17 standard deviations on the underlying principal effects scale. Estimates using the four subscale measures suggest this association is driven mostly by the correlation between principal value-added and principals' short-range planning skills and behaviors (see Appendix Table 1). We find no evidence of a significant correlation between time management and growth in reading in either model.

Because differences in school organization and job demands might predict differential importance of time management for principals across school levels, we also tested for evidence of differences among elementary, middle, and high school principals (not shown).² For math, the coefficients that correspond to model 2 in Table 6 are positively signed at all three levels (and twice as large in secondary schools), though given the smaller samples, not statistically significant.

Subjective Assessments

² Results available from authors upon request.

As described in detail in Grissom, Kalogrides and Loeb (2012), there are numerous drawbacks of using value-added models to measure of principal effectiveness. In particular, these measures may do a poor job of isolating the contribution of the principal from the contributions of other school factors. Despite the appeal of measuring effectiveness by student learning, questions about validity of the measures lead us to assess the relationship between time management and subjective assessments of principals as well.

Table 7 repeats the principal effectiveness analysis, this time using the subjective assessments provided by APs and teachers. The AP assessment results are shown in the upper rows, and the teacher assessments in the lower rows. In each case, we show results first for all schools combined, then separately for elementary/middle schools and high schools. All models include controls for principal and school characteristics, though these coefficients are omitted from the table for brevity.

The coefficients in Table 7 reveal a nuanced pattern of results. Model 1 suggests that, on average, principal time management is associated with *negative* assessments of principal effectiveness from their APs ($\beta = -0.14, p < 0.10$). Splitting the schools by level, however, we see that, in fact, the association is positive for high school principals ($\beta = 0.17, p < 0.05$), where the complexity of the work environment makes principal time management arguably more important. Among elementary and middle principals, the association is negative ($\beta = -0.27, p < 0.01$).³

The results for teachers' subjective assessments show no evidence of an association between time management and principal effectiveness in the sample of all schools, but, as with

³ Results for the subscale measures are shown in Appendix Table 2. The results show that the negative association between time management and APs' assessments in elementary and middle schools is driven by a negative association with short-range planning behavior. The positive association for high schools is driven by a combination of short-range planning, delegation and focus, though neither is statistically significant in the small sample.

the AP assessments, pooling the schools masks a positive association for high schools. For these schools, a one standard deviation increase in the time management factor is associated with a 0.12 standard deviation increase in the subjective assessment ($p < 0.05$). The point estimate for the sample of elementary and middle schools is negative but not statistically significant.⁴

Discussion and Conclusions

Research outside of education has shown that time management skills can provide professionals in demanding workplaces with strategies for making more out of scarce time resources, allowing them to focus attention on high-priority matters in ways that may improve their overall job performance (Claessens et al., 2007). The goal of this study was to assess whether these claims apply to school leaders, a group for whom increasing job demands and expectations are raising concerns that “the job simply is not doable” (Institute for Educational Leadership, 2000, p. 12).

Modifying an instrument used in numerous prior settings to assess time management capacities (Britton & Tesser, 1991), we find principal time management to be multidimensional, encompassing skills and behaviors related to short-range planning, time consciousness, delegation, and focus. Although we find that principals rate their overall time management skills higher in elementary schools and smaller schools, where perhaps time management is simpler, characteristics predicting subscale scores vary, with no principal or school characteristics a significant predictor of more than two subscales.

⁴ Appendix Table 2 shows a statistically significant negative correlation between teachers’ assessments and principal delegation for elementary and middle schools. For high schools, all four subscale measures are positive—the coefficients for short-range planning and focus are the largest—but only the coefficient on short-range planning is statistically significant.

We do find, however, that better time management is associated in some ways with what prior studies might describe as more “productive” time investments (Horng, Klasik, & Loeb, 2010; Robinson, Lloyd, & Rowe, 2008). In particular, principals capable of managing their time better spend more time on instruction management and less time on internal relations in their schools, though they spend no more or less time on organizational management or other task areas in our analysis. The connection between time management and instruction supports the idea that principals consider instruction their highest priority area, on average; principals with the skills to prioritize and “find” time within their work day typically allocate those found resources to instructional leadership tasks.

Whether better time management ultimately translates into better job performance is a challenging question to answer, in part because reliable measures of principal job performance are difficult to construct. Our results might best be described as suggestive. Using a student test score growth-based measure of principal job performance, we find a positive correlation with time management, but only for one value-added measure in one subject (math). Subjective job assessments from APs and teachers show positive correlations with time management for high school principals only, and in fact negative correlations for elementary and middle principals. It may be that time management is more important for high school principals who face a larger number of competing time demands. The inconsistency of this result mirrors the mixed evidence on the time management–job performance link in other research (e.g., Barling et al., 1996; Macan, 1994). Job performance is a function of a large number of factors, many of which are difficult to observe, and may be especially difficult to measure in a profession in which the influence of one’s performance on outcomes are mediated and indirect (Hallinger & Heck, 1998).

Still, the themes of the findings we present—that principal time management is associated with more productive work behaviors and, in some cases, more positive school outcomes—provide initial evidence that time management matters for principal work. One reason this connection deserves further attention is that time management is a relatively straightforward set of skills that can be learned and developed (Macan et al., 1990). A large number of training modules and workshops are available and have been widely utilized in the private sector, though these programs vary in their efficacy (Claessens et al., 2007). With relatively small time and resource costs, even modest benefits of time management training for school principals can make such investments cost-effective.

Several limitations of this study should be underscored. Perhaps most important is the issue of measurement error, present to some degree in each of the main variables utilized in this analysis. Self-reports on the time management instrument will be imperfect measures of actual time management skills and behaviors. The reliability of value-added measures of educator performance drives many debates over the use of these measures (Grissom, Kalogrides, & Loeb, 2012). Subjective assessments of principal performance by others in the school may be colored by interpersonal relationships or the fact that APs and teachers cannot observe every dimension of their principal's work. Random error in the value-added and subjective assessment measures will make statistical significance in regression models less likely, perhaps partially accounting for the mix of findings related to principal job performance. Error in the time management measures (an independent variable) is more problematic because it creates the potential for bias.

For these reasons, further exploration of the role of time management in the work of school administrators using more refined or validated time management instruments, alternative outcome measures, and larger samples would be worthwhile. Future research might also consider

factors mediating the relationship between time management and outcomes (e.g., Macan, 1994) or examine whether time management is more closely associated with outcomes under some conditions. Workload and job autonomy, for example, may influence the degree to which time management skills are useful (Claessens et al., 2007).

APPENDIX: Estimation of Principal Value-Added

Our analysis relies on estimates detailed in Grissom, Kalogrides, & Loeb (2012). We use two measures. The first is based on a model described by Equation 1:

$$A_{ispt} = A_{is(t-1)}\beta_1 + X_{ispt}\beta_2 + S_{spt}\beta_3 + C_{spt}\beta_4 + \tau_y + \gamma_g + \delta_{sp} + \varepsilon_{ispt} \quad (1)$$

Equation 1 models the achievement of student i in school s under principal p at time t as a function of the student's achievement last year, plus a vector of student covariates X (race/ethnicity indicators, gender, free or reduced priced lunch status, whether they are currently classified as limited English proficient, whether they are repeating the grade in which they are currently enrolled, lagged absences, lagged suspensions), school covariates S (the school-level aggregates of all the variables in X), classroom covariates C (the classroom-level aggregates of all the variables in X), and fixed effects for time (τ) and grade level (γ). The model also includes a principal-by-school effect, δ , which captures the mean growth of that school during the year the principal works there after the other variables in the model have been taken into account. The coefficients on δ are then shrunk using the empirical Bayes method to account for measurement error, though given the large number of students used to calculate this estimate, shrinkage produces few differences from the original estimates.

In a second approach, we add an additional term, E , as shown in Equation 2:

$$A_{ispt} = A_{is(t-1)}\beta_1 + X_{ispt}\beta_2 + S_{spt}\beta_3 + C_{spt}\beta_4 + \beta_5 E_s + \tau_y + \gamma_g + \delta_p + \varepsilon_{ispt} \quad (2)$$

E is the school value-added at the time a principal enters the school, calculated over all prior years of data using an equation that replaces δ in Equation 1 with a school fixed effect, then using the coefficients from those fixed effects. Equation 2 calculates principal value-added estimates over years that a principal leads any school (i.e., there is no s subscript on δ) but controls for the performance level at any school at which he or she begins working.

APPENDIX TABLE 1: Four Time Management Factors and Principal Value Added

	Mathematics		Reading	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Short-range planning	0.00 (0.01)	0.02** (0.01)	-0.00 (0.01)	0.01 (0.01)
Poor Time Consciousness	0.01 (0.01)	-0.00 (0.01)	0.01 (0.01)	0.01 (0.01)
Delegation	0.01 (0.01)	0.01 (0.01)	0.00 (0.01)	0.00 (0.01)
Focus	0.01 (0.01)	0.00 (0.02)	0.01 (0.01)	-0.01 (0.01)
Age	-0.00 (0.00)	-0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	-0.00 (0.00)
Female	-0.00 (0.02)	0.00 (0.02)	-0.01 (0.02)	0.01 (0.02)
Black	0.09*** (0.03)	-0.04* (0.02)	0.04* (0.02)	-0.04** (0.02)
Hispanic	-0.06** (0.03)	-0.00 (0.04)	-0.04** (0.02)	0.02 (0.02)
Master's or education specialist degree	-0.02 (0.03)	0.01 (0.04)	-0.01 (0.03)	0.02 (0.02)
Doctorate	0.02 (0.04)	0.07 (0.05)	0.01 (0.03)	0.06** (0.03)
Tenure	0.00 (0.01)	-0.00 (0.01)	0.00 (0.00)	-0.00 (0.01)
Constant	0.08 (0.08)	0.05 (0.10)	0.01 (0.06)	-0.02 (0.06)
Observations	233	103	234	103
Adjusted R-square	0.12	0.00	0.07	0.08
F	4.62	1.13	2.80	2.47

Robust standard errors are reported in parentheses

* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

APPENDIX TABLE 2: Four Time Management Factors and Subjective Assessment of Principals by Assistant Principals and Teachers

	Subjective assessment by assistant principals		
	All schools	Elementary and middle school	
		High school	
	(1)	(2)	(3)
Short-Range Planning	-0.21*** (0.08)	-0.32*** (0.10)	0.03 (0.10)
Poor Time Consciousness	0.02 (0.06)	0.06 (0.07)	-0.06 (0.08)
Delegation	0.07 (0.07)	0.02 (0.08)	0.13 (0.14)
Focus	0.06 (0.07)	-0.00 (0.08)	0.25 (0.15)
Observations	295	216	79
Adjusted R-squared	0.04	0.04	0.01
F	1.55	1.41	2.60
	Subjective assessment by teachers		
	All schools	Elementary and middle school	
		High school	
	(4)	(5)	(6)
Short-Range Planning	0.00 (0.03)	-0.03 (0.03)	0.09* (0.05)
Poor Time Consciousness	0.03 (0.04)	0.03 (0.04)	0.02 (0.08)
Delegation	-0.03 (0.03)	-0.07** (0.03)	0.04 (0.08)
Focus	0.04 (0.03)	0.03 (0.03)	0.08 (0.06)
Observations	3303	2457	846
Adjusted R-squared	0.03	0.04	0.06
F	4.17	3.94	5.43

Standard errors are clustered at the school level and reported in parentheses.

* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Note: Control variables include the following characteristics of schools and assistant principals/teachers: age, gender, race, educational attainment, years at the current school, school accountability grade, percentage of students eligible for the federal free and reduced-price lunch program, percentage of Hispanic students, school size, and school level. Combined schools are not included in this analysis. The results are robust to leaving the controls out.

References

- Adams, G. A., & Jex, S. M. (1999). Relationships between time management, control, work–family conflict, and strain. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 4(1), 72–77.
- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 179–211.
- Barling, J., Cheung, D., & Kelloway, E. K. (1996). Time management and achievement striving interact to predict car sales performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81(6), 821–826.
- Blendinger, J., & Snipes, G. (1996). Managerial Behavior of a First-Year Principal. Retrieved from <http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICWebPortal/contentdelivery/servlet/ERICServlet?accno=ED404726>
- Bond, M. & Feather, N. (1988). Some correlates of structure and purpose in the use of time, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 55 (2), 321-329.
- Britton, B. K., & Glynn, S. M. (1989). Mental management and creativity: A cognitive model of time management for intellectual productivity. In J. A. Glover, R. R. Ronning, & C. R. Reynolds. (Eds.), *Handbook of Creativity*, (pp. 429-440). New York: Plenum Press.
- Britton, B. K., & Tesser, A. (1991). Effects of time-management practices on college grades. *Journal of educational psychology*, 83(3), 405.
- Claessens, B. J. C., Eerde, W. van, Rutte, C. G., & Roe, R. A. (2007). A review of the time management literature. *Personnel Review*, 36(2), 255–276.
- Claessens, B. J. C., Van Eerde, W., Rutte, C. G., & Roe, R. A. (2004). Planning behavior and perceived control of time at work. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25(8), 937–950.
- Francis-Smythe, J.A. & Robertson, I.T. (1999). Time-related individual differences, *Time & Society*, 8 (2-3), 273-292.
- Goldring, E., Huff, J., May, H., & Camburn, E. (2008). School context and individual characteristics: What influences principal practice? *Journal of Educational Administration*, 46 (3), 332-352.
- Green, P., & Skinner, D. (2005). Does time management training work? An evaluation. *International Journal of Training and Development*, 9(2), 124–139.
- Grissom, J. A., & Loeb, S. (2011). Triangulating principal effectiveness: How perspectives of parents, teachers, and assistant principals identify the central importance of managerial skills. *American Educational Research Journal*, 48(5), 1091–1123.
- Grissom, J.A., Loeb, S., & Master, B. (2012). What is effective instructional leadership?

- Longitudinal evidence from observations of principals. Paper presented at the Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management annual meeting, November 8-10, 2012, Baltimore, MD.
- Grissom, J.A., Kalogrides, D., & Loeb, S. (2012). Using student test scores to measure principal performance. NBER Working Paper No. 18568.
- Hall, B. L., & Hursch, D. E. (1982). An evaluation of the effects of a time management training program on work efficiency. *Journal of Organizational Behavior Management*, 3(4), 73–96.
- Hallinger, P., & Heck, R. (1998). Exploring the principal's contribution to school effectiveness: 1980-1995. *School Effectiveness & School Improvement*, 9(2), 157.
- Hornig, E. L., Klasik, D., & Loeb, S. (2010). Principal's time use and school effectiveness. *American Journal of Education*, 116 (4), 491-523.
- Institute for Educational Leadership. (2000). *Leadership for student learning: Reinventing the principalship*. Washington, DC: IEL.
- Jamal, M. (1984). Job stress and job performance controversy: An empirical assessment. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 33(1), 1–21.
- Judge, T.A., Thoreson, C.J., Bono, J.E., & Patton, G.K. (2001). The job satisfaction—job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127(3), 376-407.
- Lay, C.H. & Schouwenburg, H.C. (1993). Trait procrastination, time management, and academic behavior. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 8 (4), 647-662.
- Macan, T. H. (1994). Time management: Test of a process model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79(3), 381.
- Macan, T. H., Shahani, C., Dipboye, R. L., & Phillips, A. P. (1990). College students' time management: Correlations with academic performance and stress. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 82(4), 760.
- Manasse, A. L. (1985). Improving conditions for principal effectiveness: policy Implications of research. *The Elementary School Journal*, 85(3), 439–463.
- May, H., Huff, J., & Goldring, E. (2012). A longitudinal study of principals' activities and student performance. *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, 23(4), 417–439.
- Miller, A. W. (2001). Finding time and support for instructional leadership. *Principal Leadership*, 2(4), 29–33.

- Misra, R. & McKean, M. (2000). College students' academic stress and its relation to their anxiety, time management, and leisure satisfaction. *American Journal of Health Studies*, 16 (1), 41-51.
- Orpen, C. (1994). The effect of time-management training on employee attitudes and behavior: A field experiment. *Journal of Psychology*, 128(4), 393.
- Peeters, M. A. G., & Rutte, C. G. (2005). Time management behavior as a moderator for the Job demand-control interaction. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 10(1), 64–75.
- Radhakrishna, R. B., Yoder, E. P., & Baggett, C. (1991). Time management and performance. *Journal of Extension*, 29 (2).
- Robinson, V. M. J., Lloyd, C. A., & Rowe, K. J. (2008). The impact of leadership on school outcomes: An analysis of the differential effects of leadership types. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 44(5), 635-674.
- Schuler, R. S. (1979). Managing stress means managing time. *Personnel Journal*, 58(12), 851-854.
- Spillane, J. P., Camburn, E. M., Pareja, A. S. (2007). Taking a distributed perspective to the school principal's workday. *Leadership and Policy in Schools*, 6 (1), 103-125.
- Spillane, J. P., Hunt, B. R. (2010). Days of their lives: A mixed-methods, descriptive analysis of the men and women at work in the principal's office. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 42 (3), 293-331.
- Truman, M. & Hartley, J. (1996). A comparison between the time management skills and academic performance of mature and traditional-entry university students. *Higher Education*, 32 (2), 199 – 215.

TABLE 1: Descriptive Statistics

Variables	N	Mean	SD	Min	Max
<i>School characteristics</i>					
Fraction Hispanic students	234	0.58	0.32	0.03	0.99
Fraction Black students	234	0.33	0.34	0	0.96
Fraction free/reduced lunch students	234	0.76	0.2	0.1	0.99
School size (in 100s)	234	9.29	6.48	0.64	42.83
2009-10 School accountability grade (scale: 5=A...1=F)	229	4.04	1.16	1	5
Elementary school	234	0.64	0.48	0	1
Middle school	234	0.19	0.39	0	1
High school	234	0.15	0.36	0	1
Combination (K-12) school	234	0.02	0.14	0	1
Number of assistant principals	234	1.75	0.99	0	6
<i>Principal characteristics</i>					
Female	234	0.69	0.46	0	1
American Indian	234	0	0.07	0	1
Black	234	0.3	0.46	0	1
Hispanic	234	0.44	0.5	0	1
White	234	0.26	0.44	0	1
Number of years in current school (topcoded at 8)	234	3.81	2.15	1	8
Age	234	49.66	7.49	34	70
Holds master's degree or education specialist degree	234	0.7	0.46	0	1
Holds doctoral degree	234	0.22	0.41	0	1
<i>Principal value added measure</i>					
Mathematics without adjustment	233	0	0.17	-0.33	0.94
Mathematics with adjustment	103	0.02	0.12	-0.21	0.8
Reading without adjustment	234	0.01	0.12	-0.21	0.52
Reading with adjustment	103	0.01	0.08	-0.16	0.39
<i>Principal time use (percent spent on the following category)</i>					
Management	79	20.47	12.78	1.16	54.76
Administration	79	33.41	13.30	3.70	62.96
Instructional management	79	13.12	9.50	0	41.67
Internal relations	79	21.53	10.48	4.35	45.83
External relations	79	4.22	5.97	0	37.84
Transition	79	8.76	5.76	0	24.18
Personal time	79	6.05	5.00	0	22.37

Note: Five schools were not assigned accountability grades for the 2010-11 school year.

TABLE 2: Factor Analysis

	Short-range Planning	Poor Time Consciousness	Delegation	Focus	Time Management (Summary Measure)	<i>Item means (1-4 scale)</i>
<i>Eigenvalues:</i>	5.33	3.00	2.12	1.19	5.33	
Plan your day before you start it	0.83				0.80	3.14
Make a list of the things you have to do each day	0.82				0.66	3.09
Make a schedule of the activities you have to do on work days	0.82				0.69	3.01
Write a set of daily goals for yourself	0.76				0.64	2.65
Spend time each day planning	0.68				0.67	2.75
Have a clear idea of what you want to accomplish during the next week	0.63				0.66	3.30
Have an explicit set of goals for the current month	0.48				0.56	2.93
Find yourself continuing in unproductive routines or activities		0.79				1.82
Find yourself being late for a meeting or event		0.74				1.42
Find yourself working on assignments or reports the night before they are due		0.71				1.93
Find yourself spending a lot of time transitioning from place to place		0.67				2.03
Believe there is room for improvement in how you manage your time		0.36	0.37			2.93
Ask your assistant principal to handle a situation so you can direct your attention elsewhere			0.81			2.72
Delegate minor issues to an administrative assistant or other staff			0.79		0.46	2.89
Rely on an administrative assistant to screen out less important issues before they reach your desk			0.62			2.48
Try to limit the amount of time you spend on routine paperwork			0.52	0.43	0.46	2.61
Keep your desk clear of everything other than what you are currently working on				0.59	0.59	2.28
Make the most constructive use of your time	0.42			0.59	0.69	3.10
Feel you are in charge of your own time, by and large				0.59	0.46	2.65
Find yourself getting diverted from the task at hand				-0.56		2.43
Set and honor priorities	0.42			0.52	0.65	3.19

TABLE 3: Comparing Time Management by Principal and School Characteristics

	Time Management (Summary Measure)	Subscale Measures			
		Short-range Planning	Poor Time Consciousness	Delegation	Focus
<i>Principal characteristics</i>					
<i>Gender</i>					
Male	-0.16*	-0.22**	-0.04	0.17*	-0.08
Female	0.07	0.10	0.02	-0.08	0.04
<i>Race</i>					
Black	-0.05	0.02	0.16*	-0.2	0.05
Hispanic	0.09	0.06	-0.05	0.13	-0.01
White	-0.08	-0.11	-0.10	0.02	-0.03
<i>Highest degree</i>					
Bachelor's degree	-0.23	0.04	0.22	-0.05	-0.44**
Master's or education specialist degree	0.09	0.09	0.01	0.05	-0.01*
Doctorate	-0.17	-0.27	-0.08	-0.14	0.20
<i>Number of years in current school</i>					
1 - 3 years	0.05	0.16***	0.04	-0.13**	-0.06
4+ years	-0.07	-0.20	-0.06	0.16	0.08
<i>School characteristics</i>					
<i>School accountability grade</i>					
A	0.08	0.07	-0.11	0.02	-0.01
B	-0.35	-0.40	0.28	0.00	0.06
C	0.05	0.10	0.09	0.10	-0.12
D or F	-0.20	-0.20	0.08	-0.20	0.09
<i>School level</i>					
Elementary	0.08*	0.10**	-0.05	-0.05	0.01
Middle	0.01	0.07**	0.14	0.20	-0.19
High	-0.33	-0.42	0.15	0.09	0.05
<i>School size (against largest)</i>					
Small (Fewer than 525)	0.14*	0.01	0.05	-0.04	0.31**
Middle (526-1,150)	0.06*	0.15**	-0.02	-0.05	-0.11
Large (1,151+)	-0.21	-0.25	0.00	0.17	-0.11
<i>Number of assistant principals</i>					
0-1	0.08	0.10*	0.04	-0.10	0.07
2+	-0.09	-0.11	-0.04	0.11	-0.08

Asterisks indicate significant differences from the final category within groupings.

*p < .10. **p<.05. ***p<.01.

Note: We also tested for differences by quartiles of student free/reduced lunch eligibility and student race/ethnicity but found no significant differences (omitted for brevity).

TABLE 4: Principals' Time Management and Time Allocation

	Organization management	Instructional management	Administration	Internal relations	External relations	Transition time	Personal time
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Time management (summative measure)	0.31 (1.62)	2.27** (1.08)	-1.31 (1.52)	-3.57*** (1.34)	0.13 (0.78)	0.85 (0.62)	-0.73 (0.57)
School with Grade A	2.05 (5.75)	-6.07 (4.25)	1.75 (5.11)	3.27 (5.16)	4.10 (3.10)	-2.52 (2.64)	2.33 (2.32)
School with Grade B	3.85 (5.79)	-1.96 (4.70)	3.52 (4.78)	-0.35 (4.78)	0.41 (1.79)	-0.51 (2.54)	0.92 (2.20)
School with Grade C	-2.09 (5.04)	-5.22 (3.96)	4.53 (3.65)	0.91 (4.54)	1.48 (1.62)	-0.88 (1.99)	0.78 (1.77)
Fraction free/reduced lunch students	-4.40 (11.01)	1.11 (7.07)	12.75 (10.41)	12.28 (8.30)	1.99 (5.82)	-0.97 (5.47)	5.10 (4.36)
Fraction Hispanics students	-4.05 (5.45)	-4.86 (4.66)	3.07 (7.05)	-4.33 (6.06)	0.82 (2.40)	-2.89 (3.32)	1.94 (2.66)
School size (in 100s)	0.12 (0.23)	-0.01 (0.19)	0.36* (0.22)	0.05 (0.25)	0.00 (0.14)	-0.00 (0.12)	-0.23** (0.10)
Middle school	5.15 (4.27)	-5.83 (3.52)	1.52 (4.60)	-0.04 (4.05)	3.14 (2.68)	-4.29* (2.37)	-0.33 (2.11)
High school	5.24 (4.54)	-9.69*** (3.40)	-0.74 (4.37)	3.02 (3.80)	7.32* (4.21)	-0.38 (2.22)	1.45 (1.57)
Have two assistant principals or more	-2.59 (4.13)	4.34 (3.64)	-4.95 (4.38)	-0.54 (4.27)	-2.41 (2.35)	1.08 (2.27)	0.38 (1.96)
Age	0.39 (0.26)	-0.02 (0.18)	-0.65*** (0.24)	0.25 (0.21)	-0.02 (0.10)	0.06 (0.13)	0.03 (0.09)
Female	-2.35 (3.14)	-0.63 (2.14)	-4.31 (4.11)	3.12 (2.69)	1.94 (1.58)	-0.22 (1.45)	0.71 (1.32)
Black	0.76 (4.24)	-1.42 (4.28)	6.20* (3.52)	-6.23 (4.44)	-1.79 (1.41)	-0.81 (2.17)	-1.18 (1.99)
Hispanic	11.72*** (3.51)	-0.40 (2.41)	-1.91 (3.72)	0.50 (3.14)	-0.42 (2.01)	-0.91 (2.14)	-0.73 (1.57)
Master's or education specialist degree	-7.97 (5.14)	-3.29 (4.00)	4.35 (4.11)	7.27** (3.51)	0.75 (1.37)	-0.06 (2.03)	-2.02 (2.13)
Doctorate	-0.52 (6.00)	3.21 (4.60)	-2.18 (5.91)	1.45 (4.41)	-0.34 (2.30)	0.32 (2.46)	-1.67 (2.38)
Tenure in school	-1.59* (0.92)	0.18 (0.63)	0.37 (0.84)	-0.78 (0.66)	-0.07 (0.33)	0.37 (0.47)	0.67 (0.41)
Constant	9.90 (17.24)	24.62* (12.77)	48.48*** (14.95)	-3.77 (13.52)	-1.55 (6.91)	9.67 (7.50)	-0.04 (6.44)

Observations	79	79	79	79	79	79	79
Adjusted R-squared	0.10	0.07	0.12	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
F	2.06	2.11	2.57	1.20	1.58	1.20	1.47

Robust standard errors are reported in parentheses. * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$. Time use is measured as a percentage of time spent on each category.

TABLE 5: Components of Time Management and Selected Time Allocation

	Instructional management	Internal relations
	(1)	(2)
Short-range Planning	1.79* (0.94)	-2.69* (1.39)
Poor Time Consciousness	-2.67** (1.23)	1.76 (1.32)
Delegation	0.99 (1.16)	-1.91 (1.25)
Focus	0.25 (1.13)	-1.21 (1.40)
School with Grade A	-6.02 (3.98)	3.54 (5.22)
School with Grade B	-1.96 (4.70)	-0.06 (4.99)
School with Grade C	-6.44* (3.76)	1.63 (4.43)
Fraction free/reduced lunch students	0.74 (6.94)	12.71 (8.18)
Fraction Hispanics students	-3.75 (4.57)	-5.50 (6.00)
School size (in 100s)	-0.07 (0.19)	0.07 (0.25)
Middle school	-6.05* (3.40)	-0.04 (4.62)
High school	-8.53** (3.40)	2.51 (3.97)
Have two assistant principals or more	4.29 (3.42)	0.26 (4.73)
Age	-0.00 (0.19)	0.21 (0.22)
Female	0.49 (2.14)	2.48 (2.73)
Black	0.77 (4.28)	-7.74 (4.95)
Hispanic	0.28 (2.63)	0.25 (3.22)
Master's or education specialist degree	-3.59 (3.94)	7.74* (3.88)
Doctorate	3.48 (4.43)	1.56 (5.04)
Tenure	0.11 (0.68)	-0.66 (0.70)
Constant	23.63* (12.08)	-2.97 (12.95)
Observations	79	79
Adjusted R-squared	0.10	0.00
F	2.91	1.12

Robust standard errors in parentheses

* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Note: Actual time use is measured as a percentage of time spent on each category.

TABLE 6: Time Management and Principal Value Added Estimates

	Mathematics		Reading	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Time management (summative measure)	0.01 (0.01)	0.02* (0.01)	0.00 (0.01)	0.01 (0.01)
Age	-0.00 (0.00)	-0.00 (0.00)	0.00 (0.00)	-0.00 (0.00)
Female	-0.00 (0.02)	0.01 (0.02)	-0.01 (0.02)	0.01 (0.01)
Black	0.09*** (0.03)	-0.04** (0.02)	0.04** (0.02)	-0.04** (0.02)
Hispanic	-0.06** (0.03)	-0.00 (0.04)	-0.04** (0.02)	0.02 (0.02)
Master's or education specialist degree	-0.02 (0.03)	0.00 (0.04)	-0.01 (0.03)	0.01 (0.02)
Doctorate	0.02 (0.04)	0.06 (0.04)	0.01 (0.03)	0.05* (0.03)
Tenure	0.00 (0.01)	-0.00 (0.01)	0.00 (0.00)	-0.00 (0.01)
Constant	0.07 (0.08)	0.07 (0.09)	-0.00 (0.06)	-0.00 (0.06)
Observations	233	103	234	103
Adjusted R-squared	0.12	0.00	0.07	0.08
F	4.91	1.55	3.23	2.56

Robust standard errors are reported in parentheses

* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

TABLE 7: Time Management and Subjective Assessment of Principals by Assistant Principals and Teachers

	Subjective assessment by assistant principals		
	(1)	(2)	(3)
	All schools	Elementary and middle school	High school
Time management (summary measure)	-0.14* (0.07)	-0.27*** (0.09)	0.17** (0.08)
Observations	295	216	79
Adjusted R-squared	0.02	0.02	0.01
F	1.19	1.32	3.30

	Subjective assessment by teachers		
	(4)	(5)	(6)
	All schools	Elementary and middle school	High school
Time management (summary measure)	0.01 (0.03)	-0.04 (0.03)	0.12** (0.05)
Observations	3303	2457	846
Adjusted R-squared	0.03	0.03	0.06
F	4.16	4.23	4.82

Standard errors are clustered at the school level and reported in parentheses.

* $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Note: Control variables include the following characteristics of schools and assistant principals/teachers: age, gender, race, educational attainment, years at the current school, school accountability grade, percentage of students eligible for the federal free and reduced-price lunch program, percentage of Hispanic students, school size, and school level. Combined schools are not included in this analysis. The results are robust to leaving the controls out.